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ABSTRACT

“The Rhetorics of Sovereignty: Representing Indian Territory in Nineteenth-Century Newspapers and Journals” explores issues of Native American sovereignty in newspapers and journals published in and about places imagined as “Indian territory.” Each chapter of this project explores how Indian territories were identified by different reading publics as both “space” and “place,” as “empty” places on maps to be filled by ideas about how Native peoples should live, and as places with concrete, local affiliations based on the experience of the Native people who wrote about living in these territories. The project explores connections between publics of readers and ideas about Indian territories through an analysis of The Cherokee Phoenix, the first Native American newspaper in North America, which was published at New Echota, Georgia beginning in 1828; Copway’s American Indian, the newspaper published in New York during 1851 by the Ojibwa author George Copway; Ramona Days, the quarterly publication of the Ramona Indian Industrial school published at Santa Fe, New Mexico Territory from 1887 to 1889; Our Brother in Red, which was published in Muskogee, Indian Territory from 1882 to1899; and the contemporary, online version of The Cherokee Phoenix, published at Tahlequah, Oklahoma. I assess how the journals construct ideas of Indian Territory through the concept of “rhetorical sovereignty,” which Richard Scott Lyons (Ojibwe/Mdewakanton Dakota) defines as “the inherent right and ability of peoples to determine their own communicative needs and desires” and “to decide for themselves the goals, modes, styles, and languages of public discourse.” I argue that while the journals articulate Anglo-American ideas about Indian Territory as a location for Native civilization as well as sites for geographic assimilation into the United States, they also
reveal “rhetorically sovereign” discourse and imagery, in which Indigenous people construct their own representations of Indian Territory. Because the journals demonstrate that Indian Territory was as much an idea as a geographic place during the nineteenth century, I argue that the nineteenth-century idea of Indian Territory was socially constructed, unstable, and subject to changing geographical, political, and cultural circumstances; however, I conclude that the concept maintains contemporary relevance to Native peoples in North America.
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INTRODUCTION

“AT THE PLACE OF BEGINNING”:

IMAGINING INDIAN TERRITORY IN THE CHELROKEE PHOENIX

In February of 1828, the Cherokee Phoenix was first published to provide a voice for the Cherokee Nation during the federal government's aggressive Indian removal campaign. Originating in an Act of the Cherokee Council during 1825, the weekly newspaper (later titled the Cherokee Phoenix and Indian's Advocate) was established as a public expression of Cherokee sovereignty in Georgia, the center of the Cherokee Nation prior to removal west of the Mississippi. Its masthead, a phoenix rising from the ashes, was meant to suggest a rebirth, once a written constitution and written laws had located the Cherokee Nation and its people within the public sphere of print. As a bilingual journal, this first Native American newspaper in the United States was an argument for Cherokee independence, a public representation in print and a public claim to geographic place.

From its founding, the Cherokee Phoenix revealed how text and geography were interconnected in the journal’s pages, which expressed Cherokee national identity to a larger reading public. The first issue contained the Cherokee Constitution, the first Article of which outlined the boundaries of the Cherokee nation in great local detail, providing a precise and exhaustive account of national borders within the state of Georgia. In fact, the description of the Cherokee Nation’s boundaries in Article I ended “at the place of beginning,” a phrase which described the enclosing lines of a map. The concept of returning to a beginning also suggested the Cherokee Nation’s rebirth in print, which was symbolically depicted in the paper’s masthead. While the printed page
indicated textual, cultural, and geographic enclosure as well as separation, the newspaper’s travel across national boundaries to circulate among readers in the United States symbolized the sense of movement found in the masthead image of the Phoenix’s rise. Together, the image of textual enclosure as well as a movement beyond geographic borders embody the material relationship between the printed page and the physical geography of the Cherokee Nation.

In antebellum Georgia, however, it was dangerous to articulate these boundaries, and an image from the August 12, 1831 issue of the journal reveals why. The contribution appeared in the correspondence section and depicted a body hanging from a rope. Around the image ran the words: “Death to the Rebbell,” “Shoot him,” “hang the Traitor,” and, “Cut his throat” (“Columbus” 3). The violence of the figure served as a reminder that printed words had life or death consequences when they concerned Cherokee claims to land in the late 1820s and early 1830s. After declaring their independence through a written Constitution in 1827, the Cherokee faced ongoing pressures to cede all of the Nation's traditional claims in Georgia and remove west of the Mississippi. These threats to Cherokee sovereignty were exacerbated by events that began to build during the year Cherokee Phoenix first appeared. In 1828, gold was discovered on Cherokee lands. In 1830, the U. S. Congress passed the Indian Removal Act, which gave the President the power to make removal treaties with Native nations. From 1828-1832, in spite of the Supreme Court’s ruling in favor of the Cherokee Nation’s sovereignty, the Georgia Legislature refused to recognize tribal government and began a land and gold lottery that divided Cherokee lands and distributed deeds to Georgia citizens who registered. In response to these historical events, the Cherokee
Phoenix became the forum for the Cherokees’ public claim to their Georgia homelands. While the Cherokee Nation ultimately took arguments against Georgia to the U.S. Supreme Court, the case was also argued in the pages of the Cherokee Phoenix. As the engraved hanging man indicated, physical violence was a possible outcome of such textual claims to sovereignty. Yet despite the physical threats implied in the image, Phoenix editor Elias Boudinot effectively contained its violence in print. Adept at format, he contextualized the image through his commentary in “Civilized Correspondence,” a column that framed the image ironically by suggesting that there was a “degree of savagery” among the “citizens of Georgia” that was “greatly superior to that existing among the Cherokees” (3). He concluded his editorial by pointing out that although the whites behaved with “savagery,” the Cherokee did not demand that they should “remove beyond the limits of the state” (3). Mixing an argument for Cherokee sovereignty with a claim to Cherokee lands, Boudinot turned the tables of the debate and questioned whether whites, not Cherokees, should remove beyond the Mississippi.

With the hanging man and the phoenix as guiding emblems, this dissertation explores the relationship among geographic places, textual format, and the content of nineteenth-century journals and newspapers that broadcast ideas about Indian Territory. The nineteenth-century period explored in this project is essential to understanding how newspapers and journals helped to spread of ideas about Indian Territory because it was a time of intensified public discourse by both Native and non-Native Americans about where indigenous peoples could live, as Anglo-American westward expansion placed pressures on Indian lands. With questions about Native-white ideas about land at its center, the historical period of this project begins in the late 1820s, a period which Vine
Deloria, Jr. characterizes as the “removal era,” which was characterized by legislation and treaty-making to remove southeastern Native peoples, including the Cherokee, from their homelands to Indian Territory west of the Mississippi (Deloria, Wilkins 167). It concludes in 1891, in what has been crudely defined as the “allotment era,” when the tribal nations of Indian Territory (now Oklahoma) were under pressure to allot, or divide up lands into individual pieces—segments of land that had been guaranteed to them collectively and “in perpetuity” through removal treaties signed as far back as the 1830s and 1840s. The decades examined in the project spanning from 1820s through the 1890s are important to the history of Indian politics because they encapsulate what Deloria observes is the fact that the “federal government simply chose to ignore Indian land rights” which included treaties signed between Native American leaders and the federal government that insured permanent tribal land rights, unencumbered occupancy of those lands, and freedom of self-government (167).

As these moments of history encompassed by removal and allotment indicate, this project is concerned with Native American claims to land. Yet it is also grounded in a cultural context of a rapidly growing print culture of journalism—specifically, journalism preoccupied with issues related to Native American identity. As Sharon Murphy observes in her essay on the history of Native newspapers, “Journalism in Indian Country: Storytelling that Makes Sense,” nineteenth-century Native newspapers helped Indian people to develop “written identities” and to enter into public discourse on issues of importance to their continuance as tribal peoples (329). While tribal journals such as the Phoenix were published as the official voices of Native American governments’ policies and views, other journals, such as the subject of chapter one, Copway’s American
Indian, which was self-published during 1851 by Ojibwa author George Copway, were not representative of a single tribal government but rather presented a more “pan-Indian” style of advocacy. While the Cherokee Phoenix and Copway’s American Indian represent Native-authored newspapers, still other kinds of journals advocating for Native Americans appeared in the period discussed in the project, including a Indian boarding school journals, such as the quarterly publication Ramona Days, which is discussed in chapter two, and religious journals concerned with Native cultural practices and religious conversion, including Our Brother in Red, which is the subject of chapter three.

As this project shows, journals published both by and about Native Americans in the nineteenth century represented American Indian identity and relationships to land as part of a larger public discourse on the idea of an Indian Territory. In connection to the idea of a public, journalistic discourse on Indian Territory, this project explores two of the major concepts related to nineteenth-century ideas about Indian Territory: separation and assimilation. These terms were connected to the nineteenth-century Euro-American imagination of geographic territories within North America. As historian Robert Berkhofer Jr. observes, ideas about how to govern North America’s territories were a legacy of the years 1781-1784, when the Confederation Congress articulated an “innovative solution” to governing the area north and west of the Ohio River that was gained from Great Britain under the Treat of Paris in 1783 (Berkhofer 92-93). Berkhofer notes that by “recapitulating the hypothetical history of the original states, new and yet-to-be-created territories were to gain eventually the rights and responsibilities of the original states” (90). Just as the original states came into existence as a result of declaring independence from a colonial power, so the idea of “territory” within the
United States maintained a symbolic and geographic relationship to the “colonial system.” In this relationship, the Northwest Territory and similar lands would be considered “internal colonies” of the United States, until such a time as their populations and institutions developed sufficiently for them to become states (91).

Yet the problem of cultural difference within acquired lands could not be solved by forcibly imposing laws and cultural forms on the indigenous peoples. The lands subsumed by the U. S. under the Northwest Ordinance were those set aside in 1763 by the British government as an “Indian Reserve” (Berkhofer 90). When American settlers flooded into those northwestern lands, Native peoples fought their encroachment and refused to recognize the concept of “territory,” a resistance that emphasized the problem of “assimilating” territories as future states. While it was possible for the newly formed federal government to offer a model of politics and culture to territories in the form of “constitutions and law codes, forms of government, church-state relations, and even spelling books” that had been founded in the original states, there was no guarantee that the peoples living in those territories, including Indigenous peoples, would recognize such models or agree upon how the territories should be governed or represented (90-92).

As the hanging man and Elias Boudinot’s response to that image in the Cherokee Phoenix indicate, Native and white definitions of nineteenth-century places that were called Indian “territory” differed. By mid-century, the geographical location of Indian Territory had been established according to the Indian Intercourse Act in 1834 as being “all that part of the United States west of the Mississippi and not within the states of Missouri and Louisiana, or the territory of Arkansas” (Pub. L. No. 23-161, § 12, 4 Stat. 729, 730). When the Five Civilized Tribes—the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek,
and Seminole peoples—were forcibly removed from their eastern homes to this loosely defined western land beginning in the 1830s, the Cherokee and Choctaw nations soon established national newspapers to articulate a Native idea of “territory.”

As Grace Ernestine Ray observes in Early Oklahoma Newspapers, the first journals established in Indian Territory were published by Native American nations. According to Ray, the Cherokee Advocate as the official national paper of the Cherokee Nation at Tahlequah, Indian Territory, inaugurated in 1844 nearly thirty years of exclusively Native journalism originating in Indian Territory (3, 10). Ray observes that, until 1871, all of the newspapers published in Indian Territory “bore Indian names, and were published as organs of the Indian tribes” (11). The bilingual Advocate, which contained pieces in both the Cherokee syllabary and in English, succeeded Boudinot’s paper as the official journal of the Cherokee Nation. Like the Phoenix, the Advocate emphasized the Cherokees’ independence from the United States as well as the Nation’s sovereign claims to land in Indian Territory. The journal’s motto, which appeared under the renewed masthead, emphasized Cherokee connections to place in the emended language of Sir Walter Scott: “Breathes there a man with soul so dead / Who never to himself has said, / This is my own, my native land!” (1). The motto together with the journal’s title demonstrate the ongoing need to advocate for Native American claims to place, a goal which the Advocate, like the Phoenix, fulfilled in part by appealing to distant white readers who would recognize The Lay of the Last Minstrel (1805) and Scott’s tribute to a homeland of his own (Ray 21).

While tribal journals were the only newspapers published from 1844-1871, after

---

1 The Cherokee Advocate was suspended during the Civil War but resumed publication in 1870. The paper continued until 1906, when the Cherokee Nation was dissolved (25).
the Civil War journals “filled largely with accounts of events among the Indians” but not published “altogether in the interest” of the Indian tribes began to be appear in Indian Territory. These included newspapers that were published “by church missions for the benefit of the Indians” as well as individual enterprises such as the *Oklahoma War Chief*, a publication of “Captain Payne’s Oklahoma Colony,” which was first published at Caldwell, Kansas, in January of 1883 (Ray 79). The *War Chief* represented one idea of Indian Territory in its masthead’s bold motto: “Will favor opening of Indian Territory to settlement” (79). After its initial appearance, the journal moved its site of publication “up and down the line” between Kansas and “Oklahoma Territory,” 20,000 acres of Cherokee lands in Indian Territory ceded to the United States after the Civil War, and Kansas (79). The *War Chief* was not welcomed by federal officials in Oklahoma Territory because its pages expressed the hopes of the land-grabbing “Boomers,” or white settlers who hoped to claim ceded Cherokee lands. Just as the printing press of the *Cherokee Phoenix* was seized by the Georgia Guard in 1834 for continuing to publish anti-removal arguments, publication of *The Oklahoma War Chief* was similarly interrupted. As a result of editor David Payne’s agitation for white settlement in Oklahoma Territory, United States officers seized its printing press and “threw the type into the river” (Ray 82). While those two newspapers circulated very different ideas about Indian Territory during different periods of the nineteenth century, both the *Cherokee Phoenix* and *The Oklahoma War Chief* were suddenly vulnerable when they proposed ideas about “territory” that differed from the officially articulated views of those with more political power.

As these several examples reveal, Native American and non-Native newspapers
destabilized definitions of Indian Territory during the nineteenth century. While
Cherokee Phoenix, The Cherokee Advocate, and the War Chief all refer to the western
Indian Territory that would be designated under the Indian Intercourse Act of 1834, other
contemporary places were similarly allocated. This project explores how the editors and
readers of a diverse selection of newspapers and journals participated in the textual
construction of “Indian territories” in four regions of the United States: Georgia during
the 1820s and 1830s, the Dakota Territory of the 1850s, the New Mexico Territory during
the 1880s, and the Indian Territory in what would become Oklahoma during the 1890s.
The nineteenth-century journals I examine are important to reconstructing historical
attitudes because they indicate the continual and often contradictory connection between
“assimilation” and “separation” with reference to the idea of geographic “territory.”

As Patricia Wald observes in her essay “Terms of Assimilation: Legislating
Subjectivity in the Emerging Nation,” one of the contradictions that arose in the
nineteenth century with reference to the Indian nations recognized as sovereign entities
within the United States was that they were “unincorporated,” and therefore not governed
by the laws of the United States (79). While Wald’s observations refer specifically to the
Cherokee in Georgia prior to removal, historian Brian Dippie has noted that the same
questions about governance extended to Indian Territory west of the Mississippi, which
was never formally incorporated as a territory of the United States (Dippie, 244-246). In
the nineteenth-century context, Indian Territory was defined most clearly from an Anglo-
American point of view at the time of Andrew Jackson, under whose administration
numerous legislative efforts to define the concept were advanced. As legal historian
Brian Utter notes, although “several bills” were introduced in Congress during the early
1830s to establish a western Indian Territory, no such official legislation was ever enacted; instead, the outlines of Indian Territory were decided by both an indigenous and a Euro-American presence on the land.

In 1834, when the press of the Cherokee Phoenix was seized by the Georgia guard a year before pro-removal Cherokee signed the the Treaty of New Echota and agreed to Cherokee removal, Indian Territory included present-day Kansas, most of Oklahoma, and parts of what came to be Nebraska, Colorado, and Wyoming (Utter 211). Within a decade of the Cherokees’ removal from Georgia to present-day Oklahoma, many other Native peoples would be forcibly relocated to this loosely defined region. Yet as Jack Utter notes, over the course of the nineteenth century, “Indian Territory” was steadily reduced in size as “new official territorial governments were established and states were carved out of it” (211). After the Civil War, due to sessions made by pro-Confederate Native nations, Indian Territory consisted of today’s Oklahoma, without the panhandle (212).

As the geographical appropriations of Indian lands during the nineteenth century indicate, continual pressure on Indian lands throughout the west made the possibility of an Indian “place” important to both Native Americans and whites. Due to continual conflicts over land, however, Indian Territory remained a rhetorical and a geographical concept that would be imagined and reimagined in print, an indicator of how Indigenous peoples and Euro-Americans across the continent believed they could live together.

I became interested in such representations of Indian Territory during a 2003 graduate seminar at the Newberry Library in Chicago. The seminar, “Creating North American Indian History in Nineteenth-Century Museums,” explored representations of Native peoples in museums as well as a range of documents, including magazines and
newspapers. The seminar focused on how diverse cultural documents such as paintings, photographs, museum displays, pamphlets, and periodicals emphasized stereotypical images of Native peoples and the places they lived but also presented gaps in what the seminar saw as an Anglo-American “master” narrative about American Indians. I focused my research at the Newberry on how this Anglo-American narrative was often concerned with the concept of Native American “civilization” and assimilation, as well with the ways in which narratives of progress were disrupted and made unstable by Native-authored writing. As my research in the Newberry's primary resource documents revealed, magazines and newspapers were important sites for Native writing throughout the nineteenth century. When I began to explore the library’s substantial archives, I discovered for the first time Native newspapers like the Cherokee Phoenix, Copway’s American Indian, Ramona Days, and Our Brother in Red. What was interesting to me about all of these journals was that, despite their diverse sites of publication as well as their different political and cultural concerns, they all focused on articulating a geographic “place” for Native peoples, whether it was in Georgia during the 1820s, the Northwest Territory during the 1850s, the New Mexico Territory during 1880s, or in Indian Territory during the 1890s. Following a geographic trajectory that did not neatly confirm the idea of Anglo-American westward progress and Native retreat, each journal argued for or against, and sometimes both, the idea of a separate geographic place for Indigenous peoples.

As a point of departure for this project, the Cherokee Phoenix provides a foundational example of how images of Indian Territory were circulated in the nineteenth-century press. Edited by Elias Boudinot from 1828 to 1832, and Elijah Hicks
from 1832 to 1834, the *Cherokee Phoenix* and continues to be published today (Littlefield, Parins 90). From its inception, the paper was bilingual, containing material published in both English and the Cherokee syllabary that was developed by Sequoyah (George Gist, or Guess) beginning in about 1809 (Foreman 5). Acknowledged by scholars of Cherokee history and culture to have been a method of unifying the Cherokee Nation under assault, the syllabary was first invented to foster communication among the Cherokee people (Basel 42, Bender 24-25). Sequoyah, who could neither read nor write, began to create the syllabary after overhearing a conversation in which two young Cherokee men remarked upon the ease with which whites communicated through writing (Basel 17, 42-46, Bender, 25, Starr 48). Although the Cherokee were initially skeptical, his syllabary proved easy to learn and, by 1822, was spreading throughout the Cherokee Nation (Basel 43). As Theda Perdue and Michael Green have observed, by 1835 nearly a quarter of the Cherokee population in Georgia were “literate in their own language” and “slightly more than half the households had members who read Cherokee” (84). Thus the content of *Cherokee Phoenix* reinforced the idea of a geographic connection among Cherokee people.

While historians agree that the syllabary helped to foster Cherokee communication at a time of national crisis during the 1820s and 1830s, the *Phoenix* emphasized the power of print to connect the Cherokee people to a non-Native reading public beyond the Nation’s borders. A non-Native readership can be confirmed by the regularly published list of agents operating in Boston, New York, Richmond, and Charleston, a sign that the newspaper appealed to readers in urban centers along the eastern seaboard (“Agents” 1). The journal published reports of missionary activities
among Native peoples, which further suggests an audience of non-Natives interested in Indian conversion. The column headings of the paper's regular published sections also indicate a non-Native reading audience interested in both Indian religious conversion and topics of general interest about Native peoples. The regularly published departments included a section entitled “Religious,” which included material about Christian missions as well as accounts of conversion, plus a segment called “Indians” that reported on Native Americans in general, including missionary activities among the American Indian tribes (“Religious” 2, “Indians” 3). Other regular columns included a “Communications” section that published letters and a “Summary” news department, which reported on national and international events as well as news from the Cherokee Nation (Littlefield, Parins 86). In addition, a section entitled “Poetry” often included Bible passages in the Cherokee syllabary, while the “Gen’l Council” section included legislation and news of the Cherokee council (86).

The “Communication” section of the Phoenix shows how an idea of Indian Territory was defined by non-Native contributors. A July 1828 letter from “Professor C.S. Rafinesque” reveals how one non-Native reading public coalesced. Rafinesque describes finding a copy of Cherokee Phoenix “in the hands of M. Duponceau, President of the American Philosophical Society,” who plans to send the journal “to a learned society in France” (“Communications” 2). While the journal’s readership in France suggests the international circulation of the Phoenix, Professor Rafinesque’s letter also emphasizes the enthusiasm among American readers for establishing a permanent Cherokee Nation in Georgia. Rafinesque writes that he wishes for Cherokee success in their “attempt to become a permanent Nation,” yet he cautions that the practice of slavery
among some of the Cherokee may lessen the support of the northern states for Cherokee sovereignty, a situation he argues would result in forced removal (2). While Rafinesque does not address the question of slavery from a non-Native point of view, he advises Cherokee readers of the *Phoenix* to “form a kind of Territorial government, annexed to the Federal Union, so as to become an independent acknowledged Federal Territory, with a delegate in Congress and the privilege to become a State when your population will allow it” (2). Rafinesque’s statements indicate that issues of geographic separation and assimilation were important to imagining Indian Territory and reveal the extent to which the legal issue of “domestic dependent” status was part of the idea of Indian Territory.

