

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The Yamasee War: A Study of Culture, Economy, and Conflict in the Colonial South. By William L. Ramsey.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/99x318zp>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 35(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Crouch, Christian Ayne

Publication Date

2011

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/>

its contents and implications. In the article, Fenton rejects the claims of the Onondaga chiefs representing the Iroquois Confederacy to return wampum belts that had become a central holding of the New York State Museum. Although Fenton overtly opposed the return of the wampum belts on the grounds that they had been legitimately transferred to the care of the Regents of the University of the State of New York in 1898, one wonders whether Fenton's own role as an officer of the New York State Museum influenced his position. As a museum spokesman, Fenton argued that the wampum belts and, by implication, other treasures from indigenous peoples have become part of the regional and national heritage. These are arguments that many (but not all) museum officials and archeologists have used in numerous cases prompted by the passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990). Although Fenton's article predated that act by about twenty years, his arguments demonstrate a misunderstanding of and blindness to the moral basis of Native American claims to their cultural heritage, whether these objects were removed through legal means or taken fraudulently. Fenton's loyalty to his own community seems to have outweighed his respect for the Iroquois and their sovereignty.

William Fenton: Selected Writings is a welcome addition to the literature on Iroquoian societies because it brings together some of the complex and thought-provoking articles by one of the major scholars in the field. Starna and Campisi's introduction discusses some highlights of Fenton's work and career. In the collection, there is a summary description of each article. Although these descriptions are quite helpful, perhaps they are a bit too brief. Readers, particularly those not so familiar with the contexts of Fenton's work and of Iroquois culture, might benefit from some further analysis.

Nancy Bonvillain

Bard College at Simon's Rock

The Yamasee War: A Study of Culture, Economy, and Conflict in the Colonial South. By William L. Ramsey. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008. 324 pages. \$29.95 cloth; \$29.95 paper.

The colonial Southeast has experienced a renaissance of scholarship during the past decade, and yet, despite this, there has been no comprehensive reevaluation of the 1715 Yamasee War until now. William L. Ramsey's study sets out to correct this lacuna and to "draw southern historical memory . . . farther back into its multiethnic colonial roots" (10). The Yamasee War, for Ramsey, is a significant event that shaped the plantation South and its racialized hierarchy.

It is also a conflict that numerous scholars have begun to consider “a serious candidate for America’s bloodiest war in proportion to the population” (2). If this is the case, it is surprising to realize how much this war has been overlooked. As Ramsey argues, the war set up the framework of Southern life that was used for the next hundred years and thus bears careful reconsideration. It also fundamentally reshaped indigenous settlement patterns and political alliances, gave the Cherokees unprecedented negotiating power with the Carolina colony, led the Creeks to a new mode of engagement with European empires, and caused the Choctaws to rethink the traditional power basis of their leadership. Through a format divided into four sections—“Tinder,” “Spark,” “Fire,” and “Ash”—Ramsey describes the reasons, calculations, blunders, and concessions that led to violence, exploded, and then receded into a system in which “Carolina eschewed economic profit in favor of an administered Indian trade capable of securing the frontiers and restraining the slave population” (223). This accommodation ultimately set the roots for a “divide and conquer” approach as the plantation industrial complex expanded during the eighteenth century.

Retracing this history, with attention to gender, race, economy, and politics, is a difficult undertaking and one that this work fulfills successfully for the most part. Ramsey initially takes on what he considers to be the incorrect portrayal of the causes of the war in prior historical accounts. He disputes that the Yamasee War was the effect of “trader misconduct or trade abuse” alone (131). For Ramsey, these explanations are misleading and reductionist, minimizing the scope of the conflict and its significance to later history through oversimplification. Nation by nation, Ramsey brings to light the motivations of all sides of the conflict and expands his geographic scope well into the interior of the continent. In the “Tinder” and “Spark” sections, Ramsey discusses Yamasee discontents alongside those of other indigenous nations, such as the Cherokees and Choctaws, and places these within the context of competing Spanish, French, and English imperial policies and a changing Atlantic economy. He rejects a single source of indigenous grievances, arguing that many Indians “responded to a complex, localized set of diplomatic and military considerations that had virtually nothing to do with trader misconduct or trade abuse” (131). For instance, good Cherokee relations with English trader Alexander Longe counted for more within that nation than the desires of Carolina’s colonial Indian commissioners. Ramsey is careful to provide the broader context of Atlantic trade that influenced colonial and indigenous decisions. As overseas trade began privileging deerskins over all other skins, and as Carolina’s government came into conflict with individual English traders, fundamental changes took place in Indian country that affected each nation in unique ways. Thus, in putting to rest old explanations for the conflict, Ramsey points out that this

was “a series of interlocking alliance networks” within an international context that came together in different ways between 1714 and 1718 (97).

