

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Even the Snow Is White: Displacement and Literary Ecology in Diane Glancy's *Pushing the Bear*

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6xp6f15p>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 33(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Hada, Kenneth

Publication Date

2009

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

COMMENTARY

Even the Snow Is White: Displacement and Literary Ecology in Diane Glancy's *Pushing the Bear*

KENNETH HADA

One cannot read important voices of nature writing and ecology literature without noticing a view of landscape that closely parallels an indigenous perspective. For example, Barry Lopez gains insight from the Navajo culture to ground his thoughts concerning how story and landscape function to bring interior harmony to an individual otherwise bound in chaos.¹ The Navajo ceremony Beauty Way is “a spiritual invocation of the order of the exterior universe” for the purpose of “re-creating” individuals in order “to make the individual again a reflection of the myriad enduring relationships of the landscape.”² Other writers in the genre, such as Aldo Leopold, emphasize a view of land similar to that of a Native understanding. In his famous “Land Ethic” he warns against seeing land as a commodity, instead emphasizing the communal aspects of land.³ John Graves, in *Goodbye to a River*, echoes the notion of spirituality, landscape, and individual identity and consciousness.⁴ In his elegiac journey Graves’s Thoreau-like observations also include reverential references to the “People” who inhabited his Brazos River before the whites arrived. Another important book for literary ecologists, Harry Middleton’s *The Earth Is Enough*, posits Elias Wonder, a dislocated Sioux, along with the two protagonists who resist modernization, relying instead on the insights gained by observing indigenous culture.⁵ Jack Burns, the protagonist of Edward Abbey’s

Kenneth Hada is an associate professor in the Department of English and Languages at East Central University in Ada, Oklahoma. His research and teaching interests include American and ethnic literatures, regionalism, and ecocriticism.

The Brave Cowboy, celebrates the “rocks and trees and spirits of the wilderness” as he is acutely aware of “another presence.”⁶ Many other examples exist. It is unnecessary to draw an artificial distinction between Native American authors and others, but it is noteworthy that many nature writers and ecocritical scholars recognize worthwhile ecological themes intrinsic to Native American culture. Many Native American authors, such as Paula Gunn Allen and Joseph Bruchac, are also central to the ecocritical movement.⁷ The notion that individuals should naturally be a reflection of landscape seems to be a premise that Native American authors share with nineteenth-century transcendentalists, contemporary nature writers, and ecocriticism scholars.

In his introduction to *The Remembered Earth*, Geary Hobson explains that land and psychology are indistinguishable for Native American peoples.⁸ For example, the Choctaw word *Oklahoma*, usually translated as either *red land* or *red people*, really means both people and land. A better reading is *red people's land*. Hobson writes, “In many Native American languages the words ‘people’ and ‘land’ are indistinguishable and inseparable.”⁹ The psychology and spirituality of indigenous people are inseparable from landscape, each partner together in a relationship of natural being. Such a relationship goes beyond Indian cultures, however. It is fundamental for those who understand the precarious situation of our natural resources. Increasingly, environmental writing implicitly, if not explicitly, is returning full circle to various emphases of Native cultures.

It is an oversimplification to say that indigenous cultures were never harmful to the environment before the arrival of Europeans. Jared Diamond and others have adequately demonstrated that pre-European cultures also contributed to the demise of the earth's resources.¹⁰ Romantic notions of a noble savage worldview are not helpful. However, it is also generally true that Native cultures, given their close proximity to landscape, usually practiced a more harmonious relationship with the natural spheres of their existence than the settlers arriving in North America. Certainly, succeeding generations in modern America have moved even farther away from any kind of spiritual kinship with land or nature. As a result of a dichotomized worldview that has tended to posit Christianity and the Enlightenment against nature, the realm of nature has been reduced to that of adversary or, at best, only playing a secondary, supportive role to human life. Allen, for example, argues that the Judeo-Christian position has unnecessarily caused such a split between human and nonhuman life. She contrasts the Judeo-Christian God, who “makes everything and tells everything how it may and may not function,” with the “American Indian universe,” which “is based on dynamic self-esteem.” She sees the “Christian universe . . . [as] based primarily on a sense of separation and loss,” while an Indian worldview demonstrates the “ability of all creatures to share in the process of ongoing creation.” Native culture demonstrates an intimate relationship with nature, and, as Allen concludes, this relationship “makes all things sacred.”¹¹ This fundamental epistemological difference may serve as a starting point for literary ecologists who also may wish to see the universe holistically, rather than in a grand dichotomy that relegates nature to a submissive, utilitarian role.