As Priscilla Wald observes, by the late 1820s “the terms are set for the simultaneous, and often contradictory, policies toward the indigenous tribespeople: assimilation (in the service of appropriations of both land and identity) or removal” (“Terms” 82). This “contradictory” viewpoint is evident in Rafinesque’s comments, which articulates a “kind” of Territory, which although “annexed” to the United States would also be independent. Yet that same “independent” but geographically annexed and thus dependent Territory would only eventually gain the “privilege” of becoming a state, a situation that potentially illustrates Wald’s idea of assimilation as the appropriation of “land and identity” (82). Rafinesque does not outline in detail the future of the Indian state with respect to its laws and cultural formation, and his lack of specificity confirms the ambiguity circulating around questions of land ownership and citizenship for the Cherokee during the removal period (79). As Wald notes, the issue at stake in imagining an “unincorporated” territory is what the idea of a “territory” allows with relation to a centralized power with legislative reach.
The ambiguity of Rafinesque’s reference to a Cherokee state reveals that Native American presence in North America troubled ideas about an American identity. His comments support Wald’s idea that the crisis of identity symbolized in questions about what constituted Indian Territory and territorial rights were questions about how Native Americans could exist in relationship to colonial government in North America. These questions about the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized were central to the existence of the Phoenix as well as to its advocacy efforts. When Boudinot changed the journal’s title from Cherokee Phoenix to Cherokee Phoenix and Indian’s Advocate on February 11, 1829, he acknowledged the escalating crisis of ruptured territorial and cultural boundaries in Georgia. He notes that the Phoenix is “sacred to the cause of the Indians” and observes that he “feels himself especially bound as far as his time, talents, and information will permit” to “endeavor to enlist the friendly feelings and sympathies of his subscribers abroad, in favor of the aborigines” (1). Boudinot’s genteel language in requesting the “friendly feelings and sympathies” underplays the gravity of the situation faced by the Cherokee in 1829. In December of 1828, less than a year after the first issue of the Phoenix appeared, the Georgia Legislature passed an act to annex the Cherokee Nation within the state’s limits and to extend jurisdiction over the Nation’s citizens (Hutton, Reed 117). The purpose of the edict, which would go into effect in June of 1830, was to force the Cherokee out of Georgia. With the discovery of gold on Cherokee lands in 1828, more than simply land claims were at stake in this legislation. While it was never passed, squatters in search of gold flocked onto Cherokee lands and President Jackson ignored Cherokee requests for the eviction of these unlawful settlers (117). The Phoenix’s role as public advocacy tool became more pronounced during the 1830s, as
President Andrew Jackson continued to ignore Cherokee requests for help in countering Georgia’s pressures their land. In 1830 Jackson passed the Indian Removal Act, which gave the President the power to negotiate removal treaties with Native American tribes living east of the Mississippi (McLoughlin xi). This Act increased already active discussions of Indian removal to western Indian Territory in the pages of the *Phoenix* and emphasized the need for the support of white readers for the Cherokee cause.

Elias Boudinot’s anti-removal comments in the *Cherokee Phoenix* were an extension of his public personae, which embodied the assimilationist aspect of Cherokee society that the journal represented to readers. As historian Theda Perdue observes, Boudinot had “an unusually public life” (41). Prior to the publication of the *Phoenix* in 1828, he had traveled up and down the eastern seaboard on public speaking tours to raise money for the purchase of a printing press which would be used to print the New Testament in English and Cherokee characters, a tour which successfully raised enough to purchase a press for $1500 (67). Boudinot was a member of the “first generation of English-educated Cherokee” and as such represented the segment of Cherokee society that was its public face during the first three decades of the nineteenth century (41). Boudinot was born Gallegina (Buck) Watie to a leading Cherokee family (5). Boudinot’s father, Oo-watie had established a farm Oothcaloga, Georgia, which he fenced, farmed, and developed “in the manner of whites” (5). Despite Boudinot’s upbringing on his father’s farm, which was more “isolated and individualistic” than his father’s childhood had been, Boudinot nevertheless represented a distinctly Cherokee national identity, that of the acculturated segment of society, whose children attended Mission schools and who were taught the “arts of civilization” (5-6).
While the influence of Euro-American education and religion were central to Boudinot’s life, he also maintained a distinctly Cherokee identity that can be understood with the framework of the concept of assimilation. In *Removable Type: Histories of the Book in Indian Country, 1663-1880* (2010), Phillip Round describes Boudinot’s assimilationism as connected to his separatist views. While Boudinot represented the “civilized” face of Cherokee institutions in *Cherokee Phoenix*, he also advocated that the nation should remain “distinct and untainted by white intrusion” (132). As Round observes, Boudinot can be described as a “separatist assimilationist” who hoped to maintain the “civilized” institutions of the Cherokee Nation geographically distinct (132). As Round points out, Boudinot established an idea of the Cherokee Nation as “separate” from the United States but “equal” to it in the freedom to self govern and protect its national boundaries (132). As can be seen in the publication of the Cherokee Nation’s boundaries in the first issue of *Cherokee Phoenix*, the journal was a public representation of this separate but equal nation.

Through the *Cherokee Phoenix*, Elias Boudinot represented a separatist and assimilationist idea of Indian Territory. As Phillip Round observes in *Removable Type*, Boudinot was a “Christian separatist assimilationist,” whose experience of white racism caused him to be skeptical of Indian geographic assimilation as either a preferable or possible answer to white-Indian conflicts over land (Round 132, Perdue 74). Claiming a Cherokee homeland in Georgia was part of Boudinot’s separatist stance, and he expressed his geographically “separatist” point of view in *Cherokee Phoenix*. In the journal’s prospectus, which was published in the first issue of the *Phoenix*, Boudinot stressed the concept of Cherokee assimilation, promising that the journal would provide
an “account of the manners and customs of the Cherokees, and their progress in Education, Religion and the arts of civilized life” (“Prospectus” 3). In keeping with this promise, Boudinot often published examples of Cherokee life that emphasized their cultural similarities to whites, as in a May 8, 1830 article which observes that young Cherokee men “almost all dress like the whites around them, except that the greater number wear a turban instead of a hat, and in cold weather wear a blanket that frequently serves for a cloak” (1). Much as Boudinot’s comments about clothing emphasized aspects of cultural assimilation, the contents of the journal itself were a comment on Cherokee progress. The first and second issue of the Phoenix included the Cherokee Constitution, an account of its laws, translations of Bible passages, and political and religious documents that emphasized Cherokee progress toward adopting white cultural and political values (“Constitution” 1, “Laws” 1, “Lord’s Prayer” 4).

As editor of the Cherokee Phoenix, Boudinot combined the concepts of assimilation and separation with arguments about a Cherokee Nation that would remain “distinct and untainted by white intrusion” (Round 132). As Phillip Round observes, even in his later, pro-removal phase as editor, Boudinot believed that Indian Territory would be a place where Indians could live separately from whites. In the pages of the Phoenix, Boudinot appeals to white readers in support of a geographically separate Cherokee Nation, noting that the journal’s survival, and, by extension, the survival of the Cherokee Nation depended on the support of the “many true friends of the Indians in different parts of the Union” (3). In order to gain the support of these sympathetic readers, Boudinot chose pieces that described western Indian Territory as “uncivilized” in comparison to the Cherokee Nation in the east. An essay from the September, 1828 issue
of the journal illustrates the ideas of both cultural assimilation and geographic separation in which Boudinot believed. The essay, “Indian Emigration,” by a Cherokee named Young Beaver presents a Cherokee idea of Indian Territory that is different from the Anglo-American viewpoint expressed by Professor Rafinesque, which invokes the idea of a Cherokee “territory” that will eventually become a state. In contrast to geographic assimilation through statehood, Young Beaver argues for continued separation, even as he emphasizes images of Cherokee assimilation through pastoral images of Cherokee lands in the East.

“Indian Emigration,” describes the federal government’s attempts to induce the eastern Cherokee to remove west of the Mississippi. Commenting on the Cherokee who had previously removed to Arkansas, Young Beaver refers to them through images of Native savagery familiar to white readers: “If we direct our eyes to Arkansas, we shall see our brethren in distress, in consequence of their removal; we see them walking in grosser darkness than ourselves” (“Indian” 3). While he associates the movement west with the Cherokees’ decline into violence, Young Beaver associates the eastern Cherokee and their lands with peace and prosperity. He notes that the Arkansas Cherokee have “raised the tomahawk” against one another but would not have done so had they remained in their eastern homelands. He describes the attitudes of the eastern Cherokee when he asks “Who will dare to molest us as we pursue the windings of our paths in peace through our fertile valleys?” (3). By describing the “fertile valleys” of the eastern Cherokee Nation, Young Beaver constructs a geographic alternative to Indian Territory that appeals to white readers by drawing upon the image of Cherokee “progress” in agriculture, implied in Boudinot’s reference to “civilized arts” in the prospectus. By
invoking pastoral imagery familiar to Anglo-American readers, Young Beaver constructs an anti-removal argument through appeals to Anglo-American approval of Cherokee progress and “civilization.”

While Young Beaver draws upon stereotypical imagery to depict geography and its effects people, he also articulates it as a moral category in constructing an image of Indian Territory. Referring to the federal government’s removal policy, Young Beaver questions whether “a glimpse of the blue summit of the Rocky Mountains” would “inspire” the eastern Cherokee “with a moral aptitude to learn anthems of adoration to the Great Father of the universe?” (3). Young Beaver blends Euro-American and Cherokee religious references in the “Great Father of the universe,” a figure who suggests both the assimilationist Christian elements of Cherokee society but also a Cherokee religious context which combined references to both biblical material and Cherokee origin legends that referred to a “Mysterious Being” in connection to the origin of the world (Mails 145, Teuton “Theorizing” 193-194). Thus, Young Beaver’s essay suggests Cherokee acculturation, or the blending of both Euro-American and Cherokee beliefs with an idea of a separate Indian Territory, as symbolized in the “fertile valleys” of the Cherokee Nation, east. Young Beaver contrasts this pastoral Cherokee Nation with images of the natural world in the western Indian Territory as he continues to question the viability of removal. He asks whether “an association with bears and buffaloes” will “give us a new spring and vigour [sic] to our efforts, and thereby enhance our civil and moral improvement?” (3). The answer to this question is that the Cherokee have resolved “never again to cede one foot more of land” and are to be regarded as “free agents in disposal of their Territory” (3). In the conclusion to “Indian Emigration,” Young Beaver
asserts a specifically Cherokee “Territory” that counters the idea of assimilation through statehood in Rafinesque’s letter and underscores Cherokee sovereignty and independence. Young Beaver’s letter demonstrates how Cherokee Phoenix constructed the idea of a sovereign Indian Territory in the east in which the Cherokee were free to govern themselves independently.

Young Beaver’s assertion of Native sovereignty can be understood within the context of a “rhetorical sovereignty,” a key concept explored with reference to Native writing and representations of Indian Territory in this project. Richard Scott Lyons (Ojibwe/Mdewakanton Dakota) defines the term “rhetorical sovereignty” in his essay “Rhetorical Sovereignty: What do American Indians Want from Writing.” In the essay, Lyons describes “rhetorical sovereignty” as “the inherent right and ability of peoples to determine their own communicative needs and desires in this pursuit, to decide for themselves the goals, modes, styles, and languages of public discourse” (450). As the example of Young Beaver’s essay indicates, newspapers provided a location for Native peoples to represent themselves and articulate claims to place that were specifically local and indigenous, even as they articulated assimilationist or acculturated points of view. Young Bear’s essay, like other Native writings in the journals I explore, demonstrates what Lyons describes as the “right and ability of Native peoples to represent themselves” (450). As an act of self-representation, “rhetorical sovereignty” relates to Indian Territory because, as Lyons notes, it is “the right of a people to conduct its own affairs, in its own place, in its own way” (450). Lyons points to the direct relationship between land and sovereignty when he observes that from 1778–1868, the U.S. signed and ratified some 367 treaties with Indian nations, all of which presumed a sense of sovereignty on
the part of Indian groups (451). However, Lyons observes that the Supreme Court Cases of the 1830s in Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1831) and Worcester v. Georgia (1832), Chief Justice John Marshall’s famous pronouncement of the Cherokees as a “domestic dependent nation” constituted the United States’ “first major, unilateral reinterpretation of Indian sovereignty” (451). According to Lyons, these Supreme Court cases exemplified “rhetorical imperialism,” which he defines as “the ability of dominant powers to assert control of others by setting the terms of debate. These terms are often definitional—that is, they identify the parties discussed by describing them in certain ways” (452). As I show in this project, “rhetorical imperialism” is found in descriptions of Indian Territory that define it from Anglo-American points of view as a place that can be civilized as well as one that might eventually be assimilated geographically into the United States through statehood.

While Richard Scott Lyons’s concept of “rhetorical sovereignty” is important to understanding ideas of Indian Territory explored in this project, Phillip Round’s *Removable Type: Histories of the Book in Indian Country, 1663-1880* is an essential conceptual model for the relationship I explore between the print culture of journals and ideas about place. In his work, Round discusses an idea of “Indian Country” and the “place’ of American Indian cultural production” and of “printing and books” (8-9). Round focuses on the creation and reception of print in specific geographic locations and the publics of readers for books in historically and geographically specific locations (8-9). Through the delineation of “Indian Country” as a “heuristic field” Round conceptualizes the “cultural field” of the Native production and consumption of texts in particular historical moments and in specific geographic locations. The link Round
identifies between geographic places and texts is instrumental to an understanding of the larger print culture of the nineteenth century that also encompassed newspapers and journals published by and about Native peoples. While Round focuses exclusively on Native producers and consumers of print, my project focuses on newspapers and journals published by both whites and Indians in an effort to understand how a geographic concept, Indian Territory, was negotiated in print by both Native and non-Native publics of readers.

Phillip Round’s *Removable Type* provides an essential framework for understanding the connection between print culture, history, and ideas of place for journals and periodicals because much of the scholarship that has focused exclusively on Native American newspapers and journals has been either bibliographic or has discussed a single newspaper as part of a larger study of Native literature. Examples of scholarship in Native American studies that offer readings of individual newspapers as part of larger studies include Cherokee literary critic Donald Heath Justice’s discussion of Cherokee Phoenix in the context of Cherokee nationhood and removal in *Our Fire Survives the Storm: a Cherokee Literary History* (2006). Justice’s larger concerns are with establishing a literary history for the Cherokee; however, his emphasis on the relationship between writing and place is important because it suggests the role which writing, including writing by Natives in newspapers like the *Phoenix*, helped in constructing an idea of “home” for the Cherokee (46). In his discussion of *Cherokee*
Phoenix, Justice draws helpful connections between “local” and “extended” readership for Native journals and the journal’s assertion of Cherokee claims to place, noting that the words of Cherokee and white officials were printed in Cherokee Phoenix, so that the journal’s anti-removal message was carefully pitched to appeal to both Native and white readers on behalf of the Cherokee (80). Justice’s attention to the connection between a public of readers and their relationship to the formation of ideas about Native land claims are important to each of the journals I discuss because his argument points to the ways in which journal readers as well as journal editors helped to construct ideas about Indian Territory.

Native studies scholars such as Donald Heath Justice have addressed Native newspapers in order to understand identity. However, scholarly work in the field of journalism has also yielded studies that focus on non-Native constructions American Indians in the nineteenth-century American press. John Coward’s The Newspaper Indian: Native American Identity in the Press, 1820-90 (1999). This work is a useful model because it provides readings of Native representations in newspapers within specific moments in the history of white and Indian conflict in the United States. Coward’s assertion that the “real power” of communication is its regular and repeated “ritualistic offering” of news about Indians which in American newspapers was “created, organized, and received in ways that supported Euro-American ideas” and “challenged or ignored Native ones” (16). Coward’s observation that “news should not be evaluated against some external (and problematic) notion of ‘reality’ but analyzed as a particular form or reality itself” is important to understand in connection to this project because it suggests a way to understand the journals I discuss as containing a similar inherent
reality. This textual construction of a “territory” depends on specific geographical, political, and historical moments. As “maps” to imagined geographic spaces, the journals explored in this project construct their own internal narratives, which, as Coward argues, “helped to create and confirm” but also contradict “social order” in the nineteenth century (10).

As sites of the textual negotiation of Indian Territory, each of the nineteenth-century journals I discuss presents a case study for understanding narratives of what Dana Luciano describes as “monumental history,” which in an American context of colonialism involves the “hardening of historical narratives into official, monumental forms” (34). All of the journals in chapters one through three offer “monumental” histories of place constructed in specific historical moments in the evolution of the idea of Indian Territory. The nineteenth-century historical period of this project explores narratives about Indian Territory from the 1820s through the 1890s, beginning with Native removals to Indian Territory west of the Mississippi and ending during a decade of pressure to allot Indian Territory in the 1890s. Yet these so-called “monumental” narratives of Indian Territory were not uniform in type, and they were often tested in the pages of journals in ways that suggest their foundations were unstable to begin with. Joel Pfister’s work on Indian education in *Individuality Incorporated: Indians and the Multicultural Modern* (2004) provides a useful model for this project’s exploration of how so-called “master narratives” about Indian identity are constructed in journals.

In *Individuality Incorporated*, Pfister explores how narratives of Indian identity were established by school newspapers published at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, which was established by Richard Henry Pratt in 1879 at Carlisle, Pennsylvania.
Important to this project and my analysis of the boarding school journal *Ramona Days* is Pfister’s analysis of the staging of “Indianness” at the Carlisle School. Pfister shows how the various Carlisle newspapers depicted Native Americans “in the white man’s image” as being transformed by their education into future U.S. citizens (33). Pfister argues that Carlisle’s school newspapers disseminated narratives about Native pupils learning to become “possessive individuals” at the Carlisle School (34-35). Pfister defines “possessive individualism” through images from the school’s journals that emphasize Native transformation into “propertyholding citizens” whose newfound identities “vilified the Native ethos of communal giving and welfare as a communitistic or socialistic production of self, emotions, and values” (53).

While ideas about “monumental” and “countermonumental” narratives as well as theories of individuality and rhetorical sovereignty are central to my arguments about images of Indian Territory in the journals, I also draw upon the work of Native Studies scholars who have been defined as “separatists” for their assertion of a Native American intellectual and cultural tradition in North America that is distinct from Euro-American literary and philosophical traditions. These authors’ works are historically and culturally grounded. Vine DeLoria (Standing Rock Sioux), Robert Warrior (Osage), and Craig Womack (Creek-Cherokee) contribute to the critical discussion of sovereignty through their scholarship on the history of Native American writing and its relationship to the reality of colonial experience of Native peoples. In an essay on sovereignty in the *Wicazo Sa Review*, Vine De Loria Jr. emphasizes the land-based political claims to sovereignty. De Loria cautions that the “definition of sovereignty” runs the risk of losing its “political moorings” when it is not defined carefully and in relationship to real political experience
(26). As Jack Forbes (Chickahominy) observes, in the nineteenth-century Anglo-American context, sovereignty indicates a nation which functions as an “autonomous state” that is free from “external control” (14). The difference between Native and Anglo-American ideas of sovereign peoples is described by Richard Scott Lyons, who observes that the “Indians who entered into treaties as nations are better understood as representing themselves as a people” (454). Rather than being unified through an abstract concept of the state, as in the Euro-American tradition, Lyons describes a Nation-people as “a group of human beings united together by history, language, culture, or some combination therein—a community joined in union for a common purpose: the survival and flourishing of the people itself. It has always been from an understanding of themselves as a people that Indian groups have constructed themselves as a nation” (454). As Lyons observes, the workings of a “nation-people” rather than a “nation-state” emphasize a political process that “takes as its supreme charge the sovereignty of the group through a privileging of its traditions and culture and continuity” (454). Rather than emphasizing the sovereignty of the individual, Native sovereignty emphasized Native sovereignty in the texts used for this study emphasizes a people’s relationship to one another and to the places in which they lived in collective terms rather than from the point of view of individual use value.