Ramsey holds all sides accountable for violence as he reconstructs the road to war. He ably describes the numerous triggers for conflict, such as when he notes that the “disappearance” of colonial Carolinian diplomatic missions in 1714 severely damaged English governmental credibility with the Yamasees and others. The careful explication of reasons and discontents on all sides are traced from the period immediately before the conflict into the war, and this helps Ramsey’s account avoid sweeping generalizations. The complex narratives recounted in the sections “Spark” and “Fire” explain how war became inevitable and was less “shocking” a conclusion than previously thought. But Ramsey’s attention to detail comes at a cost. The narrative of borderland politics can be overwhelming at times, as Ramsey “defines a number of problems associated with each phase of the conflict and pursues the most likely answers” in almost every chapter (7). The inclusive history, wide geographic scope, and range of possibilities sit together in a somewhat unwieldy presentation. For those not familiar with the chronology of the conflict, the actual discussion of the war in the “Fire” section can be difficult to follow because so much of the analysis and narrative is focused on the war’s antecedents and effects.

Yet detail reaps its own rewards, particularly in Ramsey’s final chapters in the “Ash” section. These are rich in conclusions and suggestions for further scholarly investigation. The Carolina colony’s desperation for a Cherokee alliance to curtail frontier violence and the need to control enslaved Indians and Africans caused the English government to agree to a series of demands that ran counter to colonial profit. These descriptions of the aftereffects of the Yamasee War answer Ramsey’s stated objectives of broadening the scope of Southern history and showing the positive and negative influences of the war. Notable among Carolinian concessions were the innovations of set-price schedules, the use of pack horses, and an engagement in gift exchanges. The Creeks, through a policy of neutrality, forced the English (and French and Spanish) to accept traditional Creek modes of alliance and trade. Yet if the war encouraged the Carolinian colonists’ accommodation to indigenous needs and demands, it also, Ramsey persuasively argues, caused the English to segregate Indians from Africans through slavery for the purpose of security. The English used Indian trade in support of the plantation complex, severely limited cross-cultural exchange through trade and marriage, and carefully defined and codified racial boundaries. At times Ramsey underplays the importance of his conclusions, describing his work as the extension of studies that have looked at southeastern Indian slavery and the rise of indigenous political alignments like the Creek Confederacy. His narrative does more than this, as evidenced by his claim that in 1716 and 1717 “South Carolina engineered a set of racial policies

that guided its treatment of both African Americans and Native Americans for the next century” (182). The effects of the Yamasee War that he describes outlasted the rapidly shrinking Indian slave market and the formation (and later decline) of Indian confederacies.

Beyond the painstaking reconstruction of a conflict that has been too long ignored, Ramsey’s narrative also suggests a dialogue between the Yamasee War and other moments of exceptional borderland war in colonial history. He is deeply interested in how spaces of cross-cultural exchange encouraged conflict and renegotiation and draws on Richard White’s methodology to shape this narrative. In doing so, this work brings renewed attention to a classic study and suggests its continued importance. Ramsey’s descriptions of Anglo-Indian and Franco-Indian relations in the Southeast adds to and extends the “map” of borderlands exchanges that have appeared in recent works about colonial Southern history. His study can be used alongside similar efforts that have investigated Spanish, Indian, and Anglo-American relations in the South, such as Julianna Barr’s *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman* (2007) or Kathleen DuVal’s *The Native Ground* (2007). Taken together, these narratives engage in Ramsey’s “quest for a more unified Southern historiography” (226). In tracing the reasons for and the afterlife of a conflict that could be argued to be one of America’s bloodiest, *The Yamasee War* broadens the ideas of Jill Lepore’s *The Name of War* (1999) through its suggestion that this local war shaped a white Carolinian racial consciousness and economic choices. As such, this narrative offers the promise of future comparisons to be made between northern and southern American wars. Ramsey also points to an interesting reevaluation of colonial American diplomatic history through his compelling description of relations between the Iroquois Confederacy and the Cherokees and Creeks during the early eighteenth century. In tracing these connections, *The Yamasee War* treats Indian diplomacy with the same care most scholars give to intercolonial diplomatic affairs. Ramsey concludes his narrative by giving his readers a gem from the archives: the full text of the 1715 Yamasee letter to Carolina Governor Charles Craven that explained the Huspah King’s rationale for war. Printing the text of a document rumored to have been in existence for three centuries but never published is a poetic and fitting end for this work and sums up its intervention in this field. It allows us all to reflect on and use *The Yamasee War* for new endeavors, opening a host of new questions for colonialists, Atlanticists, and Americanists alike and showing why this deceptively brief and long overlooked conflict is worthy of our serious attention.

Christian Ayne Crouch
Bard College