Stories from indigenous cultures are increasingly valuable for studies in ecology and literature. Thomas King reminds us that “the truth about stories is that that’s all we are.” As Hobson recognizes the inseparable quality of Indian psychology and land, King combines the power of story with the identity of Native culture. One of the many stories that King retells and interprets for his readers is the “one about Coyote and the Ducks” in which Coyote tricks the Ducks into giving up half of their beautiful feathers in exchange for protection. King, in his clever manner of mixing story with cultural inference, refuses to “finish the story” for readers, but then he does connect the Coyote and Duck story to ecological concerns such as “dumping raw sewage into the ocean.” He then specifically connects the loss of land due to legislative policies to the very identity of what it means to be Indian. King concludes this lecture by reiterating the pointed question arising out of the Coyote and Duck story. When there are no more Ducks (Indians), “Who will sing for us? Who will dance for us? Who will remind us of our relationship to the earth?”¹²

Similarly, Bruchac uses Native stories to connect human enterprise with care for the environment. He presents stories from his Abenaki tradition, such as “Gluskabe’s Game Bag,” to remind us of our tenuous relationship with nature. Moreover, he argues that human cooperation with nature is as much “practical” as it is “mystical”—meaning that sustenance of all life is interdependent and contingent on cooperative rather than exploitive practices. Bruchac recalls Iroquois prophecies concerning a sick earth, when “elm trees would die” and “air would be harmful to breathe and the water harmful to drink.” The human “power to upset the natural balance” must be mitigated by “ceremonies and lesson stories . . . to remind us of our proper place.” Bruchac reminds us to “see things in [common sense] terms of circles and cycles.” Before acting, we must remember the “seven generations to come.” We must ask: “How will my deeds affect the lives of my children’s children’s children?”¹³ The spirit of this “seven generations” test is very much in accord with ecologists who warn against shortsighted, improper use of natural resources that will eventually affect succeeding generations.

As the references to Hobson, Allen, King, and Bruchac suggest, the natural link between identity and land is a prominent aspect of Indian epistemology. What King also makes explicit is the role of a story, even a story that illustrates loss and confusion. Even more specifically, Bruchac (as well as King, Allen, and Hobson) connects Native story with contemporary environmental concerns. Diane Glancy’s historical fiction, *Pushing the Bear*, follows this Native approach of using story in the midst of tragic chaos—not only retelling the reality of the injustice but also demonstrating the coping power of a story for healing and survival.¹⁴ Moreover, in this story of displacement, the upheaval is characteristically told in dialogical terms in which the threat to landscape and human identity are combined. Her novel reconstructs one episode in the Cherokee Trails of Tears (there were actually several relocations to the west, for the Cherokee and the other eastern tribes of the same period).¹⁵ The Removal of eastern peoples from their ancestral lands westward to eventual resettlement in Oklahoma is a complex, agonizing story. As Glancy’s novel depicts, dislocation from places of origin has tremendous psychological and

cultural consequences. Glancy's novel is valuable for several reasons. First, it keeps the memory of premodern Cherokee culture alive. Second, it vividly reminds readers of an undeniable ugly history in which many of our cultural forefathers (including some biological ancestors) participated, one of which an honest assessment is necessary to help move us beyond the limitations of racial and cultural bigotry. Third, *Pushing the Bear* ultimately celebrates the survival of an adaptive and dignified people.¹⁶

In addition to these prerequisite historical considerations, for literary ecologists, *Pushing the Bear* significantly offers a subsequent directive. The study of Native culture may function as an ironic mirror into which all members of modern society should look to avoid potentially self-destructive practices. Beyond the historical displacement of the Cherokee, expulsion from land functions in an archetypal manner, something to which readers of all cultures can relate—a fear that even modern landowners worry about. Displacement violates the very psychology of those who have some connection to land, regardless of how ownership and stewardship (or lack thereof) is perceived and practiced.