The work of Robert Warrior (Osage) provides an important background for the significance of journalistic writing to an understanding of the relationship between Native peoples and representations of place. In *The People and the Word: Reading Native Non-Fiction* (2005), Warrior argues that Native American literature is rooted in nonfiction. Warrior explores sovereignty in part through the concept of “intellectual sovereignty,”
which he explores at length in *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions* (1995). In *Tribal Secrets*, Warrior describes Native sovereignty as the struggle to assert Native claims to “land and community” which were historically eroded by the United States’ government when it “abrogated the sovereign-sovereign” relationship with Native peoples in North America (87). For Warrior, “intellectual sovereignty,” like Lyons’s concept of “rhetorical sovereignty” is a process of “self-determination” that reclaims a place for Native Americans in North America through writing. In *The People and the Word*, Warrior explores the “sense of sovereignty and self-determination embodied in both the philosophical traditions of tribal nations and their emerging literatures” (92). Significantly for this project, Warrior defines literature in broad terms, including under this definition “constitutions, novels, poems, newspapers, translations, and contemporary songs” (92). Warrior’s emphasis on nonfiction is useful to understanding how the writing of Native peoples in journals and newspapers is part of a larger Native American intellectual tradition. As Warrior notes, the publication of *Cherokee Phoenix* was especially significant because it represented a move toward Native self-expression based in Native assertions of sovereignty rather than in religious writing based in Euro-American religious traditions. He observes that until the 1820s most Native writing was produced “by Native male Christians,” who were “members of the clergy” and therefore in their historical contexts “most likely to become authors” (xvii). As Warrior observes, since the publication of the *Phoenix*, “[t]housands of Native writers have plied their trade within the pages” of newspapers, which has created a journalistic history of Native writing that is a significant contribution to Native intellectual history.
Like Robert Warrior, Craig Womack (Creek) has also been defined as a Native separatist critic because he writes about a distinct Native American intellectual tradition. Important for my work is Womack’s identification of Native American writing in newspapers as part of that tradition. Womack’s chapter on Native American journalist Alex Posey in *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism* (1999) has proved useful for understanding the relationship between Native journalism and Indian Territory within the context of allotment and statehood questions that are posed in the newspaper *Our Brother in Red*, the subject of chapter three. Womack’s chapter on Posey’s journalism analyzes the Creek writer’s essays on Indian Territory and statehood in the *Eufaula Indian Journal*. Womack situates his discussion of Posey’s work in the historical context of allotment in the late-nineteenth century Womack describes how Posey’s journalism claimed “Indian Territory for Indians” while also “staking out intellectual territory” that was specifically Creek (145). Womack’s discussion of Posey’s journalism as Creek separatist writing can be seen in Posey’s arguments for a Creek state in Indian Territory (145). Womack notes that the dialect writing Posey published in Indian Territory newspapers were highly critical of whites, an example of both claims to geographic separatism—the idea of a Creek state, as well as intellectual separatism. Similarly, in chapter three, I argue that the editorial role of Muscogee (Creek) author S. Alice Callahan at *Our Brother in Red*, is also an argument for Indian Territory as belonging exclusively to Native peoples. Much as Posey argued for a Creek definition of place through his journalism, I show that in the novel *Wynema*, as well as in *Our Brother in Red*, Callahan posits Creek sovereignty through arguments against allotment. Thus, like Posey’s writing in newspapers, Callahan’s journalistic role in *Our Brother in Red*
argues for Creek claims to a place in Indian Territory.

The historically grounded scholarly work of Robert Warrior, Craig Womack, and Vine DeLoria Jr. is important to the study of Native representation in this project; however, I also draw upon Gerald Vizenor’s theoretical approach to issues of American Indian identity. In *Fugitive Poses* (2000), Vizenor (Anishinaabe) investigates the construction of the “*indian*” in various discourses and representational modes. As Vizenor defines the term, the *indian* is an “absence” rather than a presence, a simulation constructed by whites (14). Vizenor deconstructs the terms used to define Native Americans, and criticizes the act of defining the *indian* in order to reveal how texts and images have offered the absent “*indian*” in place of the “*native,*” a term that Vizenor associates with a “presence” that is grounded in native stories and native experience (15).

In this project, I use Vizenor’s term *indian* to explore representations that are examples of the simulations that Vizenor describes, images constructed by whites that are founded in cultural stereotypes rather than in lived Native experience. Vizenor’s approach to Native American representation is particularly important to the photographic representations of Native peoples I explore in chapter two, as well as the textual representations I examine in chapter three.

The works of Craig Womack, Vine DeLoria, Robert Warrior, and Gerald Vizenor are important to this project because they examine American Indian intellectual, geographic, and political sovereignty and for this reason their work influences my exploration of the gaps in the master narrative of geographic as well as cultural assimilation of Native Americans in Indian Territory. Each of the chapters in this project looks at how Native and Anglo-American narratives about Indian Territory are
constructed, as well as how they are tested in the pages of the journals. Chapter one explores George Copway’s public advocacy for Indian Territory in *Copway’s American Indian*, which was published in New York during 1851. Copway used the *American Indian* as a platform from which to advocate for a separate Indian state. I show how Copway’s identification of his Indian state as a place where Native peoples could become future citizens was compromised by the publication of Ojibwa narratives in the journal. I argue that these stories contradict and complicate Copway’s arguments for his Indian state as a location for Native assimilation. While the ultimate goal of Copway’s Indian state was that it would become part of the United States, when his idea of Indian Territory is read in the context of “Influence on Dreams” and “Origin of Death and Medicine Worship” were first published in his collection of Ojibwa stories, *Traditional History and Characteristics of the Ojibway Nation* (1850), Copway’s claim to a specifically Indian territory can be perceived in more complicated ways than simply a desire for Native territorial and cultural assimilation. Instead, Copway’s use of sentimental rhetoric, a sign of the assimilation of Native speech to Anglo-American literary forms, gives way to an assertion of specifically Ojibwa imaginings of the cultural connections to place.

Chapter two explores *Ramona Days*, the journal of the Ramona Indian Industrial School in Santa Fe, New Mexico to show how the journal argued for New Mexico Territory’s statehood by offering Indian education as a method for “civilizing” both New Mexico’s Indigenous people and its landscape. Named for the Native heroine of Helen Hunt Jackson’s novel, *Ramona* (1887), the journal was published by the University of New Mexico’s “Indian Department” to raise funds for the Ramona School. However, the
journal also participated in an ongoing discussion of New Mexico’s statehood, a future event that would benefit both the school and its founder, Ramona Days editor Horatio Ladd by bringing more funds to the school. As the chapter shows, Ramona Days is a public relations brochure that emphasizes an idealized image of southwestern architecture and Indigenous people that depicts Indian peoples and their dwellings as domesticated and posits the school itself as a site for both reform and tourism, linking the two and suggesting that Indian people and New Mexico Territory are a marketable commodities. The visual rhetoric of New Mexico Territory constructed in Ramona Days shows that the public image of Indian reform advocate Helen Hunt Jackson shaped architectural and social formations through an authorial “magisterial gaze” that imagines the school, its architecture, its students as well as New Mexico Territory itself as able to be assimilated into the United States.

Chapter three explores the relationship between images of allotment in the novel Wynema by S. Alice Callahan (Muscogee/Creek) and the author’s editorial role at the Methodist newspaper Our Brother in Red, which was published at Muskogee in Indian Territory from 1882-1899. The chapter examines pieces from the Women’s Christian Temperance Union’s column, which Callahan edited briefly in 1891, as examples of the ways in which the political and the sentimental meet through the reform rhetoric of the WCTU. I argue that the WCTU’s concept of republican motherhood and its image of the family argues for the possibility of “assimilating” Indian Territory through allotment or statehood. When they are read in the context of Callahan’s novel, the fictional and religious pieces that appeared in the WCTU column indicate that the cross-cultural and cross-racial friendships Callahan posits may be predicted to fail because the heroine’s
education leads to assimilation and the disappearance of her Indian identity. However, I also show how Wynema’s newspaper reading in the novel implies a nascent Indian women’s public sphere of reform that is articulated through newspapers. I read this public sphere of reform as a possibility for understanding Indian Territory in a specifically Muscogee Christian context that resists the editor’s reformist rhetoric in the journal, which attempts to characterize the Territory as part of a middle-class Anglo-American Christian family.

The conclusion of this study looks at the idea of “virtual sovereignty” through the contemporary online edition of Cherokee Phoenix. By beginning and ending the project with a discussion of Cherokee Phoenix, I show how the concept of rhetorical sovereignty is an ongoing process of textual negotiation in the twenty-first century. The journals I explore in the nineteenth-century context asserted or refuted Native sovereignty through their circulation among a public of readers. In the case of Cherokee Phoenix online, the definition of sovereignty is negotiated by Cherokee readers who assert connections to the Cherokee Nation in Oklahoma, despite living in disparate locations throughout the United States. Pieces from the journal that connect it to Tahlequah, Oklahoma, its site of publication, and those that discuss the Phoenix’s freedom from direct control by the Cherokee government indicate that although it is published online, the journal is not atemporal or geographically disconnected. I argue that the online version of Cherokee Phoenix offers striking continuities with the nineteenth-century Phoenix and its claims to place. I argue that the Phoenix embodies the “freedom of the press” that Boudinot invoked nearly 200 years ago, and that the online version of the Phoenix opens up new possibilities for interpreting rhetorical sovereignty through connections to place.
CHAPTER ONE

“EVER-TO-BE” INDIAN TERRITORY: GEORGE COPWAY’S POETICS OF PLACE IN COPWAY’S AMERICAN INDIAN

In the August 2, 1851 issue of *Copway’s American Indian*, Ojibwe author and editor George Copway describes his self-published journal, observing that it is “a paper for the Indian Wigwam” and the “the white man’s parlor” (2). Copway’s reference to the Indian and white man’s homes suggest the role of place in defining the journal’s imagined public sphere of readers. Unlike the *Cherokee Phoenix*, however, which invoked a Cherokee liberal public sphere through rational critical debates about sovereignty, *Copway’s American Indian* claims Native sovereignty through a “poetics of place” that connects Indian Territory to an Ojibwa idea of place. The idea of Indian Territory as place is important to the *American Indian* because the journal was conceived of in part as a promotional device for Copway’s idea for an Indian state, “Kahgega,” which he proposed formally to Congress in 1850. When the journal is read in the context of his proposal, *The Organization of a New Indian Territory East of the Mississippi* as well as two Ojibwe narratives that appeared in the journal, it is possible to see how in the *American Indian* Copway fleshes out the legally and geographically defined idea of Indian Territory offered in his Kahgega proposal.

This chapter identifies “space” and “place” as rhetorical constructions based on historical circumstances. In *The Production of Space*, Henri Lefebvre’s defines “space” as “part of an interaction between ‘subjects’ . . . and their surroundings” (18). He

---

associates “abstract space” with Capitalism, observing that in the industrial era, “abstract space took over from historical space” (49). As industrial production became a mode for understanding space, temporality was denied in favor of defining space “objectally” (49). In the mid-nineteenth-century context of the Indian Territory idea, “abstract space” is a product of westward expansion and the territorial prerogative of objectifying both people and the places in which they lived as part of a larger idea of the “use value” of land. In the context of industrial production and space, Lefebvre observes that “abstract space” erases “distinctions” which derive from the natural world and from historical time (49). Lefebvre notes that it is a “dominant form of space” embodied in the “centres of wealth and power” which “endeavor[s] to mould the spaces [they] dominate” (49). As a concept, the power structures imagined by Anglo-Americans are discursive ones found in official governmental documents but also in any texts that construct it from a point of view which defines Indian Territory and dictates the styles of self-representation, for example modes of subsistence or language and cultural practices available to the Native peoples who live in Indian Territory. In the context of limited forms of expression, “abstract space” and its limitations on self-representation suggest an idea of Indian Territory as “empty” and able to be filled by what Gerald Vizenor in *Fugitive Poses* calls the “indian,” a term which he defines as denoting the “simulation” of tribal identity, an idea of the Native which is marked by an absence of the indigenous tribal narratives that ground tribal experience (15).

In contrast to the abstract idea of “space,” Indian Territory is defined from an Ojibwa point of view in *Copway’s American Indian* through Ojibwa stories, suggesting that it is a “habitus,” a place imagined through tribal narrative and relationships to land.
In the journal, Copway describes connections between people and the places they live based on narratives of tribal history. The connection between people and place offered through Ojibwa narrative in the *American Indian* is fundamentally different from that found in Euro-American ideas about place. As Eric Cheyfitz has observed, there is in Euro-American and Native thinking historically been a difference in ways of understanding peoples’ relationship to place in which Euro-Americans conceived of place in individualistic terms of use while Native peoples traditionally perceived it from the point of view of collective relationships between land and people (58). Copway’s Congressional proposal represents his adoption of some of the individualistic modes of understanding “abstract space.” The proposal is an appeal to white readers through descriptions of Indian Territory that are based on largely on individualized notions of the self and appropriative views of the land as “empty” and therefore a space to be colonized.

However, Copway’s proposal for his Kah-ge-ga state also contains obviously tribal ideas about place. When the Ojibwa oral narratives that appeared in *Copway’s American Indian* are read in the context of the individualistic idea about space as a site for Indians to become individualized, land owning citizens in an Anglo-American model, they suggest how the *American Indian* as a promotional device for Copway’s Indian Territory idea posits space as a collectively defined Ojibwa place. Thus Copway’s “Kahgega,” or “Ever-to-be” Indian Territory can be understood in two ways. As it is described in the Congressional proposal, Kahgega is as an imagined space where Native peoples would become individualized future citizens. However, in the context of the Ojibwa narratives that appeared in the *American Indian*, Kahgega is an antidote to individualism for Indians, such as is suggested by Isaac McCoy’s plan for Indian
Territory, which he named “Aboriginia.” As a way of naming Indian territory as a Native place, Kahgega is also a place that is defined by an Ojibwa sense of cultural specificity and ideas about relationships between people and place that are grounded in a tribal sense of “we” rather than an individualistic “I.”

The American Indian indicates that Copway’s Kahgega Indian state was grounded in Ojibwa perspectives and narrative; however, critics of Copway’s work have observed that his Indian state idea was essentially an abstraction. Bernd Peyer describes Kahgega as an “abstract reformist idea” an example of the author’s public presentation of himself as a Romantic Indian—an “I” capable of constructing his world and a relationship to space that finds its source in the individual (245). Donald Smith observes that Kahgega’s name reveals Copway’s “vanity” and his preoccupation with cultivating his public personality (36). Copway reveals the authorial public self in his account of traveling in Europe, Running Sketches of Men and Places in England, France, Germany, Belgium and Scotland (1851). A visit to the British House of Lords prompts Copway to describe Lord Thompson, an abolitionist, as a “smart man by his looks,” but one who, according to Copway, is not confident in presenting himself publicly (109). Copway observes that for many people like Thompson, “the pronoun ‘I’ is a great stumbling-block [sic]” (109). Copway observes that “to use a common expression ‘they are all in my eye’” (109). While his reference seems somewhat unclear, his pairing of the eye/I is suggestive of both an ear for language and an individualized self that orders the world through self-perception.

Copway’s reference to the “I” in describing Lord Thompson suggests both his understanding of Euro-American conventions of self-promotion and authorship as well as
a suggestion of the transcendentalists’ notion of the “I” as constructing the world through the “eye.” In the context of world as an extension of the self, the idea of Indian Territory as described in contemporary discourse suggests Emerson’s observation in “Self-Reliance” that “Time and space are but physiological colors which the eye makes” (27).

Although Bernd Peyer observes that George Copway was not directly connected to any of the Boston transcendentalists, he was a “satellite member of New York’s literary circle” including William Cullen Bryant, Washington Irving, and Nathaniel Parker Wills (263). In her work on Copway’s autobiography, Cathy Rex observes that the author’s public speaking career along the eastern seaboard allowed him to become “intimately familiar with such famous figures as the ethnographer Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, historian Francis Parkman, and writers James Fenimore Cooper, Washington Irving, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, whom Copway purportedly inspired to write The Song of Hiawatha, a romanticized poem about the Lake Superior Ojibwe (2).

Copway’s friendship with Henry Rowe Schoolcraft also indicates that he knew of the growing field of ethnography. Schoolcraft wrote a letter to Copway that appeared in the first issue of the journal. Schoolcraft’s ethnographic specialist’s voice concerning the topics to be addressed in the journal show his publicly respected knowledge of Native cultures, particularly that of the Ojibwe. In his letter, Schoolcraft notes that the journal is an “appropriate means of bringing the subject of the Indians to the test of an enlightened public opinion,” and observes that there are “two primary objects to be accomplished” by the journal (“Letter” 1). The first is the “diffusion of entirely correct opinions regarding the state and character of the tribes” and “the most practicable means of applying the views of humanitarians respecting them” (1). Copway’s connections to white authors and
ethnographers who proposed their own public ideas about the Indians indicate that Copway participated in what Bourdieu describes as a “field of cultural production,” a textual site of contest in which ideas about Indian and the spaces that they inhabited were constructed.

As a representation of an idea of the Indian produced through literature, Cowpay’s decision to name the Indian state after himself suggests the Romantic idea of the self in nature, an idea of space as constructed by and extending from the self. Copway’s savvy self-promotion included referring to himself in the titles of his works as an Ojibwe “chief,” a title he did not in reality hold. Copway’s sense of cultural importance among the Ojibwe may have originated in his father’s tribally significant role. Copway’s father was a veteran of the War of 1812, and a “man of power” among his Rice Lake band of Ojibwe (Smith 24). However, neither Copway nor his father held the titles of “chief” (24). Copway’s reference to himself as “chief” of the Ojibwe appears in the title of the 1847 edition of his autobiography, *The Life, History, and Travels of Kah-ge-ga-gah-bowh (George Copway) a Young Indian Chief of the Ojebwa Nation*, and in the expanded 1850 edition of the autobiography, *The Life, Letters, and Speeches of Kah-ge-ga-gah-bowh*, or, *G. Copway, Chief of the Ojibway Nation*. As the changes in title suggest, Copway’s appeals to white audiences through the culturally stereotypical role of Indian “chief” had increased over time. While he is “a young Indian chief” in the first title, he is “Chief of the Ojibway Nation” by 1850.

The references to his authority as a Native public figure through the identity of “chief” indicate that Copway understood how to take advantage of the non-Native public’s interest with the Romantic Indian and the Noble savage to promote himself and
advocate for Native Americans collectively. Copway’s self-presentation to a white public suggests a similar foundation in contemporary attitudes toward race that W.E.B Dubois would describe as “double-consciousness” in *The Souls of Black Folk* (1893) (3). Dubois suggests that for African Americans “double-consciousness” is a sense of “always looking at one's self through the eyes of others” (3). While a reference to Dubois does not suggest similar experiences for Native Americans and African Americans in the nineteenth century, Dubois’s comments nevertheless point to the issue of a non-white public figure’s awareness of the self as both inside and outside of the dominant culture. Gerald Vizenor refers to a similar sense of doubling when he alludes to what he has called the “simulations” of the Native self—copies of copies that are products of the Western imagination but accepted and consumed as the “real” (*Manifest 5-6*). In his public role, Copway could be considered one of what Vizenor calls the “postindian warriors of survivance” who acknowledge the world of simulation but emerge from it and through the engagement of simulations attempt to create a tribally specific reality.

The sense of Ojibwe tribal specificity is therefore part of Copway’s participation in a literary and ethnographic culture in which he defines a Native self from a Native perspective. Despite criticisms of his position as an opportunist who looked for any chance benefit from the mid-nineteenth-century public’s fascination with things Indian, he is not simply the cosmopolite speaking for an idea of what Vizenor would call the *indian*, a simulation of the popular imagination. Although Peyer has described him as a “transcultural migrant” as well as a “Romantic Cosmopolite,” he also notes that Copway’s writings were “intrinsically tied to his Southeastern Ojibwe heritage” (224). In this sense, while New York provided a location from which to disseminate his views on
Indians, Copway nevertheless continued to speak from his experiences of traditional Ojibwe life in both his Congressional proposal and in *Copway’s American Indian*.

As is indicated by the title of George Copway’s autobiography, the *Life, History, and Travels of Kah-ge-ga-gah-bowh* (1847), as well as his later accounts of his travels in Europe, *Running Sketches of Men and Places in England, France, Germany, Belgium, and Scotland* (1851), the author spent much of his life away from his native home in the Lake Ontario region of Canada. In the narrative, Copway remarks that when he was twelve, he participated in a dream ceremony that marked the coming of age in Ojibwe culture. Tellingly, the spirit asks Copway: “Is this where you are?” (*Life, History* 49). The question is an important in connection to the role of place in Copway’s life and writing. As Copway notes in the 1847 autobiography, his father interpreted a dream in which the spirit showed him images of water and wind: “the wind may indicate that you will travel much; the water, which you saw, and the winds, will carry your canoe safely through the waves” (*Life, History* 51). While the statement is a prescient reminder of Copway’s life travels, his name suggests that he would always occupy a particular rhetorical location as advocate for Natives. His Ojibwe name, “Kah-ge-ga-gah-bowh,” which he translates as, “standing firm” or “stands firm,” suggests occupying a place, a fitting name for an idea for an Indian Territory articulated by a Native person who spent much of his life away from his birthplace.

Copway was born in 1818 into the Crane clan of Rice Lake Ojibwe on the western shores of Lake Ontario, Canada. In his autobiography, Copway describes his early life as a traditional one in which he participated in Ojibwe customs, such as hunting and spiritual practice. In the *Life, History, and Travels*, Copway comments that he
“loved the woods, and the chase” and observes that he was “out early and late in quest of the favors of the Mon-e-doos (spirits)” (8). Despite his early practice of Ojibwe religion, which included the instruction of his father, who was a medicine man, Copway eventually converted to Christianity (11). He was increasingly drawn into the white world after his parents became Methodists in 1827, and in 1830 he acceded to his mother's deathbed plea that he become a Christian, at which time he took the name George Copway (Konkle 191). Copway’s new name suggests the personal impact of Christianity and colonialism in his life.

Although Copway’s account of becoming a Methodist can be understood in a larger context of Native narratives of conversion, he couches the experience in terms that suggest his youthful dream visions. In the Life he notes that he views his life “like the mariner on the wide ocean, without a compass, in the dark night” further observing that he “watches the heavens for the north star, which his eye having discovered, he makes his way amidst surging seas . . . till he arrives safely anchored at port (12). In the context of Copway’s upbringing in a geographically compromised Ojibwe community heavily influenced by missionaries, Methodism may have offered firm ground on which the author could stand. Copway attended the Methodist Mission School at Rice Lake, Ontario, and from 1834 to 1836 he helped Methodist missionaries spread the gospel among the Lake Superior Ojibwe. In 1838, Copway entered Ebenezer Manual Labor School in Jacksonville, Illinois. After he graduated from Ebenezer in late 1839 Copway traveled in the northeastern United States before returning to Rice Lake, where he met and married Elizabeth Howell, a white woman.4

---

4 According to Donald Smith, Copway most likely depended heavily on Howell, an accomplished writer, for editorial help on all of his projects. Though there is no evidence that she wrote for Copway’s American
Until 1842 the Copways served as missionaries to the Indian tribes of Wisconsin and Minnesota. Accepted as a preacher by the Wesleyan Methodist Canadian Conference, Copway was briefly a missionary in Upper Canada. In 1845 he was elected vice president of the Grand Council of Methodist Ojibwes of Upper Canada. Later that year the Saugeen and Rice Lake bands accused him of embezzlement; although Copway's mishandling of the funds may have been due less to dishonesty than to unfamiliarity with modern accounting procedures and to failure to communicate with the bands, he was imprisoned briefly in the summer of 1846 and expelled from the Canadian Conference (Konkle 191). He then went to the United States, where he was befriended by American Methodists and launched a new career as a lecturer and writer on Indian affairs. In the years 1847-1851, he published all of his major works: the autobiography, *The Life, History and Travels of Kah-ge-ga-gah-Bowh* (1847), an account of the oral history of the Ojibwe, *The Traditional History and Characteristic Sketches of the Ojibway Nation* (1850), an expanded version of his autobiography, *The Life, Letters, and Speeches of Kah-ge-ga-gah-Bowh, or G. Copway, a chief of the Ojibwa Nation* (1850), a British edition of his autobiography, *Running Sketches of Men and Places, in England, France, Germany, Belgium, and Scotland* (1850), an account of his European travels, and his Congressional proposal for an Indian State, *Organization of a New Indian Territory, East of the Missouri River* (1850). During the late 1840s and early 1850s, Copway also

---

managed a heavy public speaking schedule and founded *Copway’s American Indian*.

Copway began publishing *Copway’s American Indian* at New York in July of 1851. The journal completed its short run in October of that year, due to lack of paying subscribers (Smith 43). It was conceived of as part of Copway’s attempt to promote his Kahgega state idea, when that proposal received scant attention from Congress. (Peyer 254, *Copway Organization* 18). In the inaugural issue of the journal from July 10 1851, Copway describes that the intention of the journal is to educate the public about Native Americans. He notes in the first issue that the journal is an attempt to answer to the “inquisitiveness of the Anglo Saxon” about Native Americans (1:1). He alludes to geography when he notes that those questions have been “put to us in every part of the country” and that he will attempt to satisfy those questions with information for “our pale-face friends” (1).

One of the reasons Copway included the variety of information about Indians included in the journal was to inform potential “pale-face” supporters about the necessity for a separate Indian state. In the first issue of the journal, Copway printed the Constitution of the American Christian Association, for Protective Justice to North American Indians” (2). The Association would support the “furtherance of Education and Interest among the Indians” (2). Unlike the Cherokee Constitution, which asserted the sovereign rights in their homelands, American Christian Association Constitution called for funds to be raised for a “permanent settlement or settlements large enough to collect them in body or bodies” the “remnant Indian tribes now scattered in the frontiers” (2). These tribes would be gathered “into a territory or territories, to be set apart for that purpose exclusively for such Indians, and as soon as a state government can be formed in
such territory, to secure its admission into the Union, upon such provision as the general government of these United States may direct, or in perfect equality with other States.

(2). As a promotional device for his Indian Territory idea, the journal clearly articulated the need for Native Americans to be gathered in one place and suggested the methods for doing it.

Like the Congressional proposal, *Copway’s American Indian* indicated the author’s ambitions as Indian advocate and writer. It also indicates Copway’s involvement nineteenth-century journalistic print culture. In August 16, 1851 issue of the *American Indian*, Copway printed a notice from an unidentified newspaper. Titled “Notices of the Press,” it details Copway’s journal in its material and thematic contexts: “We have received No. 2 of this interesting paper, published in the city of New York. The editorial department is conducted with great ability by Kah-ge-ga-gah-bowh, as he is called in his native tongue, but better known as Rev. George Copway, a Christianized Indian, and a celebrated Chief of the Ojibway nation” (3). The reviewer describes the material qualities of the journal, noting that “In mechanical skill the ‘American Indian’ will compare favorably with the best: printed on superior paper and containing 24 wide columns. $3 per anum (3). Concluding with a description of the journal’s content, the author suggests the popular image of the Noble savage: “What startling thoughts this sheet brings up in the mind! It seems but a few years ago that our State was peopled with wild and uncivilized Indians, whose untutored minds were trained only on the battle-field or in the chase, and whose pens were the murderous dagger!” (3). While he notes the formerly “savage” state of the region’s Indians, the writer suggests the role of the Native writer in “preserving” the history of Native people: “Now, one of that race sends to their
ancient hunting grounds—but to a different people—a Journal containing their history as a nation *that is almost extinct!*” (3). While Vanishing Indian imagery is the focus of the piece, the author concludes with a reference to technology and geography: “Kah-ge-gah-bowh can contemplate the fact that the modern machinery of the ‘pale face’ bears his newspaper crashing over the graves of his departed fathers! The paper should receive hearty support from the white man, we wish it the most abundant success” (3). The “technology” which the writer is feels it necessary for Copway to “contemplate” is both the technology of transportation—the undefined “modern machinery” of the paleface but also the technology of the printing press, which allowed Copway to disseminate the histories of his “vanishing race.”

These appeals to white readers are important in understanding the *American Indian* as a textual territory itself. As suggested by the reveiwre’s account of the size and subscription price of the journal, it was an ambitious project. The *American Indian* was a four-page, six-column weekly that was divided into several sections, each of which treated a different topic related to Indians (“Copway’s” Littlefield, Parins 113). In order to organize this information, Copway asked for guidance from ethnographer Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, who proposed some topics to be addressed (113). In a letter to Copway, Schoolcraft proposed that the *American Indian* should contain topics such as the “history, tribal organization and government, religion, manners and customs, intellectual capacities and character of the race, present conditions and future, prospects, as well as a ‘General History of the American Tribes’” (113). The *American Indian* addressed these topics after a fashion, although the content of the paper was rather irregular, and some columns did not appear weekly. One regular column, “Plain Talk to the Wise,” treated issues of
general interest to Indians. The newspaper also carried a weekly section, “The Indians,” which discussed the affairs of specific tribes. Like many of its contemporary newspapers, the *American Indian* carried material excerpted from other journals, as well as articles and information supplied by Copway himself. In the first issue, the editor promised to publish correspondence containing notices and reviews of pertinent books and periodicals. He proposed to cooperate with the missionary movement by soliciting information from individual missionaries in the West while at the same time publicizing their work to a sympathetic audience.

*Copway’s American Indian* was unusual for its time because it was non-tribal, the only journal published by an individual Native American until Carlos Montezuma published his personal monthly newsletter *Wassaja* in the early twentieth century (Murphy 17). Unlike many journals published to advocate for Native Americans, the *American Indian* was not supported by any missionary society, and it represented Copway’s personal interests as author and entrepreneur in search of support for his scheme to create an Indian state, which he named “Kahgega Territory” or, “Ever-to-be-Indian Territory,” as he translates the name in his Congressional Proposal (*Organization* 18). The name Kah-ge-ga is indicative of Copway’s public stance as a spokesman for Native Americans. As is suggested by Copway’s self-confident gesture in naming an Indian state after himself, he held a proprietary attitude toward the Native Americans for whom he advocated. He associates the journal with collecting information about Native Americans in one place. In the regular column “Plain Talk to the Wise,” Copway suggests the collecting aspect of the journal: “The great object of this paper will be to enlist public attention to the importance of collecting and preserving the fragments of
history now scattered over our land which relate to the Aboriginal Races of America, as well as the means of their preservation” (1). Copway’s comments suggests that, as Bernd Peyer has observed, Copway’s newspaper was influenced by the “ethnological interest generated by the publications of the American antiquarians, which blossomed in the 1840s after the establishment of the American Ethnological Society in 1842 and the Smithsonian Institution in 1848” (264). Among the apparent supporters of Copway’s Kahgega proposal was Ephraim George Squier, an antiquarian scholar associated with the American Ethnological Society (264). Copway also met Henry Rowe Schoolcraft and Lewis H. Morgan, both of whom were foundational in the study of American Indian ethnography (264).

The readers of Copway’s *American Indians* were in reality few. The journal ceased publication for lack of funds after a few short months because Copway could not find the support of the white readers he hoped to inform about Native Americans. While his statement that the journal would be a newspaper for the “Wigwam,” there are no available subscription records for the journal, so it is difficult to know whether it circulated among Native readers. A few promised pieces in the Algonquian language appeared, but little else in the journal revealed that Copway was attempting to reach a Native readership. Instead, its readers were apparently the many white authors with whom Copway had formed acquaintances, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, William Cullen Bryant, William Gilmore Simms and Washington Irving, whose letters appeared in the first issue of the journal (“Letters” 1).

Similarly, readership can be construed through letters from ethnographers, such as Henry Rowe Schoolcraft and Lewis Henry Morgan, whose correspondence also appeared
in the first issue. Their connection to the journal suggests that Copway’s journal like his Indian Territory idea was a unifying scheme whereby Copway could “collect” in an ethnographic fashion the Native peoples of the Northwest who were being displaced by increasing white demands on their lands. The journal’s collating aims are embodied in the titles of its articles, which were often short pieces simply titled “scraps.” These “scraps,” were generally simple homilies meant to instruct, such as “Idleness is the burial of a living man,” or, “What is majesty when invested in externals? A jest” (“Scraps” 2). The fragmentary quality suggested by the “scraps” which are found throughout each issue of the newspaper indicate that Copway’s American Indian was a collating scheme, whose object was to represent in one location information about diverse Native peoples. The desire to collect and unify identifies the newspaper as what Michel de Certeau calls a “locus of utterance,” a textual space which “redistributes cultural space” by identifying the newspaper as an authoritative source on Native American language, culture, and history (68).

One of the ways that the American Indian unified the diverse Native populations represented in the journal was to publish fiction that drew included familiar Native stereotypes, such as the vanishing Indian. The fiction was much like that of James Fenimore Cooper and William Gilmore Simms, both of whom wrote letters promising to make a contribution to the American Indian that were not forthcoming.5 “Neykemee, the Delaware” is a frontier story by an anonymous author that takes place after the Revolutionary War. Lydia Maria Child’s “An American Tradition,” features a

5 Cooper and Simms wrote letters to Copway which appeared in the first issue of the newspaper. Cooper admits to poor health but promises at least “some little anecdote or sentiment, or sketch” which might be “thrown off by the aid of an amanuensis” (10 Jul. 1851: 1). Simms congratulates Copway on the newspaper but notes that he is quite busy. He observes that Copway will “occasionally . . . have something from my pen” (10 Jul. 1).
Cooperesque vanishing Indian, the chief “Chocura.” Both stories take place in the colonial past and both titular Indians die tragically at the ends of the stories. Child’s name would have appealed to readers and the story was an obvious attempt to attract white readers by appealing to familiar literary tropes about Indians.

However, the *American Indian* also presents a resistant voice for Indians, one that questions Anglo-American treatment of Native Americans and redirects readers to a Native perspective on the Anglo-American colonization of North America. An editorial piece from August 2, 1851 suggests the connection between the *American Indian* and Copway’s advocacy for Native lands in the Congressional proposal. “Can Such Things Be,” by “J.N.” is written from the perspective of a Chinese observer of America’s Indian policies. The piece elaborates upon a “single paragraph” from an unidentified piece of writing by Edward Everett (2). Everett opposed Andrew Jackson’s Cherokee removal policies, and Copway contacted him about contributing to the newspaper. In a letter appeared in the July 10 issue, Everett notes that he “cannot promise” a written contribution to the *American Indian* but requests that his name be “put in the subscription hat for two copies” (1). Everett, along with Governor of Massachusetts George Briggs and Thomas Ewing, Secretary of the Home Department had written a letter of introduction to Copway’s *Organization of a New Indian Territory*. This letter supports Copway’s efforts in a fashion similar to the letters discussed by Hillary Wyss in *Writing Indians*, in which she identifies aspects of eighteenth-century white missionaries’ letters written on behalf of Native converts. Wyss identifies the letters by whites and from

---

6 “An American Tradition” (30 Aug. 1851:1) does not appear in any collections of Child’s works. If it was printed in a magazine, Copway does not attribute the story to its original source. “Neykemee, the Delaware” (6 Sept. 1851: 1-2) is unsigned and does not appear in either OCLC or the Library of Congress’s databases or catalogs.
Native converts as “carefully controlled” power interactions in which Natives and whites aid one another in constructing, maintaining, and questioning power relations between white missionary and Native convert (11). While Everett’s letter at the beginning of *Organization* was written in the context of Indian politics, it suggests the extent to which Copway used the means at his disposal to control the situation, engaging powerful political figures to support his Indian state idea.

The letter also indicates Copway’s own careful control of his public personae. The letter describes Copway’s appearances on the Boston lecture circuit, observing that “By his lectures and demeanor while here, Mr. Copway has won the esteem and respect of many of the most respectable citizens of Boston, and created an interest in his humane and noble purpose” and presses the senatorial audience for the proposal, hoping that the proposal readers “will, so far as your judgment may approve, extend to him any aid in your power toward the promotion of his plan” (28). Copway gains credibility from these letters, but they do not remove his agency as the proponent of Kahgega, instead the letter from Everett and the other politicians as well as J.N.’s response to Everett in “Can Such Things Be” suggest that through the *American Indian*, Copway extended the work of textually constructing Kahgega in his *Organization*. In this sense, the Kahgega idea is socially constructed through not only Copway’s writings but also those who supported his Indian state proposal, such as Everett.

As a response to another socially constructed concept of Indian land claims, “Can Such Things Be” suggests Edward Everett’s evident disgust with white appropriations of Indian lands. J.N. paraphrases Everett’s argument:

> God having created earth for man to multiply himself in and replenish with his living images, therefore the grounds over which tribes of wandering savages hunt
for prey generation after generation is not thereby appropriated nor taken possession of; and is consequently open to the first comer for cultivation; because, being cultivated, the earth would yield more and support a larger population, with different habits of life. (2)

The piece explains the difficult situation of Native Americans whose lands were taken from them because from a European perspective they did not adequately utilize its resources.

J.N. further explores Everett’s ideas and censures whites by questioning the use of public land for leisure purposes: “By what title would the parks or pleasure grounds be held—if hunting grounds are not allowed to the children of God? What man would have any right to a garden—to a lot of wilderness—or a patch of greensward, so long as any other man could be found to turn it to better account, in feeding the human family and promoting civilization.” (2). J.N. argues that if whites do not use lands for farming and cultivation, then they also have no title to it. He concludes by suggesting that by the logic of American colonialism, whites should be removed from lands which they do not adequately use:

No, no; according to your own theory, nay, according to your own practice with the Red men of America, we, the Red men of Asia, being more numerous and powerful, and therefore better judges of the law, and of what God meant by peopling the earth, as he did you, short-sighted, selfish, and besotted creatures can be supposed to know—we insist upon your giving up, and clearing out, and moving off, and the sooner the better” (2).

While J.N may not be George Copway, the editorialist speaks for Native concerns in ways which give Native Americans a voice, albeit through the distancing device of a “foreign” observer. This method of speaking about Indian politics from a non-Indian perspective identifies Copway’s colonial context as a writer and speaker, and it suggests the multiple voices that can be found in Copway’s writing as a whole.
J.N.’s piece distances the reader from a politically critical Indian voice and calls attention to the problems scholars have found in discovering an “authentic” Indian voice in Copway’s writing. By publishing an article like “Can Such Things Be,” Copway is able to be safely critical of whites without risking his position as public speaker in the newspaper. Through J.N., editor Copway asserts that Indians should remove whites by suggesting that a people related to Native Americans would be able to “take possession of” the American continent and push whites “into the Pacific,” much as whites in the 1850s were fulfilling the promise of Manifest Destiny by moving Indians westward (1). As a rhetorical device that allows Copway to be critical of whites, J.N.’s voice is an example of “subjugated discourse,” which Cheryl Walker identifies in a Native American context as discourse which is “inevitably vertical, but the placement of entities on the vertical axis is unstable, sometimes presenting Euro-Americans as the superior group and sometimes presenting Indians as deserving the higher position” (Indian 17). In this case, the distancing mechanism of the Chinese speaker allows for a criticism of whites which places the “Red men” of Asia, and, by association, the “Red men” of North America, in a position which is superior to that of whites. The criticism of white appropriation Indian lands in “Can Such Things Be?” employs subjugated discourse, a rhetorical mode that allows Copway, through the voice of J.N., to critique the dominant culture and represent a Native point of view. While it is not a direct criticism, the subjugated mode of addressing unequal power structures of colonialism suggest the role of the journal in articulating a critical voice. This critical voice is especially important because it is presented in the context of a journal that was a fundraising device for Copway’s Indian Territory plan. This suggests that the journal and, by extension, the territory itself were
potential counterarguments to federal Indian policies of Native removal and forced migration.

Copway’s experience of Ojibwe disputes over non-Native claims to their land, and his knowledge of Ojibwe removals in the United States and Canada informs the criticism, and his autobiography provides a context for his criticism of white treatment of Native peoples, as well as for his Indian state idea. His experience of Ojibwe land struggles in Canada and the United States were always an impetus for him to advocate for Indian lands to be identified and protected. One such account of Native-white conflicts over land in his work appears in his autobiography *Life, History, and Travels of Kah-ge-ga-gah-bowh* (1847). In the *Life*, Copway observes that in the year of his birth Great Britain purchased the Rice Lake portion of Ontario which was home to Copway’s family: “In the year 1818, 1,800,000 of it were surrendered to the British government. For how much do you ask? For $2,960 per annum! What a great sum for British generosity!” (75).

Elsewhere in the autobiography, Copway notes that the both the American and Canadian Ojibwe were “hedged in, bound, and maltreated” by “both the American and British governments” (84). And Donald Smith notes in his introduction to Copway’s *Life* that the Rice Lake Ojibwe were overrun by the numerous Irish settlers who flooded into the newly purchased territory after 1825 (7). The terms “hedged,” “bound,” and “maltreated” suggest the antebellum context of Copway’s autobiography. In particular, they imply slavery and its relationship to an agricultural system of fenced property owned by individuals. This association suggests that limitations placed upon traditional Ojibwe methods of self-support, such as fishing and hunting, were a threat to Indian freedom and sovereignty. Smith underscores these limitations further when he notes that the
Mississauga’s trapping and fishing grounds were greatly reduced by the immigrants (7).

Copway understood from his childhood experience the difficulties faced by the Canadian Ojibwe. His time as student and missionary in the Great Lakes region of the United States during the 1830s and 1840s made him aware of the hostile appropriation of Indian lands there, much of it belonging to the Ojibwe. As Bernd Peyer notes, in 1850, Zachary Taylor authorized the “immediate and complete removal of the Ojibwes in Michigan and Wisconsin to unoccupied territory in central Minnesota” (246). Copway knew of the problems faced by the Ojibwe in Michigan and Wisconsin. Dale Knobel observes that the Lake Superior Ojibwe among whom Copway had ministered in the 1830s and early 1840s exchanged lands in 1837 in “east-central Minnesota and northwestern Wisconsin for federal assumption of debts owed to white merchants, cash, and annuities” (179). A second exchange was facilitated in 1842 by whites interested in Lake Superior copper deposits, in which the Ojibwe “surrendered the western end of Michigan’s upper peninsula and the remainder of their holdings in northern Wisconsin” (180). The Ojibwe remained on the ceded land until the late 1840s because it was not immediately occupied by settlers. The Ojibwes’ insistence on being allowed to occupy selected areas of the ceded land led President Zachary Taylor to issue his removal order of 1850. This removal resulted in the Sandy Lake tragedy, in which several hundred Ojibwes died as a result of forced migrations in Minnesota and Wisconsin.  

To force the Ojibwa west of the Mississippi, the Bureau of Indian Affairs made a last-minute change to move the annual annuity payments from a central region around La Pointe, Wisconsin, the economic and spiritual center of the nation, to the less central but well known trade location of Sandy Lake, Minnesota. The BIA hoped to strategically trap the Ojibwa in Minnesota, forcing them to spend their annuity payments in Minnesota rather than Wisconsin, which was both economically and politically beneficial to the BIA. The Ojibwa were concerned about the issues this move presented, and many bands of Ojibwa gathered together to deliberate their options. Unfortunately, the discussions consumed such a lengthy span of time that the Ojibwa were left with sparse time to plant their spring crops. As a result, they were forced to relocate to Sandy Lake if they wished to survive. In the fall of 1850, representatives from 19 Ojibwa bands
removal efforts inspired Copway to lecture in the East, South, and Midwest on his plan for a separate Indian state advocated in the *Organization of a New Indian Indian Territory, West of the Mississippi* (1850).