As Glancy's novel indicates, Cherokees were faced with an ugly dilemma: on the one hand, they could relinquish their land to the wave of white dominance and peacefully and willingly move west, or, on the other hand, they could resist and suffer violent consequences before being forced to evacuate. Such a choice was especially threatening for a people whose identity was inseparable from landscape. In addition to the historical lessons that *Pushing the Bear* illustrates in dramatic dialogues, the novel speaks to all citizens concerning our need to understand and reclaim a lost association with landscape.

Glancy's novel realistically reconstructs the internal conflict that individual Cherokees experienced during this assault on their culture. The dialogue she imagines is often bitter, despairing, struggling to make sense of the absurd situation in which they find themselves. Glancy's text is multivoiced, "heteroglossic" in M. M. Bakhtin's terms, in order to demonstrate individual conflicting viewpoints expressed within the larger frame of expulsion. For Bakhtin, a novel is a rhetorical meeting of distinct voices, a collection of dialogues, in space and time. A novel is a compilation of voices representative of various cultural or moral views. He refers to this diverse arrangement of voices in a text as heteroglossia, and those alternative voices share a privileged position in texts. No final, authoritative, heroic voice trumps all other representation. Questions of right and wrong become dramatically pronounced when competing views are active options, rather than just stock responses to an epic hero. Morality is not an abstraction within the dialogical contexts. Dialogue exposes moral issues as real questions in search of answers rather than mere rhetorical devices provided to enhance the status of a protagonist. Values associated with the speakers become apparent because the characters have an investment in their speech. The Bakhtinian novel is a format in which competing concerns must be heard. Authentic novels are "a dialogized system made up of the images of 'languages,' styles and consciousnesses that are concrete and inseparable from language. Language in the novel not only represents, but itself serves as the object of representation." The voices of a

novel occur within crucibles of space/time meetings, which Bakhtin refers to as *chronotopes*. When Bakhtin uses this term he means “the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature.”¹⁷ Understanding the various speeches in a novel directly correlates to a chronotope. The chronotope allows for a full exploration of the dialogical content. It shapes dialogue.

Michael McDowell points out that a Bakhtinian heuristic allows readers to “hear characters and elements of the landscape that have been marginalized. [The reader’s] attention is directed to the differences in the kind of language associated with specific characters or elements of the landscape” giving each character or element “an autonomous” and “distinct” voice. By establishing a dialogue within a specific space/time continuum, an alternative viewpoint is authenticated.¹⁸ Dialogue, occurring in and shaped by a particular time and place, becomes the essential structure of a novel. Through these particular encounters, readers are brought into intimate, realistic contentions for values, identity, and authority. One particular chronotope that Bakhtin recognizes is the “chronotope of the *road*,” which he sees as spatial intersection—“a particularly good place for random encounters.” He also recognizes the chronotope of an “alien world.”¹⁹ The pronounced effect of this narrative style in Glancy’s novel is that readers hear several characters individually questioning and challenging various themes. Each is given prominent status in her text (this includes Cherokee and others, those imaginatively created by the author as well as those historical figures to which she alludes). Beyond this, the geographical space takes on a character-like quality. Glancy has commented on this aspect: “The land carries the voices of those who have walked upon it. . . . I started off *Pushing the Bear* with one voice, and it wasn’t enough. I had to go back and add . . . everybody who had traveled with them on the Trail of Tears. It takes many voices to tell a story, and I think we carry those voices within us.”²⁰ In *Pushing the Bear*, readers follow the actual movement of Cherokees, state by state, mile by mile, as they walk an uncertain path crossing new and forbidding waters toward an unforeseen future in an alien place later known as Oklahoma. Glancy takes readers into the soul of each of her characters as they walk alone with their thoughts intermittently surfacing in speech. The novel’s discourse, voiced by many characters intersecting with strangers (Cherokee and others encountered en route), speaks several truths and is understandably linked to the loss of home and the uncertainty of a new place.