As the Ojibwe experiences of removal show, Copway’s *Organization of a New Indian Territory* responds directly to the problems encountered by the Ojibwe and other Indians as white settlers pressed westward in the 1840s and 50s into Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa. The continued geographic possibility for a new Indian state aside from that already extent in Oklahoma Territory was supported by the United States’ acquisition of territories from Mexico after the Mexican War ended in 1847. As a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, which resulted in the United States’ acquisition of lands included in what is now New Mexico, Arizona and Southern California, presented once more the idea of a space for Indians who conflicted with whites over lands throughout the United States and its newly acquired territories. Yet by the early 1850s, the idea of establishing any new a separate Indian lands other than those already set aside in present-day Oklahoma were was fading in the wake of westward expansion and the concept of a reservation system.

In 1851, the year in which Copway published the *American Indian*, the Secretary of the Interior Alexander Stuart observed that with respect to Native Americans, a “temporizing system can no longer be pursued,” a statement which indicated that the removal and separation policies of the first three decades of the nineteenth century were packed up and started an arduous journey to the shores of Sandy Lake, where they had been told to gather in late October for their annual annuity payments and supplies. They waited there for several weeks before a government agent arrived and informed them that Congress had been unable to send the appropriate money & supplies. A small portion of the payment finally arrived in early December, consisting of spoiled food and a small percentage of the promised payment. By this time, around 150 Ojibwa had died of dysentery, measles, starvation, or freezing. The return journey was equally perilous: aside from being weak from sickness and hunger, the Ojibwa were also unprepared for a winter journey. As a result, 200-230 more Ojibwa died on the return journey to La Pointe.
no longer practicable ("Rep., Secy. Interior" 502). Thus, Stuart observed, the only alternatives were to “civilize or exterminate” Native populations (502). As an answer to Stuart’s statements, the United States government offered “the reservation system” which historian Brian Dippie calls an “official alternative to extinction” (75). Thus, instead of a separate Indian nation, the government increasingly supported the establishment of reservations in the 1850s. Reservations were a practical answer to the increasing presence of whites throughout the United States and its territories, a reality which allowed the United States an official solution to the perceived difficulty of Native peoples living “in close proximity with, or in the midst of, a white population” (Brown “Rep., Com. Ind. Affairs” 946).

The Westward movement of white settlers during the 1840s and 1850s revealed that any new proposals for Indian Territory were increasingly impossible geographic efforts at “temporizing” Indian civilization. The geographic space which Thomas Jefferson could imagine in the early nineteenth century as being open to Indian relocation, were unimaginable in the 1850s, as whites moved into places inhabited by Native Americans, who represented competing claims to the definition of place. As an effort to present a Native counterclaim to white constructions of imaginatively constructed western spaces as locally and culturally definable places, Copway’s Kahgega proposal offered a Native concept of time in a specifically defined geographic place that suggest the influence of Ojibwe culture on Copway’s writing, and the complex relationship between his idea of Indian Territory and his ideas about Native assimilation.

The Kahgega territory as described by Copway is defined by the idea of time. Copway’s translation of Kahgega as “ever-to-be Indian territory” contradicts the concept
of time found in Anglo-American Indian policy makers’ idea of Indian Territory as an imagined space for Indian progress toward assimilation. Problematically, however, mid-nineteenth-century attitudes toward the idea of history itself made Kahgega “ever-to-be” an idea rather than a lived reality that contained a Native concept of place that included a past, present, and future. It was only an imagined “civilized” future imagined for Native peoples in Indian Territory. As Steve Conn observes in *History’s Shadow: Native Americans and Historical Consciousness in the Nineteenth Century*, by the 1840s and 1850s represented increasingly perceived of Indians as having a separate history form that of Anglo-Americans(21). Even Jefferson, who suggested that Native Americans had a history that was evident in the Indian mounds he studied and wrote about in *Notes on the State of Virginia* cast Native peoples as outside of Anglo-American historical time.

In the *Notes*, the famous speech of Chief Logan, intended by Jefferson as a refutation of Comte de Buffon’s allegation that there was no American equivalent to the oratory power of Cicero, described in the American conscious an idea that Indian history was something completed. Often reprinted in school primers in the nineteenth century, Chief Logan’s speech was an exemplar of the vanishing American stereotype which cast Native history as complete. Jefferson’s rendering of Logan’s speech depicts both dehumanizes Natives, as when Logan observes, “not a drop of my blood in any living creature,” and suggests the end of Indian history, when Logan utters the now famous lines, “Who is there to mourn for Logan? Not one” (124). As Anthony Wallace observes in *Jefferson and the Indians*, Jefferson’s printing of Logan’s so-called “speech” was a “succinct expression of an apocalyptic view of Indian history” (1). As Steve Conn observes in *History’s Shadow* the mid-nineteenth century interest in “preserving” and
“cataloguing” Native ruins, an interest which George Copway exploits in his
“preservation” of “scrap”s of history in American Indian, conceived of Indian history as a
part of the “past” that could be found in “objects” and “preserved” (118). These objects
were essentially the same “relics” of the past that Indian languages were perceived as
being—essentially ahistorical in any Anglo-American sense. Equally, these dominant
methods of defining Native relationships to place (through objects) and time (through
language and objects) constructed discourses that perceived Indians as without a sense of
the past connected to the present.

As Copway describes it, Kahgega is a rhetorically imagined space, an idea that
will become a geographically and culturally realized space. The idea of Indians’
perpetual habitation in Kahgega is found in Copway’s translation of his name for the state
as “Ever-to-be Indian Territory” (Organization 18). The term “ever-to-be” suggests that
as an imagined “space,” Kahgega will always belong to Native Americans. As
both a name and a conception of space, Kahgega suggests what Gerald Vizenor calls
“survivance,” the “active presence” which is defined by “native ancestors” and
“memories” and “native stories” (15). As an idea, Kahgega is complicated, by the fact
that in the Congressional Proposal Copway also states that Kahgega would eventually
become a state, and that the Native peoples who lived in Kahgega would become United
States citizens. This vision of the future for Kahgega’s Indians assumes western ideas
about linear time and presents Indian Territory as a place for allowing Indians gradual
and eventual assimilation while living separately whites. In its progressive vision of
citizenship and assimilation, Copway’s proposal suggests earlier nineteenth-century ideas
of Indian Territory as a location where Native people would become civilized and
eventually become citizens of the United States.

The idea of permanence suggested in Copway’s name suggests his resistant role as author and speaker in articulating the territory, particularly as a Native American proposing the idea to Congress—an activity generally undertaken by whites. Kahgega is important because it was an idea presented by a Native American as a possible solution to the problem of Indian-white conflicts over land in the Northwest. Both Natives and non-Natives had presented ideas about a territory for Northwestern Indians in the 1840s. Bernd Peyer observes that in 1841, the Indian Office authorized Governor James Duane Doty of Wisconsin Territory to negotiate treaties with Sioux inhabitants of the area. These treaties induced the Sioux to sign away thirty million acres of land in northwestern Iowa, Minnesota, and the Dakotas. In trade for this, the Sioux would be provided with all of the ceded land north of the present Iowa-Minnesota border south of the 46th parallel, which territory would be open only to people of “Indian blood” (245). The treaty did not pass the Senate, although President John Tyler strongly supported it (245). While Copway’s proposal was similar to that of Doty, he also had knowledge of a proposal for a separate territory submitted by the Ojibwe. In 1845, Copway had been part of the Saugeen council meeting in Canada, at which the Canadian Ojibwe had proposed a permanent Indian territory for the Ojibwe to be located in the Old Northwest (245). Although Copway’s proposal is an important way of understanding time and place in a Native context, it is important to understand that both whites and Natives similarly imagined an Indian Territory for Northwestern tribes in a similar geographic space.

While Copway’s proposal drew upon his understanding of both Ojibwe and white ideas about a northwestern Indian Territory. His description of it in the Congressional
proposal, *Organization of a New Indian Territory East of the Missouri River*, reveals specifically Ojibwe definitions of place that define Kahgega as tribally specific and therefore located in a tribally defined place. In the *Organization*, Copway advocates for the establishment of an Indian territory of more than eighteen thousand square miles, which he in present-day central and southeastern South Dakota (roughly one-third of the state) (Copway *Organization* 18, Smith 37). According to Copway, Kahgega would be overseen by a non-Native governor and an Indian lieutenant-governor, and “well educated” Indians would administer the territory (37). All of these groups would help to guide Kahgega to eventual statehood (37).

Kahgega’s statehood, and the eventual citizenship of its Native peoples, presents problem of assimilation versus isolation for Native peoples. In the *Organization*, Copway confers upon Indians American citizenship and implies their eventual assimilation. In the proposal, he suggests that Indians must first become “civilized” and attached to their homes: “My object is to induce the general government to locate the Indians in a collective body, where, after they are secured in their lands, they may make such improvements as shall serve to attach them to their homes” (13). He defines this space geographically, observing that the location he has chosen for northwestern Indians is “the unsettled land, known as the North-west Territory, between the territories of Nebraska and Minnesota, on the eastern banks of the Missouri river. The great Sioux river being the eastern boundary, from its head waters draw a line westward until it meets the Missouri river; thence down the Missouri to the place of beginning. This would form an Indian territory large enough for all the scattered tribes of Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, &c” (13). His reasons for choosing this area are that the area suggested in most proposals
for the removal of Northwestern Indians, particularly the Ojibwe, is the “upper waters of the Mississippi” (14). Copway argues that this is not a suitable location for an Indian state because the Indians would too quickly come into contact with land-hungry whites, a situation which would cause further difficulties “[b]ecause the upper waters of the Mississippi are going to be the greatest source of the lumber trade, and the races coming in contact with one another must cause trouble along the river” (14). Copway further describes his reasons for removing the Indians further west: “They will go away from the course of emigration which goes up the Missouri and thence westward. They would be two hundred and fifty miles north of this trail. The climate is best for them. Either north or south would not do. In the first, they would suffer from cold; in the last, from sickness” (14). He feels that this isolated area would allow the northwestern tribes to adjust gradually to “civilization”: “The distance of this territory westward would cause their removal to be gradual, and by the time the whites should reach there, the Indians would be so far improved as to be enabled to live as neighbors, and could compete with the whites in point of intelligence, and mechanical and agricultural skill” (14). The term “compete” signals the contradictory nature of this territory and the kind of sovereignty it grants the Indians who live in it. Indians would “improve” by learning agriculture and mechanical skills that would place them on equal terms with their white neighbors.

As Copway’s use of the term “improve” implies, in his proposed Kahgega state, sovereignty is based on Lockean notions of the landholding farmer. Copway does not see sovereignty in communal or collectively tribal terms. He refers to the need for limiting Indian lands in order that they abandon hunting as a means of sustenance: “When they have land that they can call their own, and limited, so that the scarcity of game will
oblige them to till the soil for a subsistence, then they will improve, and the sooner this state of affairs is brought about, the better” (10). Copway’s enclosure of Indian space is in keeping with the notion commonly held at the time that American Indians could only be civilized if they adopted to Anglo-American patterns of land ownership and agricultural methods.

The Congressional proposal also limits Indian sovereignty politically in ways that relate to geography inasmuch as the government of tribes in Kahgega must be modeled on that of the United States. In a section which outlines the political makeup of the territory, Copway states “And be it further enacted, That each of the tribes residing within said territory, may establish and maintain such government for the regulation of their own internal affairs, as to them may seem proper; not inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States, or the Laws thereof” (19). Although he allows the Indians may construct their own forms of government within Kahgega, they must bear resemblance to that of the United States. Copway links Kahgega with Washington, and in doing so creates a tension between native sovereignty in the West and political control of Indian affairs in the East. Copway infers Indian sovereignty when he observes that the Indians may regulate their “internal affairs” in ways that seem “proper,” phrasing which suggests a tribally based government. However, as David Murray notes, the term “proper” clusters around the idea of “property, propriety, appropriation, and ultimately sovereignty” (80). Each of these terms is important to an understanding of Indian sovereignty in Kahgega because they originate in Anglo-American concepts of property ownership.

As an aspect of something that can be appropriated, the “proper” is understood as something that can be owned, or made one’s own. This sense of ownership conforms to
Copway’s complicated experience as a missionary and Christian convert. Jace Weaver’s notion of “communitism,” which he describes in *That the People Might Live: Native American Literature and Native Communities*, relates to sovereignty and suggests an important sense of community that does not embrace notions of “appropriation” and “property” in sovereignty. For Weaver, communitism is a combination of “community” and “activism” and a concomitant “proactive commitment to Native community” (xiii). Weaver does not try to limit what he defines as Native communities, or what is meant by American Indian literature, but he acknowledges a need to connect indigenous languages—including English as spoken by Indians—and tribally specific places with writing. These places and languages are part of the rhetorical sovereignty which communitism implies: a sense of American Indian political and cultural autonomy engendered by writing. The autonomy that Weaver describes is closely related to the need for a sense of self-expression that comes from tribally specific places. As Weaver notes “When Natives are removed from their traditional lands, they are robbed of more than territory; they are deprived of numinous landscapes that are central to their faith and their identity, lands populated by their relations, ancestors, animals and beings both physical and mythological. A kind of psychic homicide is committed” (38). In the *American Indian*, Ojibwe stories suggest Copway’s desire to ground Kahgega in an Ojibwe sense of place and geography, turning the space of his Indian state into an Ojibwe place.

Kahgega is defined as a place by people and their collective relationships to specific geographies. However, its context as an idea is the Euro-American concept of a separate geographic space for Indians. This separate space was imagined by non-Natives
as populated by Native Americans learning to become individuals in the Anglo-American model. The appropriative concept of the “proper” is applicable to this Anglo-American vision of Indian Territory. Eric Cheyfitz, connects the “proper” to language when he observes that “propriety” can be used interchangeably with “proper,” “authoritative,” or “legitimate” (90). In discussing the colonial situation in early America, Cheyfitz shows how “proper” or “literal” language is juxtaposed in writing about white/native contacts so that proper language is the language of the colonizer. Proper speech is linked to “decorum” and the notion that each individual will know his or her place in a hierarchical system of communication and speak accordingly. Metaphorical or figurative language, which is often imagined as the opposite of the “proper” is paradoxically part of the “proper” speech of the colonizer, but only when used with “decorum” or “propriety” by the colonizer. Thus, the speech of the colonized is forever deferred in meaning, so that any claims to political representation on native terms is impossible. Rather than being terms of equal exchange among Natives and between Natives and whites, the terms of the “proper” are used to place colonial cultures in relation to one another hierarchically.

In their analysis of “propriety,” both Murray and Cheyfitz link language to political representation. Murray’s use of “appropriation” in connection to “proper” clearly demonstrates the mid-nineteenth-century, expansionist context for Copway’s Organization. It was written six years after journalist John O’Sullivan coined the term “Manifest Destiny” when he advocated for the annexation of Texas in an article in the Democratic Review (O’Sullivan “Annexation” 2). By the time Copway published his Congressional proposal, the term had become part of the national lexicon, particularly after Texas, and then Oregon, were annexed to the United States. Yet Copway’s
Organization of a New Indian Territory refutes this language of Anglo-American expansionism even as he affirms its rhetorical tendency to map, divide, and delineate land.

When read in the context of Copway’s autobiography and its account of Native land relationships, Copway’s Organization of a New Indian Territory plan has other, more insistently Ojibwe meanings. The Organization has been interpreted by some critics as self-promotional pamphlet that is symbolic of his acculturation and individualization. However, the plan can also be read within the context of Copway’s assertion of an Ojibwe-centered worldview. The first example of the Ojibwe-centered culture of Kahgega Territory can be found in Copway’s choice of locations for the state. Copway describes Kahgega as “the unsettled land, known as the North-west Territory, between the territories of Nebraska and Minnesota, on the eastern banks of the Missouri river. The great Sioux river being the eastern boundary, from its head waters draw a line westward until it meets the Missouri river; thence down the Missouri to the place of beginning” (13). Copway appeals to white readers’ knowledge of Anglo-American names for the region in this section and invokes map-making when he asks the reader to “draw a line” to delineate a western boundary for Kahgega. While this statement appeals to Anglo-American readers’ awareness of mapping conventions and concepts of geography, Copway also draws attention to Kahgega as a region that was home to the Ojibwes’ hereditary enemies, the Sioux.

When Copway erases the Sioux presence in Kahgega, by describing the region as “unsettled,” he underscores an Ojibwe-centered view of geography. While Copway’s experience of Ojibwe-Sioux relations was with the bands of Dakota Sioux in Minnesota
rather than the bands of Sioux in the Dakotas, his Ojibwe sense of geography can be understood in an Ojibwe cultural and historical perspective. This animosity between the Ojibwe and Sioux is evident in Copway’s autobiography, where he observes that “The Sioux and the Ojibwas have been at war from time immemorial” (Life, Letters 113). Thus, his decision to name Kahgega as “uninhabited” suggests an Ojibwe territorial world-view in which the Sioux are written out of Kahgega altogether. This assertion can be supported by the historical reality that the Dakota region in which Copway’s Kahgega Territory was to be located was “within the hunting grounds of the Sioux” (Smith “The Life” 20). Copway may align himself with Anglo-American ideas of isolation, which Brian Dippie has shown were part of United States Indian policy until the second half of the nineteenth century (47). However, he nevertheless asserts an Ojibwe view of Indian peoples who would live in Kahgegah that is grounded in an Ojibwe view of tribal relations.

The historical tension between the Dakota Sioux and the Lake Superior Ojibwe is evident in Copway’s autobiography, where they suggest an expression of Native histories of geographic locations. In the Life, Travels, and Speeches (1850), Copway describes his time as a Methodist missionary among the Ojibwes of the Lake Superior region of present-day Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan, as well as his work among the Minnesota bands of the Sioux (Sweet 69). Describing a Lake Superior landscape marked by Sioux-Ojibwe warfare, Copway describes a river journey with some Ojibwe. On the journey, one of his Ojibwe companions points to specific geographic locations on the journey where battles between the two peoples have occurred. Copway describes the remembrance of an Ojibwe Chief who has accompanied him on the trip: “The Chief,
pointing to a certain spot, observed, “There I killed two Sioux, about thirteen winters ago” (Life, Letters 114). In contrast to the western conventions of mapping and delineating found at times in the Organization of Indian Territory, Copway indicates a distinctly Ojibwe sense of place, and a specifically Ojibwe idea of geography that informs his erasure of a Sioux presence from Kahgega. On the journey with the Ojibwe described in the Life, History the trees themselves bear witness to the Sioux-Ojibwe conflicts. Copway observes: “Every half mile, trees were blazed (barked,) and notches made according to the number that had been killed” (114). While lines are drawn in Kahgega to indicate the boundaries of the Indian state, in the passage from the Life, memory and cultural history create a context for Native geographic boundaries.

The Ojibwe relationships to geography through tribal custom that are found in the Organization of an Indian Territory suggest that the proposal can be read as a contradiction of the rhetoric of lines, boundaries and maps that appeal to the white politicians whom Copway hoped would support his Kahgegah proposal. The proposal also contradicts white ideas about Indian territory as a space for Native peoples to become “civilized” in preparation for eventual assimilation. Through an assertion of linguistic authority, Copway further asserts Ojibwe primacy in Kahgegah by discussing the importance of the Algonquian language in the Organization. Copway emphasizes the Ojibwes’ important role in the Territory through remarks about the Algonquian language that suggest its importance in asserting cultural and political power in the Kahgega territory. In the Organization, Copway describes the linguistic necessity of finding a common language for the tribes that will be located in Kahgega.

In describing the languages to be spoken in Kahgega, Copway notes the linguistic
connection among the unnamed “northwestern tribes” he would have settled in Kahgega, observing that the “language of the northwest tribes is peculiarly adapted for such a state of society; they would soon understand each other, the Ojibwe language being the great family language of all the Algonquian tribes west” (Organization 15). In describing the tribal relations in Kahgega territory, Copway suggests a linguistic connection that is also a cultural and political one, noting that the Algonquian-speaking peoples were “all one people once,” further observing that their reunification in Kahgega “will be a great social blessing” (15). Although scholars have acknowledged Copway’s “pan-Indianism,” his emphasis on the northwestern tribes, and the Ojibwe dialect of Algonquian in particular, suggests a tribally specific notion of Indian Territory that emphasizes both place and cultural identity rather than the Euro-American stereotype of a generic Indian identity.

The linguistic and cultural specificity suggested by Copway’s emphasis on uniting Algonquian speaking peoples in Kahgega suggests pan-Indianism. However, it is not such an assertion. Copway is specific about the Indian peoples who he would have populate Kahgega. This contradicts Timothy Fulford’s emphasis on Kahgega as a “pan-Indian” state (284). Although Copway asserts in Organization that he wants to “make the great family of the Indians ONE, should I live long enough—one in interest, one in feeling, one while they live,” he elsewhere states clearly which Indians would not be part of the unified Indian people of Kahgega. He describes Kahgega as “more practicable” for the Indians of the northwest and refers to the southeastern Indians of Oklahoma when he observes, “I would not be understood as thinking or legislating for the civilized portion, who are by far the most enlightened of the American Indians” (13). Thus, Copway does not speak for all Indians, and the “generic” Indian referred to in the
journal’s title becomes connected to specific places and a specific group of languages.