Of the many themes woven into the various narratives of Glancy’s novel, literary ecologists will especially notice passages that connect identity and landscape. A primary example is spoken by the character Maritole: “Didn’t the soldiers know we were the land? The cornstalks were our grandmothers. In our story of corn, a woman named Selu had been murdered by her sons. Where her blood fell, the corn grew. The cornstalks waved their arms trying to hold us. Their voices were the long tassels reaching the air. Our spirits clung to them. Our roots entwined.”²¹ Here Maritole echoes the psychology of landscape and identity expressed above by Hobson. Her words suggest a dynamic relationship “between human and nonhuman beings”—the symbol of corn, for instance, signifying a participatory ceremony now threatened.²²

The voice of the character Luthy says: "I'm part of earth as I walk. I am the harvested crops. I should not mind the trail any more than the corn minds the harvest. When I hear the voice of the corn, I know I'm a part of the earth."²³ Another character, identified simply as Maritole's Father, articulates the personal chaos that follows when people are disoriented from the reality associated with place. In addition to losing their lands, the soldiers

took the order that couldn't be seen. They opened us up to the old disorder . . . that was the horror of the trail—we saw beyond our corn-fields and cabins and villages into the west, where the sun disappeared. And worse, we knew the black space inside our heads was only a copy of the nothingness itself. And because of the hollowness, we were meant to hold things, and would always hold things, as long as there was something to hold.²⁴

The imbalance feared by these voices is directly at odds with the desired order of a Native worldview: "At base, every story, every song, every ceremony tells the Indian that each creature is part of a living whole and that all parts of that whole are related to one another by virtue of their participation in the whole of being."²⁵

Not all whites hated the Cherokee, and many offered heroic assistance.²⁶ Often assistance came, however, with an implied or even explicit deal that the Cherokee would adopt Christian doctrines, as interpreted by whites.²⁷ Glancy's novel depicts the Cherokee Christian, Reverend Bushyhead, who struggles to blend Christian precepts with the fact of their removal. In one of his speeches, he laments, "My words seemed to fly back in my face as I talked. . . . The wind seemed to pick up the corners of the afternoon and turn it into dark as we finished our walking that day. The voices high in the trees hissed. . . . Sometimes the trees seemed to pound themselves against the ground in a fit of anger. If only the soldiers could hear the woods speak."²⁸ Here, even the Christianity of the Cherokee is inadequate to guarantee honest or just interactions with the dominant culture.²⁹ The mixing of orthodoxy and Native epistemology, evident in Bushyhead's words, signifies an awkward juxtaposition marked by confusion. His Christianity is marked by his Cherokee roots. He hears the woods speak, which is to suggest the communal quality of his discourse, a discourse compatible with notions put forth by Leopold and others referred to above. It is evident that in this most troubling of times, when the minister wishes to comfort and guide his people, he most keenly feels the comfort of nature and, most significantly, recognizes that the soldiers' inability to participate in such a dialogue is a sure indicator of the great gulf existing between the Cherokee and the greater culture that the soldiers serve.

Perhaps the statement that is together most cryptic and bitter is a simple declaration by the character War Club: "Even the snow is white."³⁰ These terse words suggest a perceived inversion concerning the roles of nature and the Cherokee, which before the coming of the Europeans had been that of companionship, nurture, and instruction. In this context, to label the snow as

“white” establishes a semiotic reminder of the European oppression forcing the Cherokee expulsion. The Cherokee story in many ways is representative of the larger clash between European settlers and Natives throughout North America.³¹ Their story is that of enduring injustice, their good faith attempts to cooperate with the new, imposing governments finally betrayed in mockery. The Cherokee culture obviously endured a severe challenge with the onslaught of those who deemed them expendable, and their way of life less than civilized. “Even the snow is white,” War Club grumbles as he copes with the Removal. His statement reveals the depth of psychological and cultural devastation he feels, to the point that even nature, the close ally of the Cherokee, the phenomenon that distinguishes them from their oppressors, seems to be in ironic alliance with the white oppressor.

Literary ecologists recognize that a cooperative stance with nature is essential for human survival. Too often, too much of the mainstream culture has assumed that mastery of nature guarantees white survival when just the opposite will eventually prove to be the case.

In the introduction to her book, *Removals: Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Politics of Indian Affairs*, Lucy Maddox explains how American history has essentially become two divergent disciplines, with differing perspectives and emphases. One view has evolved to become the so-called master narrative and, as such, has dominated other so-called minor narratives, or indigenous perspectives of American history.³² The fact that one primary view of history has overshadowed indigenous views of history is important for literary ecologists because the heart of this narrative is a story of conquest that improperly seeks to legitimize the conquest of indigenous peoples. Moreover, such nefarious claims also foolishly tend to ignore or stereotype their understanding of reality and thus their intrinsic association with nature.³³ Maddox offers a revealing quote from the *North American Review*, published in 1838, the year of Cherokee displacement: “The moment the new world was discovered, the doom of the savage race who inhabited it was sealed; they must either conform to the institutions of the Europeans, or disappear from the face of the earth. . . . Barbarism and civilization were set up, face to face, and one or the other must fall in the encounter. The history of two hundred years is a perpetual commentary upon this text.”³⁴ The binary presented in this quote of “barbarism and civilization” underscores the tension of the period and illustrates the belief that a Native way of life held in close, reverent association with nature is somehow unfit for civilized humanity. However, for literary ecologists, the binary also ironically verifies the need for a return to a Native epistemology if our natural resources are to be managed and sustained successfully. This chasm, as quoted by Maddox, is obviously short-sighted because it suggests that it is unnatural for people to live reverently and peacefully with the very organic material that generates and sustains life. Increasingly there are those who argue that unless Americans learn to value a close relationship with land and all the complex components of life within the atmosphere and biospheres, extinction becomes a possibility.

Unbridled, mismanaged, wasteful, exploitive American consumerism is an unfortunate outgrowth of a fragmented epistemology that disrespected

Native lifestyles. In contrast, a sustainable ecology is holistic, and such a view intrinsically values the material culture that makes human life possible. Allen demonstrates the close connection between Native epistemology and literary ecology. Her writing emphasizes Native epistemology as holistic and integral for literary ecologists:

The notion that nature is somewhere over there while humanity is over here or that a great hierarchical ladder of being exists on which ground and trees occupy a very low rung, animals a slightly higher one, and man (never woman)—especially “civilized” man—a very high one indeed is antithetical to tribal thought. The American Indian sees all creatures as relatives (and in tribal systems relationship is central), as offspring of the Great Mystery, as co-creators, as children of our mother, and as necessary parts of an ordered, balanced, and living whole. This concept applies to what non-Indian Americans think of as the supernatural, and it applies as well to the more tangible (phenomenal) aspects of the universe. American Indian thought makes no such dualistic division, nor does it draw a hard and fast line between what is material and what is spiritual, for it regards the two as different expressions of the same reality, as though life has twin manifestations that are mutually interchangeable and, in many instances, virtually identical aspects of a reality that is essentially more spirit than matter or, more correctly, that manifests its spirit in a tangible way.³⁵

Ironically and triumphantly, Cherokees have now come full circle to a renewed sense of identity after their traumatic, historical exodus. The survival of the Cherokee, and of all Native peoples, should signal to all Americans the holistic value inherent in a spirituality closely attuned with nature. The question for all of us in contemporary America, Indian and non-Indian alike, is, will we reject the fragmentation of our society that only leads to death, and instead return to wholeness, to a sense of spirituality that embraces a healthy communal relationship of nature with humanity?

Glancy’s novel reconstructs the Cherokee struggle to adapt their culture to the imposing white settlers who lusted for their land and manipulated their removal.³⁶ To justify the greed, law after law was passed as hurdles to create the appearance that the Cherokee were uncivilized and somehow outside the legal practices of the United States.³⁷ In this context of manipulative chicanery, Glancy’s novel demonstrates the immediate, personal sense of loss—to put feelings on individual humans, not just the historically collective terms (and thus more easily dismissive) *Cherokee* or *Indian*, and so forth. Characters in her novel usually speak as individuals. The collective Cherokee voice consists of many individual voices. Their voices are haunted and specific, not detached and dismissible as abstractions. Such textualization corrects many assumptions on the part of the dominant mainstream of American history and mythology. Recognition of Native culture as fully and normative humanity is prerequisite toward appropriation of indigenous views of nature into contemporary life. Conversely, a demeaning view of Native peoples has been the genesis of our

failed ecology practices of which we will one day pay a severe price unless we reassess our affinity for a dichotomized, utilitarian view of humans and nature.