While the journal refers to an idea of America as a nation, Copway’s reference to the northwest tribes suggests tribal allegiances that reveal Native beliefs about national identity based on relationships to place. This culturally specific idea of tribal belonging can be seen in his description of Sioux reactions to Christian Ojibwes’ missionary work among them. As Donald Smith observes, when Copway and his cousin John worked as Methodist missionaries among the Sioux in the Lake Superior region, they saw perceived the Ojibwe, who Smith assumes were dressed in western style, as “Frenchmen” (“The Life” 14). Smith describes the Sioux perception as a cultural rather than a racial one, noting that the Sioux believed that the Ojibwe missionaries were “persons of European culture who incidentally happened to be Indian” (14). Further supporting this cultural and specifically tribal notion of identity in Copway’s experience, Alfred Brunson, a white missionary with whom Copway worked, writes of the Sioux reaction to Ojibwe house building among them. Watching Copway and the Ojibwe missionaries skillfully cut logs and raise buildings, one Sioux remarks through an interpreter, “Jim, them ain't Ojibbewas, they are Frenchmen; Ojibbewas can't work so” (Brunson 81). This cultural perspective of identity can also be found in Copway’s American Indian, where the author expresses an idea of being Native that imagines the “American Indian” of Kahgega as an Algonquian-speaking Ojibwe, whose connections to place and cultural practice make the supposedly “empty” space of Kahgega a specifically Ojibwe place.

Copway emphasizes Ojibwe relationship to place in Copway’s American Indian when he reprints pieces from the Traditional History and Characteristic Sketches of the Ojibwe Nation. While some of the pieces he reprinted in the American Indian under the
heading “Legends” appear in a chapter called “Their Legendary Stories and Historical Tales,” two pieces on religion represent a clear example of Ojibwe historical and cultural relationships to place that are important in the context of the newspaper’s use to promote Kahgega. While one of these pieces, “Origin of Death and Medicine Worship” appeared under the heading “Legend no. 1” in Copway’s American Indian, it did not appear in the “Legendary Stories” chapter of the History. In the History, it appeared in Chapter 12, entitled, “Their Religious Beliefs.” Similarly, a piece about Ojibwe beliefs about dreams, “Influence on Dreams,” was also reprinted from Chapter 12 of the History. The reprinting of both pieces, one as a “Legend” and the other as a piece on Ojibwe beliefs suggest that Copway was reframing his ideas about Ojibwe history through the newspaper and positing Ojibwe relationships to place that were important because the newspaper was a promotional device for his Kahgega idea.

The July 19, 1851 issue of Copway’s American Indian contains a notice which states the editor’s intention to publish a series of “Indian Traditions and Legends” in the journal (“Traditions” 2). While the reference is to a generic “Indian,” the legends that began to appear in Copway’s American Indian are accounts of Ojibwe histories and cultural beliefs that first appeared in Copway’s Traditional History and Characteristic Sketches of the Ojibwey Nation (1850). According to historian Peter Macleod, Native-authored histories such as Copway’s provide a tribal history of that nation’s traditional homelands in the Great Lakes regions of Canada and the United States (Macleod 196–197). Copway’s recording of Ojibwe histories and cultural practices in the History is an example of what Macleod calls the “alternative histories” of nineteenth-century Canada and the United States (196). To call Native histories “alternative” does not marginalize
their importance but calls attention to the fact that the “historiography of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century North America is predominantly Euro-centric” (196). While written histories of North America by Euro-Americans were most prevalent throughout the nineteenth century, Macleod observes that Native authors like George Copway also began to write down the stories passed down by tribal elders (196). From a literary point of view, books such as Copway’s *Traditional History* enjoyed some popular success as literature but were “ignored by historians” in the nineteenth century (196). Yet in the *Traditional History* Copway provides the Ojibwe stories as contexts for understanding relationships to place that contradict the notion of Indian “Legends” as simply romantic fictions. As Macleod notes, Copway “drew upon his Amerindian background” to provide information to readers about specifically Ojibwe beliefs and their relationships to the histories of places and to cultural practices (198). This also refutes what Steven Conn has noted as a Euro-American tendency to define Native accounts of their histories as “myth.” Conn notes that by locating “history only in written records meant that those indigenous oral traditions must be something other—less-than history. By and large, that something became ‘myth.’ History moved, it evolved, it existed in the flow of time; myth, on the other hand, was understood to be static and to have no relation, therefore, to history” (22). The important point in Conn’s observations is the notion of Indian “time” as marked by stasis. Although Copway’s Ojibwe narratives in their print form in the *American Indian* run the risk of being absorbed into the journal as a “locus of utterance,” in which an image of the Native American as an “other” who exists outside of history is produced by the “place of the text,” which is Copway’s authorial “I.” However, the Ojibwe narratives do not become absorbed into what David Murray describes as a written
context of Native American narrative, including written oral histories, which makes them “overdetermined for the white reader” (36). While it is true that Copway’s narratives are framed in the journal whose aim was to provide information about Indians for non-Native readers, it also refutes what Murray calls the “stance of objectivity” in ethnographic writing to assert a Native “I” that is clearly present in the narratives.

By contextualizing the stories in the *Traditional History* as part of the Ojibwe oral tradition passed on by tribal elders, Copway provides a sense of Ojibwe history and geographically specific cultural authority applicable to Kahgega in both the *History* and the *American Indian*. Copway places the Ojibwe histories he provides in the *Traditional History* in a personal context of his experience of Ojibwe culture that is significant when they are reprinted in *Copway’s Amerian Indian*. In the *Traditional History* he observes that the “chiefs are the repositories” of the “history of their ancestors” (19). Copway draws upon his own experience as a young person in traditional Ojibwe culture when he notes that “[w]ith these traditions there are rules to follow by which to determine whether they are true or false. By these rules I have been governed in my researches” (19). He notes that one of the rules is to “inquire particularly into the leading points of every tradition narrated” (19). The second rule is “to notice whether the traditions are approved by the oldest chiefs and wise men. Such are most likely to be true . . .” (19). The reliance upon tribal elders as well as the statement about the truthfulness of the stories reveals that while Copway was presenting an account of Ojibwe oral stories for white audiences, framing them within a discourse of exotic Native American “tradition,” he is also revealing an aspect of Ojibwe culture that suggests tribally based ideas about history and place. The use of both Anglo-American and Native American discursive traditions in
Copway’s writing suggest that, as Maureen Konkle has shown, Copway’s writing reveals an “epistemological struggle” that is the result of writing in a colonial situation (222). Copway’s appeals to white readers show how he used stereotypes and tropes to appeal to them while also expressing Indians’ political needs. As Konkle observes the “power of Copway’s writing is that he did not abandon the authority of tradition” (223). Instead, he incorporated them into the *American Indian* through reprinting accounts of Ojibwe historical and religious beliefs from his *Traditional History*, which suggests that the newspaper, which was intended to promote his Kahgega plan, is a location for reframing Ojibwe historical connections to place in the public sphere of American journalistic print culture.

The first piece from the *Traditional History* that appeared in *Copway’s American Indian*, “Influence on Dreams,” appeared in the July 19, 1851 issue of the journal. This account of Ojibwe beliefs about dreams is important within the context of *Copway’s American Indian* because it expresses an Ojibwe sense of identity and place. “Influence on Dreams” represents a tribally and geographically specific context for Ojibwe cultural practices and religious beliefs. The story follows the dream-seeking fasts of Shah-won-o-equa, an Ojibwe woman who retreats to a cave, where she fasts and sleeps, hoping that her dreams will bring a visit from a god (“Influence” 1). As Maureen Konkle observes, the story uses sentimental narrative conventions. Copway refers to Shah-won-o-equa as a “damsel,” and he describes the location of the Indian woman’s fast as a “romantic spot” near Grand Island, in Lake Superior (1). However, the narrative does not maintain the sentimental imagery for long. When Copway begins to describe the woman’s dreams, he moves away from Euro-American literary convention toward a tribally specific account
of dreams that suggests Native American rhetorical sovereignty. As a contemporary statement of Copway’s experience of Ojibwe culture, his reference to his experience of the fasting ritual represents a Native invocation of Native American culture that indicates its importance to contemporary Native culture. He observes at the outset of “Influence on Dreams” that he recalls undertaking a fast of “four or five days” as a young child (1). In particular, Copway’s reference to Ojibwe customs in the dreams as well as to geography make the story something more than simply a “romanticized narrative” in which a “raven-haired damsel” travels along the shore of a lake in the “manner of European travelers of the leisure classes” (Konkle 220). Instead, the Ojibwe story about dreams is placed in a contemporary cultural and geographic context through Copway’s experience of the fasting ritual and, as we find out in the narrative, his encounter with the woman in the story who has experienced the dreams and visions. Through references to these personal experiences, Copway relates fasting and dreams to contemporary Ojibwe culture and epistemology. At the outset of the “Influence,” Copway orients readers to the Ojibwe cultural context for the story. He notes that “[t]he Ojibweys place great dependence upon dreams,” a comment which situates the narrative as tribally specific (1). The story proceeds to follow a narrative structure that emphasizes geographic locations in ways other than the expected Euro-American literary convention of romantic nature and romanticized Indianness, indicating the narrative’s value to Ojibwe cultural traditions.

Shah-won-o-equ fasts near a “romantic” spot close to Grand Island in Lake Superior; however, as the story proceeds, this place becomes the location for the woman’s dream visions, shedding its association with sentimental literary images of nature and instead suggesting tribal customs. There, the woman isolates herself from her
family, who cannot find her but hear her voice resonating throughout the forest. When they find Shah-won-o-equa in the cave, Copway describes specific aspects of the fasting and dream ritual that contextualize it further in Ojibwe cultural ritual rather than romantic imagery. Copway observes that the woman is “sitting in the cave, having robes of fur covering her head, and boughs of cedar all around her. Since the day she left her home, she had taken no food, and though a rivulet of pure water coursed along her feet, she touched it not” (“Influence” 1). Although her family asks her to return, Shah-won-o-equa refuses, since she is “resolved upon remaining there until” the “gods” had visited her (1). Copway then explains that the young woman waits to receive the “god of war, the god of the vegetable kingdom, and the god of the waters” (1). All of these gods she expects to “visit her in her dreams, or in a visible form, and converse with her” (1). When at last she is visited by a “young warrior” in her dream, he asks her what she would have, “The first from the woods—the plumes of rare birds—the animals of the forest—or a knowledge of the properties of the wild flowers?” (1). The woman’s response indicates the importance of the story in the context of the journal and its assertion of Ojibwe relations to place.

When asked what she would have by the warrior, Shah-won-o-equa responds that she wants nothing he has offered. Instead she observes that she wants “a knowledge of the roots that I may relieve the nation’s sufferings” (1). Within the context of the American Indian, Shah-won-o-equa’s words reform the geography of the United States, so that it is understood on Native terms. Although it is not explained how the roots would relieve the nation’s suffering, it is clear that the nation to which she refers is the Ojibwe nation. Sha-won-o-equa’s therefore represents the relationship between Ojbiwa
storytelling and contemporary, nineteenth-century Native American political and geographic realities. Copway further contextualizes the woman’s words by appending his own experience Sha-won-o-equa’s narrative. In so doing he both verifies her dreams and asserts their connection to Ojibwe cultural connections to place. Copway notes that since the return of the young girl to her family after a series of dreams:

I have seen the girl but once. In the year 1842, while sailing along Lake Superior, on its southern shore, I came rather unexpectedly to a cluster of wigwams, where I saw Shaw-won-a-qua [sic], and listened with deep interest to her relation of the dreams of her childhood. I gave her a few wild ducks from my boatload of game, and a yard of scarlet cloth—a fabric that is esteemed very highly by the Indian women. This I did in payment for those early impressions she had made upon my mind, leading me to believe that the noble deeds of man are those, and those only, which are performed for the good of others, and that virtue will be alike rewarded in the future, whether it be found and cherished in pagan lands or in Christian temples. (1)

While Copway translates and frames the Ojibwe story in a Euro-American temporal context, he also suggests the importance of Ojibwe story and culture and an indigenous relationship to geography. He emphasizes Ojibwe cultural beliefs and practices through the account of his ceremonial gift to the Shah-won-e-qua—a symbolic reworking of Copway’s payment as a professional writer and speaker in an American literary culture. By asserting the importance of the Ojibwe woman’s account of her dream, Konkle notes that in acknowledging the power of a woman’s visions in Ojibwe culture, Copway posits the existence of an “‘other,’” Ojibwe, “knowledge which is knowledge that is a means of resistance to colonization” (222). By respecting the power of Shah-won-e-qua’s dreams, he depicts the image of a strong and respected rather than romantic and vanishing Native woman. By publishing this version of the story in Copway’s American Indian Copway suggests that the Indian Territory he sought to promote could also be a “root” for curing the Ojibwe nation’s troubles.
While “Influence on Dreams” suggests a possible return to familiar places to find sources for healing a troubled nation, another story from the Traditional History that appeared in The American Indian suggests the role of tribally specific religious practices in healing a nation’s wounds. The short piece, “The Origin of Death and Medicine Worship,” which was published in the August 2 issue of the American Indian, further suggests Copway’s reframing of Ojibwe relations to place through story and cultural practice. The story presents the “origin of the Indians’ belief in this medicine worship” and Copway notes at the outset that all Ojibwe, including himself, must listen to this story as part of an initiation into the rights of medicine worship, which, he points out, are “granted by the elder members” of the tribe (“Origin” 1). The reference to the “elders” frames the narrative within a tribal context and suggests the story’s role as an alternative Native epistemology of place. This epistemology contrasts with the Anglo-American religious one, which connects Biblical time and the concept of Original Sin to redemption in the North American wilderness. Copway observes at the outset of the origin story that he himself has passed the “mysterious ordeal” and has also heard the story. Copway’s language in describing the medicine worship initiation as an “ordeal” and a “mystery” appeal to those readers familiar with romanticized regional histories. Bernd Peyer observes that Copway’s history is stylistically and formally similar to “the New England romantic ‘literary history’tradition” as is evident in Copway’s use of “flamboyant language” as well as his “efforts to ‘salvage’ the Ojibwe past” (271). Yet Copway’s personal experience as a cultural insider as presented in the “Origin of Death and Medicine Worship” story suggests its contemporary value for the Ojibwe as something more than a excavated oral tradition of the past. While Peyer observes that Copway
draws upon the vanishing Indian stereotype often, he is also constructing, through combining the literary and the historical, a method for conveying the complexity of a peoples’ historical relationship to place that was not “successfully (in terms of critical acclaim) achieved by an Indian author” until N. Scott Momaday’s *Way to Rain Mountain* was published in 1969 (273).

Like Momaday’s work, which posits the origins of the Kiowa people in their histories of place, Copway’s story traces the origins of the relationship between place and cultural practice. “Origins of death and Medicine Worship” begins with an account of the beginnings of Indians, who were created by “Keshamonedoo,” a being who Copway contextualizes as one of the “Monedoo,” or “tutelar [sic] gods” who watch the Indian people “from heaven” (1). According to Copway’s account of the story, when Keshamonedoo “made the red men, he made them happy” (1). In a suggestion of the Garden of Eden, the Indian people live in a “forest” which “abounded with game” and among trees “loaded with fruit” (1). When one of the gods, which Copway refers to in a gender-neutral fashion as “it,” shows favor to “one of the young braves,” their friendship causes much “jealousy among his bretheren” who trouble him when the god is absent (1). In an attempt to escape “persecution” by his neighbors, the young brave expresses a desire to “ascend the vine whose branches reached the heavens” (1). When the spirit takes the young man and ascends the vine, his grandmother is upset and also begins to ascend it.

In describing the exchange between the grandmother and fellow villagers, Copway transcribes the Ojibwe language using the Roman alphabet, as he does elsewhere in the *History*. His use of Ojibwe in “Origin of Death and Medicine Worship” suggests
Copway’s assertion of Ojibwe cultural authority and the centrality of Ojibwe to Algonquian dialects. In the Congressional Proposal he notes that Ojibwe is the “great family language” of Algonquian (273). The importance of Ojibwe is also connected to its relationship to place. In the History, Copway points to the connections between Ojibwe language and place when he observes that “A language, derived, as it is, from the peculiarities of the country in which it is spoken, must, necessarily, partake of its nature” (127). In the History, Copway further praises Ojibwe for being superior to English, especially in describing natural events. While the following description of the Ojibwe language partakes of romantic notions of Indians and their relationships to nature, when they are used to contextualized Copway’s emphasis on Ojibwe place in “The Origins of Death and Medicine Worship,” the become important markers of an argument for Ojibwe rhetorical sovereignty in describing ideas of place.

In his discussion of the Ojibwe language in The Traditional History, Copway remarks that “After reading the English language, I have found words in the Indian combining more expressiveness. There are many Indian words which when translated into English lose their force, and do not convey so much meaning in one sentence as the original does in one word” (125). He continues to discuss the Ojibwe language, observing that “It would require an almost infinitude of English words to describe a thunder-storm, and after all you would have but a feeble idea of it. In the Ojibwey language, we say ‘Be-wah-sam-moog.’ In this we convey the idea of a continual glare of lightning, noise, confusion—an awful whirl of clouds, and much more” (125). While the phrase “much more” suggests a willingness to leave certain cultural aspects of Ojibwe experience “untranslated” for white readers and therefore uncolonized, he continues to
assert the equality and even superiority of the Ojibwe language. He lists several Ojibwe words with English translations, commenting that readers should “[o]bserve the smoothness of its words” (125). Maureen Konkle notes that although “lists of Indian words were common in books on Indians and had been for some time” when the History was published in 1850, those lists were generally made up of words useful to trade (217). When Copway praises the sounds and expressiveness of Ojibwe, he addresses aesthetics and the appropriateness of the language for a culture’s assertion of itself in relationship to the land.

When Copway translates phrases into Ojibwe in “The Origin of Death and Medicine Worship,” he connects place to language in ways that reveal that he perceives language as relating to tribal, collectively interdependent relationships with the natural world. This expression of a people’s connection to place can be read as part of an appeal to American literary patterns of Romanticism, especially the Romantic ideal of an individual’s and a nation’s communion with nature (Dekker 87). Copway invokes the literary Romantic idea of relationships to nature by printing letters from authors whose work drew upon these ideas, such as Cooper, whose Leatherstocking tales suggest a nostalgia for unity in nature. As George Dekker observes, Cooper’s work shows that “the regional experience, rendered with such concreteness and fidelity” in his major fiction “had a representative national significance” (87). In other words, Euro-Americans could identify themselves as distinctly American around an idea of nature that unified and made a people whole. While Cooper was of an earlier literary moment than Copway’s 1851 newspaper, his work nevertheless represents a strong sense of American geography that envisions the regional as the national in an attempt to unify non-indigenous Americans
through images of nature (Dekker 87).

Copway’s attention to the aesthetics of Ojibwe words also suggests the Transcendentalist literary context for Copway’s publication of the *American Indian*. Copway’s command that readers note the “smoothness” of the Ojibwe word for thunderstorm suggests what Hsuan Hsu has described as a Whitmanian preoccupation with the concept of the whole and unity (Hsu 135). Similarly, because Copway sites a word that refers to a natural occurrence, his interest in the aesthetic quality of the word also suggests the relationship between language and nature that can be found in Emerson’s work. The word suggests the relationship between language and nature, and implies the Transcendentalist emphasis on human perception as the source of reality. As a way of perceiving and unifying nature, Copway attempts to show how the Ojibwe language is a more accurate way of recording the “unfolding” of nature from the mind, and the idea of nature as part of the human mind’s desire to create narrative unities out of experience (Mathiessen 54).

While there are Romantic and Transcendentalist context for Copway’s discussion of the Ojibwe language in his writing, it is important that Copway was also advocating powerfully for Native American claims to geography and language that counter the unifying linguistic ideas of his literary contemporaries. In this sense, Copway’s writing counters what David Murry observes is the importance of understanding white readership for many nineteenth-century Native-authored texts. Murray notes that nineteenth-century Native writing, when read in contexts that frame them as specifically “Native,” tend to collapse into contemporary Euro-American stereotypes of the “Noble” and “primitive” that are part of the American Romantic literary context of non-Native writings about
Indians. Murray emphasizes potential readings of Euro-American Romantic themes in nineteenth-century Native writing, noting that it is possible to read “the existing body of American Indian writing” as expressing “the idea of wholeness and unity” as “an expression of a nostalgia without any political cutting edge—a nostalgia for a tribal unity, and for a simplicity which fits neatly into the patterns of literary Romanticism” (88).

However, expressions of perceived stereotypically American literary Romantic themes in writing such as Copway’s should not be overemphasized, since they only take into account a dominant cultural reading. David Murray argues that what may appear to be “derivative Romanticism” in an Anglo-American literary context in Indian-authored texts may also have “stronger and more complex reverberations within the relevant Indian cultures” (89). This is true of “The Origin of Death and Medicine Worship,” which suggests Native and collective relationships to place that are counterarguments to the tendencies of literary Romanticism and Transcendentalism to unify and absorb nature into the individualized self.

In “The Origin of Death and Medicine Worship,” images of family are rendered in the Ojibwe language, suggesting Ojibwe relationships to place that are realized through community and language. In the narrative, the grandmother invokes Ojibwe family relationships when she calls out for her son: “Noosis, be-ge-wain, be-ge-wain” (1). Copway translates her words as “ ‘My child, come back, come back!’” (1). When she climbs the vine, the people pass judgment on her actions, as Copway observes “They shouted to her, ‘Shay! ah-wos be-ge-wain, mah-je-me-di—moo-ga-yiesh!’ ‘Hallo, come back, you old witch you’” (1). Copway’s translation suggests the problems of colonialism and language. Specifically, it suggests the tendency of written European
language texts to overdetermine the meaning of a Native language as a result of the literary and cultural reality of Indian representation by non-Indians (Murray 64). However, Copway is not simply indulging in exoticism to appeal to white readers by invoking a non-European language. Instead, he foregrounds Ojibwe by placing it as the first language, followed by the English translation. In a scene of family and tribal relations, Copway uses Ojibwe to underscore the importance of family to tribal identity and place.