Literary ecologists join with Native American artists to promote a unification of life rather than the fragmentation so characteristic of postmodern America. We advocate a holistic system in which human and plant and animal life coexists with mutual respect, admiration, tolerance, and sustenance. This view is visualized in the following quote:

There are birds of many colors—red, blue, green, yellow—yet it is all one bird. There are horses of many colors—brown, black, yellow, white—yet it is all one horse. So cattle, so all living things—animals, flowers, trees. So men: in this land where once were only Indians are now men of every color—white, black, yellow, red—yet all one people. That this should come to pass was in the heart of the Great Mystery. It is right thus. And everywhere there shall be peace.³⁸

For contemporary mainstream America to assess honestly its approach to nature and her resources requires courage. Such reassessment is closely connected to that same society confronting its own history of conquest and exploitation. Honesty and humility are prerequisite in both cases. The ability to achieve a respect for Native cultures is not unlike the need to sustain the material world. Those of us who care about nature and the threat to its vital continuance should be able to find within ourselves the ability to understand honest exploration of our Native past. Conversely, those who see natural resources as exploitative, seem to be cut from the same cloth as those who saw the first Americans as expendable, as pagans who must be transformed or extinguished in the process of empire building in the name of an all-consuming white capitalism.

It is not surprising that the cultural descendants of those who displaced the Cherokee and eventually attempted practically, if not actually, to exterminate the original cultures in this land, would then all too often become thoughtless and exploitative abusers of the resources of this land. Moreover, as paranoia motivated by greed led to genocidal policies, it will take a spiritual antidote to relearn that the rhythmic cycles of nature should be revered, not simply used and taken for granted. Wise management of our natural resources is not only practically a matter of survival, but it is also emotionally cleansing, a spiritual compensation for the deeds of our cultural forefathers.

Unfortunately, the assumed master narrative of history tells us that a superior force of technology and sheer numbers of humans overran tribes and forced a peculiar and limited American worldview on them, a view that uses nature and moves on and ignores the consequences. This is the fallout of the popular, but limited, historical narrative of which we are now paying the price as we float ignorantly downstream toward ecological disaster. The misconceived narrative of history says whites won, that is, they civilized the frontiers. As winners, however, we have become conquerors of the resources, and so we must now honestly face the price of that victory for civilization. If we are to avoid our own self-imposed apocalypse, we might do well to take a look

backward. Some overlooked histories of some overrun peoples, whose existence predated the white man in America, may yet hold the clue to survival for the white man and all other races that necessarily are contingent on the fallout of that failed experiment in white supremacy.

NOTES

1. Barry Lopez, *Vintage Lopez* (New York: Vintage Books, 2004).
2. *Ibid.*, 9.
3. Aldo Leopold, *A Sand County Almanac* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949).
4. John Graves, *Goodbye to a River* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995).
5. Harry Middleton, *The Earth Is Enough* (Boulder, CO: Pruett Publishing, 1996).
6. Edward Abbey, *The Brave Cowboy* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1977), 249.
7. In this essay I refer to Paula Gunn Allen, "The Sacred Hoop," in *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*, eds. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996), 241–63. Also, I refer to Joseph Bruchac, "The Circle Is the Way to See," in *Nature Writing: The Tradition in English*, eds. Robert Finch and John Elder (New York: Norton, 2002), 811–18.
8. Geary Hobson, ed., *The Remembered Earth: An Anthology of Contemporary Native American Literature* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1980).
9. *Ibid.*, 11.
10. See Jared Diamond, *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed* (New York: Viking, 2005). Also, Joseph Bruchac acknowledges the role that Native people have contributed to the loss of animal life.
11. Allen, "The Sacred Hoop," 244.
12. Thomas King, *The Truth about Stories* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), 2 (the phrase is repeated throughout each chapter of his book), 122, 127–45, 151. He discusses Removal examples in Canada and the United States, such as the Canadian 1876 Indian Act, the General Allotment Act (the Dawes Act), the US Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, the House Concurrent Resolution 108 (the Termination Act), and the 1969 White Paper in Canada.
13. Bruchac, "The Circle Is the Way to See," 813–15, 818.
14. Diane Glancy, *Pushing the Bear* (New York: A Harvest Book, 1996).
15. See Grant Foreman, *Indian Removal: The Emigration of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989).
16. See Karsten Fitz, "Native and Christian: Religion and Spirituality as Transcultural Negotiation in American Indian Novels of the 1990s," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 26, no. 2 (2002): 1–15.
17. M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 35, 49, 84. See his chapter "Epic and the Novel" in which he writes: "In the epic, characters are bounded, preformed, individualized by their various situations and destinies, but not by varying 'truths.' Not even the gods are separated from men by a special truth: they have the same language, they all share the same world view, the same fate, the same extravagant externalization."