When the grandmother ascends the vine in search of her grandson, her actions are viewed as misconduct and are frowned upon by the other Ojibwe in her village. The attitude of the people toward the grandmother suggests the codification of traditional Ojibwe social behavior when relating to a larger group. The village warriors burn the “transgressor’s” home, and when the vine breaks just as the grandmother is about to ascend into the sky, she is reprimanded: “‘Whah, ke nah mah dah bee mage men di moo ya yiesh,’” which Copway translates as, “‘There you sit, you wicked old witch’” (1). The old woman is physically punished by the villagers, who drag her “by her hair” in order to “express their disapprobation” (1). While this detail is also suggestive of devaluation of women in a culture, it is couched in traditional narrative that, like the Biblical story of Eve, suggests that women are the source of man’s suffering. Copway remarks of the grandmother that “All who shall live after thee, shall call thee *Equa* (woman)” (1). However, unlike the Biblical story of Adam and Eve, which results in the irrevocable loss of paradise, “The Origin of Death and Medicine Worship” emphasizes renewal of balance and reconnection with place after the fall. The breaking of the vine causes suffering: “men, women, and children” “complained of pains” and some are
stricken down and are “unable to walk” (1). Although the people had previously not
known death, “[d]isease was the consequence of the breaking of the vine. Death
followed” (1). In an obvious condemnation of individualistic behavior, death is “a
penalty” that follows “transgression” (1). While personal misconduct leads to a
collective suffering, the narrative emphasizes a peoples’ renewal through knowledge of
the natural world. “The Origin of Death and Medicine Worship” shows how the Ojibwe
peoples’ knowledge of the natural world can preserve the nation.

When the beings descend from heaven to visit the suffering people, the Ojibwes
request many things. However, the only petition that is granted by the Great Spirit is the
knowledge of plants which will cure. As in “Influence on Dreams,” it is the indigenous
knowledge of plants and herbs which will preserve the people. In the context of
colonialism and its erosion of Native land base not only through settlement but also the
spread of disease, the knowledge of plants and herbs that will cure a peoples’ ills suggests
how narrative disseminates traditional methods for understanding the environment of
specific regions, including regionally specific plants. In the context of the American
Indian, the “Origin of Death and Medicine Worship” suggests how the journal is a
method for informing non-Native readers about Native connections to place. Like
“Influence on Dreams,” it suggests that the only “medicine” for the ills of colonialism
and the loss of Native American lands is a renewed relationship to place through the
maintenance of traditional medicine practices that are perpetuated through narrative.

In accordance with the Great Spirit’s instructions, the beings from the sky
“gathered up all the flowers from the plains, river and lake sides; and after drying them
on their hands, blew the leaves with their breath, and they were scattered . . . wherever
they fell, they sprang up, and became herbs to cure all disease” (1). In order to honor this
gift of the Great Spirit to the people, the “Indians instituted a dance, and with it, a mode
of worship” (1). Those who joined this worship “composed a Medicine Lodge” and
originated the “‘Medicine Worship’” (1). The origins of this practice are associated in
“Origin” with both specific features of a place—the natural world that was familiar to the
Ojibwe, as well as a people’s collective relationship to the “medicine” which is found in
the natural world. It can also be connected to the “elders” that Copway mentions at the
outset of the narrative as those who passed on the stories to members of the Ojibwe tribe,
including Copway. In this sense, the story suggests what Jace Weaver has described as a
“linkage of land and people within the concept of community” that reflects relationships
to place that are, according to Weaver, examples of a Native concept of historiography
that links human communities with place, including connections to the plants and animals
that are also part of those places (38). When “The Origin of Death and Medicine
Worship” is read within the context of the American Indian as method of gaining support
for Copway’s Kahgega proposal, the story reveals that although Copway’s Indian state
would one day assimilate, it was “ever-to-be” an rhetorical idea whose definition could
also be found in the specifically Ojibwe relationships between people and place. As one
aspect of the Ojibwe connection to place described in “The Origin of Death and Medicine
Worship,” The elders whom Copway describes as having traditionally passed on the
Medicine worship become part of this relationship to place articulated in the story, and in
the American Indian.
CHAPTER TWO

RAMONA DAYS: IMAGINING NEW MEXICO TERRITORY

Every girl who goes from the school back to the Arizona mountains will go there less of an Indian. In time she will surely lift her children to her own level. Yes, better than war is this solution of the bloody Apache problem.

Horatio Ladd, Ramona Days, January 1887

While George Copway’s American Indian represented Ojibwa oral narratives as narrative contexts for Indian Territory, Ramona Days, the quarterly journal of the Ramona Industrial School at Santa Fe, New Mexico constructed a fiction a fictional New Mexico Territory. Named for the Indian heroine of Helen Hunt Jackson’s novel Ramona (1884), Ramona Days circulated images of New Mexico Territory’s people, architecture, and places that suggest New Mexico Territory as an Anglo-American idea of the Southwest. Ramona School Superintendent Horatio Ladd’s comments about the educated Indian girl’s self-transformation and her ability to similarly make Native people “less Indian” indicate that for Ladd, Indian education was part of an effort to reorganize of social and geographic space along Anglo-American lines. While Ramona School Superintendent Horatio Ladd refers to a specific location, he also suggests a rhetorical idea of place, a pedagogical method for organizing social space hierarchically in order to quell white-Indian conflict in New Mexico Territory. The “bloody Apache problem” to which Ladd refers was the ongoing conflicts between Apaches and whites in Arizona and New Mexico began in the early 1850s, which continued intermittently until the early 1900s, even after the death of Apache warrior Geronimo in 1886 (Roberts 14-18). As Ladd’s comments imply, many of the students at the Ramona Industrial School were Apaches, members of the bands such that had agreed to go to reservations in the 1880s
Horatio Ladd offered a Ramona School education as one solution to the Apaches response to Euro-American encroachment in New Mexico Territory.

The Ramona Industrial School was established on April 1, 1885 by Congregational minister Horatio O. Ladd as one of the “Departments” of an institution that he named The University of New Mexico, which he established in 1881 (Sanchez 86). Ladd, who was from Massachusetts, generated much support from East coast religious congregations, and he also acquired lucrative government contracts that paid the school $120 per student per year. At first, the students were Pueblo children, both boys and girls (86). When Ladd encountered opposition from the local Catholic Church, which had its own Indian school in Santa Fe, he focused his recruitment efforts on the nomadic Apache, who had few advocates within New Mexican society.

According to Ladd in an untitled Introduction to the school in the journal's first issue, the journal was established to give “glimpses of life, work, progress, trials and successes” at the Ramona School as it pursued “its appointed work to civilize and raise to a higher life, by the power of a Christian and Industrial education, the future wives and mothers of our Apache tribes” (“Ramona” 4). While the school continued to admit boys, Ladd’s comment suggests the fact that the school focused increasingly on the education of girls. The purpose for publishing information about the Ramona School was to raise funds for the school, which was also supported by the United States government, the American Missionary Association, and the University of New Mexico. It was an outgrowth of a pamphlet that had appeared earlier describing the university's goals and efforts in Indian education in the Southwest and reprinting commendations from

---

8 The University of New Mexico at Santa Fe was not related to the University of New Mexico later established at Albuquerque. The university that Ladd founded had failed by 1893. By 1900 the building was being used as a high school. See Sanchez, Gurule, Larrichio, and Miller, 92.
government officials, newspaper editors, and other individuals.

Ladd drew upon a growing public interest in the Southwest as a tourist destination as well as growing pressure for New Mexico Territory’s statehood in order to show that the Ramona Industrial School would help to domesticate New Mexico Territory through Indian education. Written and visual representations in *Ramona Days* domesticate spaces, landscape, and Indians, and they show that this domesticating process was achieved largely through the efforts of the Ramona School’s white educators and administrators. The depictions of Indian students and their families in *Ramona Days* undermines Native social connections in favor of American class and gender roles as suggested by the relationship between students, teachers and administrators at the Ramona School. As part of the process of undermining Indian culture through education, The Ramona School enforced what K. Tsianina Lomawaima calls “federal domesticity training,” which weakened the roles of Indian parents in order to remake Native families in an individualistic, Anglo-American model that emphasized contemporary social and racial hierarchies (87). These hierarchies are suggested in articles that appeared in the journal as well as through visual images. One of these images was the proposed design for the Ramona Memorial Building, created by the celebrated architect Stanford White. White’s drawing of the proposed “Ramona Memorial” represents a New Mexican architecture that was informed by an Anglo-European sense of building design that also underscored differences of race and class. In the journal, representation of Indians and architecture often reveal typical Dawes-era attitudes about “civilizing” Indians while maintaining white authority. However, the territorial and rhetorical authority conveyed through architecture, images, and writing in *Ramona Days* suggests that the repetition of tropes
and images which suggest Anglo dominance are also examples of what is called *inconvenance* in theories of public architecture. *Inconvenance* suggests social disruption and resistance to hierarchies. These moments of *inconvenance* are muted but suggested in *Ramona Days* through the oral recitation of students’ letters in the homes of Apache parents, as well as the visits of parents that are recorded in the journal. While these Native writings and actions are documented as part of a larger context of educational authority in the journal, they nevertheless embody a Native use of public space that suggests that *Ramona Days* expresses a Native voice which talks back to the public of Anglo-American reformers in the journal.

**“Marked Grace and Design”: Didactic Architecture at the Ramona School**

Horatio Ladd used *Ramona Days* to raise funds for the school by reprinting an image of Stanford White’s proposed Ramona School design in every issue of the journal but the first, which appeared in March 1887. Although adequate funds for White’s planned structure were never raised the reiteration of the building’s image indicate that Stanford White’s name and signature style of design was a fundraising tool. Ladd refers to the cost of White’s building, which “will accommodate about one hundred and fifty girls, with all the appointments for teachers and school” and notes that it would cost “about $30,000” (“Ramona Memorial” 8). He further observes that he is “obtaining first pledges for the building of all of the rooms when the walls shall be put up, at a cost of $100 to $500” (9). When *Ramona Days* ceased publication in October 1888, Ladd had raised $56,544.69 in pledges and “actual contributions” (“Editorial” 2). While the sum exceeds the $30,000 designated in the first issue, it is clear that the actual donations were
much fewer than the pledges. In the journal’s final issue, which Ladd published at his own expense, Ladd appeals to readers “not only for their subscriptions” for which many have been remiss in making payments but also “for a contribution for the Ramona Memorial Building” (2). In the meantime, Ladd reports that the students continue to use the “Teachers’ Home and Schoolroom” which had been erected in late 1887 as a result of a “public meeting” in Boston that resulted in gifts from the “distinguished clergymen and citizens’ for the teachers’ building (“Rearing Ramona” 26).

In the first issue of the journal, Ladd published a description of the “Ramona Memorial Building” design created by Stanford White. Described as an “unique and original design,” the Memorial embodies Stanford White’s “conceptions of the typical style of architecture suited to the history, climate and surroundings of New Mexico” (“Ramona” 8). The term “suited” suggests the architectural concept of *convenance*, which, according to Marc Grignon and Julian Maxim, usually translates as “suitability” or “appropriateness” (29). In the context of White’s drawing of the school, *convenance* is important because it suggests the way in which the school was imagined as a public space, a location in which the Native students would live and behave in proscribed ways within a hierarchical system of authority reinforced through architectural design. *Convenance* was originally used in the seventeenth century to describe the social distinctions created by and within public architecture (29). In its architectural form, *convenance* inscribed the “publicness” of aristocratic authority and the appropriate behavior of the people in relationship to the state (29-30). White’s design was created in a nineteenth-century in which such aristocratic displays of authority had been in some measure democratized. However, the Ramona School, like White’s other designs, such as
the Boston Public Library and Pennsylvania Station were new symbols of convenance which were constructed around the idea of what “highly trained” classes and who represented a new Capitalist aristocracy in the late nineteenth century (38). The Ramona School design embodies the recuperation of an aristocratic publicness through what Michael Warner calls “[p]rofessionalism” (38). As Warner notes, even men and some women were “marking their workplaces off from the increasingly female domestic space” of the home in the nineteenth century, “professionalism” was creating a new sense of public authority (38). Yet this authority in New Mexico Territory was difficult to establish due to the the Territory’s socially dynamic and diverse makeup. As Grignon and Maxim suggest, in times of social transition, such as that experienced by both whites and Indians in New Mexico Territory in the 1880s, architectural convenance in design was a sign of underlying discomfort with social disruption. New Mexico Territory’s “Bloody Apache Wars” as well as the territory’s racial and social diversity made the design all the more urgently important.

In emphasizing the “suitability” of White’s design, Ladd suggests the unsuitability of the buildings during the period of Ramona Day’s publication from 1887-1888. When the school was established in March of 1887, as well as the Teachers’ Home and Schoolroom erected in late 1887 suggest the more prosaic realities of Indian educational architecture in the Territory. The first Ramona School structures were a series of low wooden buildings depicted in the first issue of the journal. The plain wood style of the buildings suggests a best effort when money was scarce and social distinctions were from an Anglo-American perspective still solidifying. If the buildings are understood as suggestive of a geographic relationship between whites and Indians in
New Mexico Territory, then the Territory’s Jicarilla Apaches as depicted in the image were symbols of the proximity between whites and non-whites in New Mexico Territory.

According to Horatio Ladd, the original Ramona School buildings in use until April 1888, were small, adobe and wooden structures which brought Indian students and white teachers and matrons in close proximity with one another (“Journal” 12). In his journal, Ladd describes the very first buildings in use when the school opened in 1885: “We were offered by an American ranchman of New Mexico the use of an adobe plant on the banks of the Santa Fe River, where there were cottonwood trees, and sufficient rooms for a Superintendent, matron, and teachers and the cooking and dining arrangements for fifty or more pupils” (12). Ladd describes an additional “plain building of wood, containing a schoolroom on the first floor and a dormitory for girls and rooms for the matrons above” (12). This arrangement of adobe and wooden buildings is corroborated by Romney’s description of the school she visited in March 1887: “The principal house is an old adobe, built for a private residence and not adapted to the purposes of a school. In this is the dining-room, kitchen and the private rooms of the Superintendent and his family and some of the teachers. A temporary wooden structure has been built for the schoolroom and dormitory of the children” (6). The low wooden buildings published in the first issue of the journal shows the Ramona students, which in 1885 still included some boys, among the cottonwood trees, in front of the wooden and adobe structures that Ladd and Romney mention. Inside this small building, visitors such as Romney, as well as the matrons and teachers were in close proximity to the Ramona Students within cramped quarters.

However, there is a collective quality to the original buildings, which are grouped
together in the fashion of a village and surrounded by trees. The children, who are depicted on the “playground” are dressed in Western fashion. The students’ clothing and poses suggest staged conventions of Indian “before and after” photographs, in which Native students are shown in western clothing after having shed their native garments at boarding schools. However, architecturally, the image depicts both a horizontal relationship between buildings but also a connected lateral relationship between students, and even a sense of fun. One child, a single figure to the right of the image appears to shoot a bow and arrow.

While this image of the students at the original Ramona School suggests the formality of posed Indian students in boarding school photographs intended to demonstrate the power of Indian education to transform Native people into Anglo-American citizens, the buildings and the children’s poses in the surroundings of the buildings suggest *inconvenience* or “forgetting one’s condition and rejecting the rules of modesty and prudence” in the context of the Ramona School’s original architectural design. Architecturally, the need to regulate students is suggested by the teachers’ reaction to student behavior in the low wooden buildings. In a January 1887 letter from an instructor to the Congregational Sunday School at Hiawatha Kansas, instructor Mary De Sette suggests the proximity of students and teachers. In letter referring to a box of Christmas gifts from Hiawatha, a “Hiawatha Box,” De Sette comments that the teachers retreat to a room to unpack the box, “After dinner we all went into my room and unpacked it” (17). However, she notes that the instructors “locked the doors while we did so, for Indian children’s eyes get very sharp about Christmas time” (17). While the reference to the children’s behavior is meant as a humorous commentary on youthful
energy in general, the designation “Indian children” and the reference to “sharp” eyes and locked doors suggest an architectural concept of separation and even fear.

As observations of classroom exercises in the Ramona School by Mrs. Caroline Romney, a Chicagoan and patroness of the school indicates that an “Apache War” was being waged by the students in the cramped confines of the first school buildings. Romney’s views of the Ramona students’ education are in keeping with the views of Interior Department head Arthur Teller, who remarked in 1882 that Indian boarding schools would create a Native American who was “if not a valuable citizen, at least one from who danger need not be apprehended” (House xvii). Romney, who visited the school in 1886, remarks that the students are somewhat disruptive to their teachers. Although the students behavior was not actively resistant, it nevertheless represented something that caused discomfort among non-Native observers and instructors.

The essay suggests Homi Bhabha’s concept of “colonial mimicry.” Bhabha observes that mimicry is the imitation of the cultural forms of colonial power. They are not “re-presentations” of those forms but rather “repetitions,” a key distinction. “Repetitions” of colonial power on the part of the colonized are more subtly disruptive because they are more closely tied to their colonial originators and suggest that acts of colonial force such as writing or speaking from within institutions can be replicated by the colonized. These repetitions are uncomfortable to authority, however, because they indicate the presence of the un-repressed colonial “Other” who performs acts within an “authorized” colonial institution, such as the boarding school.

In the classrooms located in the wooden building, Romney observes, the children are “great imitators” whose “special amusement” is “taking off the people they see about
them” (Romney 8). The children’s white teachers find they are the subjects of “their fair share” of the children’s mimicry, as are “all visitors to the school” (8). As Bhabha notes, mimicry’s disruptive force is not obvious but is dangerous because it is not overtly threatening. He notes that its presence “intensifies surveillance” on the part of “disciplinary powers” (124). One such instance of increased surveillance and palpable threat is Romney’s apparent need to assert that the children’s imitative play is not threatening to authority. Romney reminds readers that the children are not truly disruptive, noting that although they are skilled imitators, their actions are not “done in a spirit of malice at all” but are rather “in the nature of dramatic representation, or reproduction of something that strikes their imagination as novel or humorous” (8). The author’s acknowledgement that the children do not act maliciously suggests that their behavior has to be accounted for as more than mere play. In order to place the students’ behavior within a familiar framework of reference, they are described as actors on stage. The phrase “in the nature of dramatic representation” points to a nineteenth-century understanding of Indians as both “natural” and “staged,” or artificial. With this phrase, the author fixes the children’s mimicry within a familiar cultural field (“natural” Indians as represented on stage), it does not account for their behavior entirely. The author notes that the students are “reproducing,” making an “almost but not quite” copy of the behavior of authority, which they find “novel or humorous.” The author’s reference to humor may be an attempt to defuse potentially “malicious” Native American behavior. Yet the comment about humor inadvertently suggests another view of authority that does not fully recognize the institutions of authority at the Ramona School.

In creating their version of a new cultural experience, the students exercised
agency contingent upon their circumstances, in the process inscribing Romney’s text in a way that foregrounds the disruption that she hopes to forestall through references to stereotypical Indian roles. She describes some students’ imitation of a Methodist church service: “They went to a Methodist church service . . . where the minister was especially emphatic, and the principal feature of their reproduction of the scene in private was a vigorous pounding of the desk at frequent intervals” (8). While their behavior may not be malicious from Romney’s point of view, her observation reveals that the effect of the children pounding on the desk is incongruous. It shows that the children were replicating only what they observed of the sermon, not what they understood of its verbal message, which was undoubtedly the intended focus of their attention. Their actions are an assertion of agency and resistance within *Ramona Days*. It is similar to the resistance described by Luther Standing Bear in *My People the Sioux*. Standing Bear describes an incident from his experience as a young man at an Indian boarding school. Instead of using the blackboard pointer to designate the English name he would like sewn on the back of his shirt, Standing Bear uses the device to “count coup” on other students (137). While the Ramona School students’ behavior is not such an overt assertion of an Indian cultural expression in the boarding school context, their activity is similarly resistant in its disruption of school training in “civilization.”