18. Michael McDowell, "The Bakhtinian Road to Ecological Insight," in Glotfelty and Fromm, *The Ecocriticism Reader*, 371–91. McDowell writes, "Bakhtin's idea of the chronotope encourages us to recover the representation of place in even works of 'essential noninterest in the land.' The chronotope binds together these elements of story, geography and self, reminding us of the local, vernacular, folk elements of literature, which are rooted in place."

19. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, 243, 245.

20. Jennifer Andrews, "A Conversation with Diane Glancy," *American Indian Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (Fall 2002): 645–58.

21. Glancy, *Pushing the Bear*, 4.

22. Allen, "The Sacred Hoop," 249–50.

23. Glancy, *Pushing the Bear*, 214.

24. *Ibid.*, 215, 158–59.

25. Allen, "The Sacred Hoop," 247.

26. Foreman, *Indian Removal*, 234–35.

27. Lucy Maddox, *Removals: Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Politics of Indian Affairs* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 23.

28. Glancy, *Pushing the Bear*, 25.

29. Fitz, "Native and Christian," 9. She argues that "transculturation" occurring in *Pushing the Bear* is a successful negotiation between the Cherokee and the whites. The "colonial confrontation" evident in the novel does not leave the Cherokee as simply victims. She writes, "The function of religion exemplifies how a tribal culture succeeds in negotiating a fragile balance between cherishing old stories, beliefs, and practices and absorbing new ones. Glancy's novel stands for an innovative and dynamic version of historical representation and reappropriation, describing the transculturative relationship between American Indian historical reflections and mainstream American historiography." Although I agree that Glancy's novel does not leave the Cherokee as victims, I appreciate the intense anxiety exhibited within the characters. Glancy's novel depicts real suffering, which it seems in this case, was an unfortunate prerequisite to any notion of successful "transculturation."

30. Glancy, *Pushing the Bear*, 73.

31. See Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America* (New York: Harper Collins, 1984). His work clearly establishes the historical roots of identifying Native peoples as the Other.

32. Maddox, *Removals*, 3–13.

33. See Patricia Nelson Limerick, *Something in the Soil: Legacies and Reckonings in the New West* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2000).

34. Quoted in Maddox, *Removals*, 26.

35. Allen, "The Sacred Hoop," 246.

36. See Foreman, *Indian Removal*, 229–312 and Maddox, *Removals*, 17.

37. Maddox, *Removals*, 22–23: "This belief that the Indians could enter into civilized life only after they had learned the value of acquiring and protecting private property dominated federal policy toward the Indians throughout most of the century. The report of the commissioner in 1888, for example, almost duplicated the language of the 1832 report: the Indian must, the report said, 'be imbued with the exalting egotism of American civilization, so that he will say "I" instead of "We," and "This is mine," instead of "This is ours"' (Wilcomb E. Washburn, ed., *The American Indian and*

the United States: A Documentary History [New York: Random House, 1973], 2:1075). “From an official standpoint, as long as the Indians did not understand and practice the principles of private ownership and economic competition, they could not be considered eligible for inclusion in civilized America.”

38. Quoted in Allen, “The Sacred Hoop,” 262.