While locked doors and secretive behavior may have been described in the context of bringing Christmas joy to the Indian students, in reality, the Ramona school was something of a prison. As Veronica Villarde observes in *The Jicarilla Apache Tribe, a History 1846-1970*, during the period an official government policy on Indian education began to materialize. Indian schools demanded that a certain number of children be sent
to their institutions from the reservations; they threatened retaliatory and legal measures against uncooperative parents, and were backed up by the Interior Department. The Secretary of the Interior could prevent the issuing of rations or the furnishing of subsistence of any kind to the head of any Indian family if its children between certain ages were not in school (143). In the case of the Ramona School, there was a direct connection between the Ramona School and Fort Union, located 110 miles northwest of Santa Fe. This fort, established by the American government in 1851, had by the 1880s became a location for holding Apaches who were considered threatening to Anglo-American settlements in the surrounding area. While the fort’s prisoners included Navajos, many of them were Jicarilla and Mescalero Apache (Sanchez 54). Indian children of prisoners at Fort Union were prime candidates for placement at the school. Ladd made no secret of his intention to find students for the Ramona School at the Fort. In an 1886 report, Ladd describes his intention to travel to the Fort to locate potential students, noting that he would require signatures of parents to enable him to bring the students to the school (Ladd “Letter” 1). Ladd’s views were common in a period when it was considered a humanitarian gesture to send Apache children off to boarding school as the fort had inadequate facilities or provisions to care for the children (Sanchez 94). According to Chris Emmet, Apache parents at the fort were pressured into cooperating with the school officials and the military (403). “Passes” would occasionally be issued for parents at Fort Union to visit their children, but visitations were strictly controlled (Sanchez 94). Thus the Ramona School and its architecture was directly connected to a building whose design was meant to restrict Native Americans’ physical freedom and in so doing reshape the landscape of New Mexico Territory.
The suggestion of ease which the Ramona Schools’ students display in the image of the original school buildings may have been useful in promoting the school through images of Native students’ happiness. However, readers of *Ramona Days* were pressed most for subscriptions to the journal and support for the construction of the buildings through images of a fictional Southwest. It may have taken the practical philanthropy of wealthy Christian Bostonians to erect a permanent school building; however, White’s Ramona School Memorial appealed to imaginary notions of the New Mexico. In the first issue of the journal, Ladd describes White’s Ramona Memorial building as “an unique and original design for the building to be dedicated to the memory of Mrs. Helen Hunt Jackson” (“Ramona” 8). Ladd observes that the “marked grace” of White’s design “will be increased by its adaptability to its uses for the Indian girls of the Southwest” (8). He notes that the building was “revives, in some of its most prominent features, the ancient cliff dwellings of New Mexico and Arizona, with its low tile roof, projecting vegas, its porticoes, and quadrangular structure around a spacious court” (8). The drawing supplied by White do not reveal overt similarities to the cliff dwellings of Arizona and New Mexico, although Chris Wilson notes that White saw them on trips he took around the Southwest (Wilson *Myth* 85). White visited his brother, a mining engineer at Socorro, New Mexico, in 1883 (85). However, he was not much interested in the region’s natural environment, writing in his journal that the area around his brother’s camp looked “like the entrance to Hell” (85). Nor was White apparently interested in the people of New Mexico. In his biography of White, Charles Baldwin notes that the architect paid “no special attention to local Pueblo and Spanish colonial architecture” when he traveled through the region (154). While Ladd may have seen a tie to Native
dwellings in White’s design, it was the result of expected architectural flourishes that appealed to Eastern sensibilities. As Chris Wilson notes, Ladd’s allusions to cliff dwellings and Zuni Pueblo are “fanciful” (85). Ladd understood the aesthetic appeal of the Southwest to those who read *Ramona Days*, and he understood that in reading about the Ramona School in the journal they might partake of “romantic images of Indian and Spanish life in New Mexico” as well as similarly authentic “complimentary architectural settings” (Wilson 86). However, White’s proposed design is built in a “vaguely Renaissance style” and the “symmetry of mass and detail and motifs such as the Syrian arch and hipped roofs” make White’s Ramona School design “a typical product of the McKim, Mead, and White architectural firm” (86). It is in fact quite similar to the firm’s “pivotal” design for the Boston Public Library, which was constructed in 1895 (86). Not only was the Ramona School designed in a fashion which largely ignored the historical architectural styles of New Mexico to which Ladd alludes, its stylized lines would have been familiar to local wealthy landowners, since most “Anglo-Americans and Hispanos of means” continued to follow Eastern architectural trends, as the Queen Anne and Richardsonian Romanesque architectural styles of the late 1880s gave way to the Colonial Revival and Neoclassicism (86). However, Eastern and Midwestern readers would have found that White’s addition of “a few imported details such as iron grilles and red tile roofs” went a long way toward creating “an exotic appearance” (85). In White’s proposed design, readers of *Ramona Days* saw an Indian Industrial School inspired by romanticized notion of the Southwest based on Anglo-American ideas about a romantic, Californio past inspired by fiction.

Although Ladd asked readers’ to donate money for the grand Ramona Memorial
Building, the journal’s readers were a public of Christian women of limited means. The “Letters From Our Friends” section in each issue contained their letters, which generally promised small monetary or material charitable donations. Women, generally members of churches throughout the Midwest and East Coast wrote to Ladd pledging their support for the school and its students. One such reader was Amelia L. Bumpus, an employee at the Thomas Crane Public Library in Quincy, Massachusetts. In her letter, Bumpus informs Reverend Ladd that a “barrel” of things for the Ramona students will be sent to Ladd from the “Young People’s Soceity of Christian Endeavor,” of which Ms. Bumpus was chairwoman (Bumpus 37). A letter from Louisa L Rose of Painesville, Ohio, informs Mr. Ladd that “extracts from Ramona Days were read to an attentive audience” at the Lake Erie Seminary. The consequence of such a public reading was “five subscriptions to Ramona Days” (Rose 36). Rose’s letter suggests an attentive and sympathetic public sphere of white reformers willing to open their pocketbooks to help. Others sent material objects which would help in the civilization of Indian girls. A letter from Mrs. George E. Kendell of the “Ladies’ Association” of South Framingham, Massachusetts refers to a sewing machine which the journal’s subscribers wish to send to the Ramona School (Kendell 35). Mrs. Nathan Hersey of the “Ladies’ Charitable Society of the Congregational Church” in Spencer, Massachusetts writes to pledge “$50 toward the education of Indian girls in Ramona School,” including a check, and a pledge of subscription to the journal (34). These letters indicate the journal’s “attentive audience” was made up of readers whose means were perhaps limited but whose sympathies were with the cause of Indian civilization.

While some female readers were unable to make donations to the Ramona
Memorial Building, others were able to sponsor rooms in it. In a plan submitted by White, which appeared in the second issue of the journal, rooms in the Memorial Building are labeled for their uses, as well as with the names of the women who donated funds for the room. Ladd comments on these donors when he notes that he is “obtaining first pledges for the building of all of the rooms when the walls shall be put up, at a cost of from $300 to $500 each” (“Ramona Memorial” 15). Within the context of Indian girls’ domesticity training, this sponsorship suggests the subservient roles for which Indian girls were being trained at the Ramona School. The design of the school which is described “substantial but plain” also suggests the roles of domestic versus intellectual education respectively at the school. The girls received substantial training in cooking, sewing, and cleaning, while their language learning was rudimentary at best. An editorial by Caroline Romney on Indian education reprinted from the Denver Republican observes that at the Ramona School, the children “are taught cooking, bed-making, laundrying, in fact, all branches of housekeeping” while their academic education is “kept to the basic elements” of a “common school education” (7). The domestic work of the girls at the Ramona School is suggested in White’s design, which features a dining hall, kitchen and pantry. Ladd’s suggestion that the school was adaptable “to its uses for the Indian girls of the Southwest” implies that those “uses” are the Apache girls’ work as domestic laborers and future homemakers.

Because it was never constructed but only represented within the pages of Ramona Days, the Ramona Memorial Building was a work of fiction. As an act of the Anglo-American imagination, it was an architectural rendition of the domestic fiction of the Southwest created by Helen Hunt Jackson in the novel Ramona (1884). The novel’s
theme of virtuous Native womanhood suggests that a key part of making the fiction of the
gendered Southwest a reality was the transformation of Indian girls into wives and
mothers in the Anglo-American model. *Ramona* portrays the domestic instability that was
the result of white encroachment on Indian lands through appeals to a reading public
familiar with sentimental literary tropes. The novel follows the eponymous heroine, an
orphan, the child of a white father and an Indian mother, who is raised by a foster mother,
Señora Gonzago Moreno, but kept ignorant of the fact of her parentage. Ramona is a
recognizable heroine of sentimental fiction, beautiful, selfless, and loving toward her
family. Her character and domestic troubles were appealing to readers, and the book sold
15,000 copies by the end of 1884 (“Jackson” Dictionary 2). She falls in love with an
Indian, a shepherder, named Alessandro. The prejudiced Señora Moreno tries to keep
the two apart, but they elope and are married by Father Gaspara in San Diego.
Threatened by Spanish racial intolerance, the couple to decide to live with Alessandro's
people. At this point in her narrative, Jackson focuses on the need for reform in the
treatment of California’s Indians. A child is born to Ramona and Alessandro but dies of
medical negligence that is the result of the couple’s constant flight from land grabbing
Yankees. Although Alessandro is eventually murdered by a white man, Ramona must go
into hiding with the knowledge that the courts will not take the word of an Indian woman
against a white. Through *Ramona*, Jackson was able to frame her arguments about the
question of California’s Indians through the lens of fiction. However, her role as an
Indian activist had already been solidified through the publication of *A Century of
Dishonor* (1881). A work of non-fiction which exorciated the United States government
for its misguided Indian Policy.
Although she used fiction to sell her ideas about Indian life in California, Helen Hunt Jackson’s *A Century of Dishonor* was inspired by a New York speech given by Ponca Chief Standing Bear, which Jackson heard in 1879. Standing Bear’s account of Ponca removal, and tribal representatives’ subsequent inability to testify in court caused Jackson to forsake the poetry and fiction she had been writing for magazines and newspapers in order to conduct intensive research of the history of Native-white relations. The result of this research, *Century* documented white injustices toward Indians from early colonial times to the 1870s. When the work was not well received by the public, Jackson “sugared the pill,” according to her own commentary, and delivered her message in a more palatable fictional form through *Ramona* (Mathes 3-4). Critics have noted that although *Ramona* was wildly popular, it did little to clarify the problems of California’s tribes, who faced removal and mistreatment as a result of disputes over land. Instead, it glorifies an exotic, feudal Spanish Californio culture and its conflicts with a society of stereotypically rugged and ruthless land-grabbing Anglo-American settlers.

Although the novel may not have had its author’s intended political impact, her public role as spokeswoman for Indians was evident in the pages of *Ramona Days*. In the journal, Ladd refers to Jackson’s role as Indian activist, including an advertisement for *A Century of Dishonor* and other works. The publicity piece for Jackson’s non-fiction work suggests the domestic world with which middle-class women’s work was rhetorically associated in the 1880s. In the advertisement, Jackson’s works are listed by subject matter. Significantly however, *A Century of Dishonor* is paired in the list with another didactic work called *Bits of Talk About Home Matters*, published at Boston in 1873 by
Roberts Brothers. *Bits of Talk* treats family relations and contains chapters such as “The Inhumanities of Parents—Corporal Punishment” and “A Day With a Courteous Mother” (3). The advisory voice Jackson adopts in this work suggests the domestic privacy of the middle-class home. However, this voice is defined in part by observing those who are not middle class. “Courteous Mother” is a description of the “beautiful” relationship between a mother and her children who Jackson observes on a train. The intersection between gender roles and class status is notable in the text, as when Jackson observes: “It was plain that they were poor; their clothes were made by inexperienced hands” (65). Jackson follows with similarly pointed observations of the woman’s unfashionable dress, including her bonnet, of which Jackson notes “The mother’s bonnet alone would have been enough to have condemned the whole party on any of the world’s thoroughfares” (65). These comments suggest Jackson’s upper-middle-class, professional status. In this case, Jackson is a possessor of taste inspired by a comfortable middle-class life funded by inherited wealth as well as her career as writer and political activist (Mathes 22). This work idealized motherhood and domestic work and created for Jackson a professionalized, individual identity that defined the identities of those who were not middle class or white.

Jackson’s biographer Valerie Mathes discusses this professional identity when she observes that “Jackson herself did not fit” the role of model Victorian woman into which late-nineteenth-century Indian reformers tried to transform Native women (160). As Mathes observes, Jackson “was not confined to the house, nor did she rear her children to adulthood, and above all, she was not passive or driven by evangelical Christianity” (160). Jackson was born to prosperous Calvinist parents—her father, Nathan Welby
Fiske was an author, clergyman, and professor of Philosophy at Amherst College.

According to Kate Phillips, her mother was also a writer (11). Jackson attended Abbott Academy, a boarding school in New York City. There, she was a classmate of fellow Amherst writer Emily Dickson, with whom Jackson kept up a lifelong correspondence (Phillips 145). Jackson was also politically connected through marriage to William Sharpless Jackson, a Colorado banker and railroad promoter. Jackson was already connected to East Coast literati through her father’s Amherst connections, and her own writing (22). She was a friend of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Oliver Wendell Holmes, John Greenleaf Whittier and Charles Dudley Warner (22-23).

As Jackson’s literary friendships suggest, she was part of a professional class of authors whose late-nineteenth-century religious, literary, and social formation was a result of Calvinist, Transcendentalist, as well as Sentimental traditions. In her writing about Jackson’s literary work, Siobhan Senier has identified an “‘intensity of possession’” which is also a function of middle-class “possessive individualism” that is a byproduct of the nineteenth-century heritage of Sentimental literature about family and home (32). Senier points out that Jackson’s Indian writings suggest “possessive individualism” because Jackson fashioned “authorship and authorization around the position of ‘spokeswoman for’ Indians” (32). In the nineteenth-century context of the Ramona School and Indian education, the act of “speaking for” those whose class or race did not allow them to represent themselves was a hallmark of a sentimental tradition that Nina Baym has identified in her work on nineteenth-century women’s fiction as a scheme for “ordering all of life, in competition with an ethos of money and exploitation that is perceived to prevail in American society” (27). Even as the Sentimental tradition waned
in literature, by the last quarter of the nineteenth century its values were entrenched at institutions like the Ramona School, where the lessons of federal domesticity training for Indian students legitimated whites, particularly white women, as professionals in contrast to their Indian students, whose future as imagined by the Ramona School was in the fulfillment of duties in the home.

The program of domestic training implemented by Horatio Ladd at the Ramona School institutionalized middle-class gender roles and legitimated Ladd professionally as clergyman and entrepreneur. Ladd, like Jackson, was from an upper-middle-class New England family. He was born in Hallowell, Maine in 1839, where his father was also a minister. Ladd attended Yale Divinity School, graduating in 1863 and later became a pastor and teacher of Theology at Olivet College in Michigan in the late 1860s (Bohme 145). After becoming principal of the New Hampshire Normal School in 1873, Ladd was asked by the New West Education Commission, an arm of the Congregational Church, to become principal of a private school, the Santa Fe Academy at Santa Fe, New Mexico. Ladd accepted the request and traveled with his wife and daughter to Santa Fe in 1880 (145). Within a year of his arrival, Ladd had fallen afoul of the Board of Trustees at the Academy over an issue of disciplining students—Ladd expelled some of the children of prominent Santa Fe citizens who also supported the school (147). However, his entrepreneurial skills were soon in use as he busily raised money outside the Academy’s Board of Trustees for the University of New Mexico, which was incorporated in May 1881 (147). Ladd’s diary notes from this period indicate his views on the development of the school and suggest how they might shape his understanding of New Mexico Territory. In an 1881 journal entry, Ladd observes that the University’s officers and
professors would be limited to those who practiced “Protestant Evangelical Christianity.”

Ladd’s journal entries about Santa Fe suggest the same objectifying tone as Jackson takes in her writing about the poor. Ladd and his wife arrived in the city on the newly established Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe rail line to find a “rambling adobe-built town” filled with the “rough crowds of a Western mining region” (Ladd “Journal” 5, Wilson 64). After alighting from the train, they had difficulty finding a room. Ladd expresses both the Protestant religious framework for his experience as well as the domestic rhetoric of the time when he remarks that when “no rooms were available” in even the “low, dirty, crowded adobe tavern” where the Ladds ate a “hasty dinner.” He notes that a gentleman, “upon hearing his wife’s exclamation of dismay at the impossibility of finding a room for the night, kindly offered and insisted that we should occupy his room in a hotel.” Ladd later learned that the young gentleman was none other than the son of “Brigham Young of Utah.” Ladd’s description of the impropriety of the family’s search for a room as well as his acknowledgement of another Protestant religious organization in the territory indicate that Ladd perceived New Mexico Territory through Anglo-American middle-class eyes and shaped it rhetorically through his own experience.

Ladd’s diary notes from the Santa Fe motel indicate Anglo-American social and religious framework for perceiving New Mexico. Other comments about Santa Fe from the same entry also suggest an Anglo-American experience of the perceived differences.
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of race and culture he found in New Mexico. Ladd acknowledges the non-Anglo cultural past of Santa Fe when notes that the city was “discovered by the Spaniards of Coronado’s Expedition in 1520 A. D. as an ancient Pueblo” (Ladd “Journal” 4). While Ladd may have more appropriately used the word “founded” rather than “discovered,” since a Pueblo Indian population was already well established in the region, he nevertheless acknowledges the area’s long and diverse colonial history. It was this diversity that troubled many Americans of non-Spanish descent who wrote about New Mexico Territory. As Reginald Horsman observes, when the Territory was created in 1850, its population of Indians and peoples of mixed African-American, Indian, and European descent, as well as Anglo-Americans and Mexicans of European descent were nominally assimilated into the United States (276). New Mexico would not become a state until 1912. Until then, it “functioned as an internal colony, administered as a territory” by presidential officials (Wilson 72). However, Horsman emphasizes the problematic issues of racial and cultural difference for those who wished to see New Mexico Territory as destined for statehood as an “Anglo-Saxon,” Protestant state (76-77).

Nearly forty years after New Mexico Territory’s annexation to the United States, Ladd expresses a discomfort with the racial and cultural variety of New Mexico Territory. In an 1880 journal, Ladd notes that he will “not enter into an account of the moral, social and business conditions of the community having in its isolation developed so many differing interests and confusing traits of characters which it had gathered to itself since the American occupation” (Ladd “Journal” 5). Ladd further observes that “A frontier town so far removed from Eastern customs and influences had few common standards, and every individual had to be enlisted if possible, singly . . . in the
development of higher moral and religious motives, than that had prevailed so long in that singular community” (6). Ladd’s comments emphasize his concern that New Mexico Territory was not yet sufficiently Anglo-American, Protestant, or middle class. The “higher moral and religious motives” of which Ladd speaks in his journal suggest the social evolutionary language of his time, and the phrase thus further emphasizes his participation in middle-class, Sentimental Protestant culture.

New Mexico’s statehood was also part of Ladd’s publicity campaign for the Ramona School. One aspect of his fundraising efforts for the school was to convince readers that the Ramona School could help to civilize the territory. An article reprinted from the Santa Fe Daily New Mexican that appeared in the April 1888 issue of the journal suggests the need to domesticate New Mexico’s Indians in order to imagine them as part of the civilized United States. Discussing the issue of New Mexico’s Indians, the author observes that when a census was taken in 1880, “the territory was home to hostile and bloodthirsty Apaches” but that by 1887 “the hostile Apache is no more” (“Statehood” 19). The author concludes that with the Territory’s progress in education, it is time to “commence to prepare” for statehood (19). Although Ladd is not the author of the piece about statehood, its concern with Indian civilization and education as one of the steps to statehood reveals the relationship between assimilation and citizenship that was part of the Indian education movement at the end of the nineteenth century.

The domestic rhetoric that surrounded statehood and citizenship was evident in *Ramona Days*. In the “Address of Governor Ross,” which appeared in the July 1888 issue, the governor observes that “[t]he children of the community are in a large sense the property of the State, as they are embryo citizens” (“Address” 22). The governor uses the
language of maternity to describe the children of New Mexico Territory and imagines them in both biological and proprietary terms. Although the governor does not refer specifically to Indian children in the address, the language of biology and ownership that he uses points up the maternal, domestic rhetoric which was connected to citizenship in New Mexico. An editorial reprinted from the *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, “Are Our Indians Improving?” similarly suggests the government’s parental role toward Indians: “We are bound to consider the Indians within the United States as our Indians. They may be fairly said to belong to us” (5).  

The editorialist views Indians as the property of the United States, implying the parental role that Indian education played in imagining a domesticated New Mexico Territory.

A letter from President Grover Cleveland suggests that education is the only viable response to the Indian Question in New Mexico Territory. The letter refers to Ladd’s proposed plan for Indian education at the Ramona School, “the scheme which you propose, if carried out, will be an important factor in solving the Indian question. I have arrived at the conclusion that a Christian and secular education are the surest, if not the only, avenues to reach the end we also much desire; the civilization and citizenship of the Indian; and the female children are certainly exceedingly promising objects of such education.”

Some of the future citizens and “objects” of the education to which Cleveland refers are displayed in an amorphous group on the page opposite to Cleveland’s letter. “Apache Girls On Arrival At The Ramona School, Santa Fe, N.M.” depicts a group of fourteen girls. All of them are wrapped in grey blankets. The
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expression on their faces is passive, in keeping with the expressions found on the faces of most photographic subjects in the nineteenth century. Some of the girls have covered their heads with the blankets, while others let them hang loosely around them. The image reveals that most of the girls have yet to have their hair cut, a ritual that often occurred after their arrival at the boarding school.

The image suggests the Indian girls’ lack of individuality. The blankets appear to hide the children while also suggesting the anonymity that from the white perspective went along with the notion of the Indian “tribe.” These blankets became so symbolic of Indian tribal identity from the white perspective that the “backsliding” into tribal life that often occurred as a result of children’s boarding school experiences was known among boarding school administrators and educators as going “back to the blanket” (Hanson 196). While these fourteen girls have not yet shed their tribal identities in the etching made upon their arrival at the Ramona School, the “after” image which appears a few pages later shows the same fourteen girls in western dress. The etching is titled “Apache Girls Six Days After Arrival at Ramona School” and shows the girls wearing plaid dresses and black boots, and carrying or wearing hats. Their hair has been cut, and those who are seated sit in chairs, rather than on the ground. The blankets that covered the girls in the first image are gone. The quick, six-day transformation the girls have made from “savage” to “civilized” life is remarkable. As Laura Wexler notes, this rapid transformation was often noted in the titles of “after” photographs from the Hampton Institute. The “speed” and “thoroughness” which the school could boast of in transforming native children into “civilized” Americans in captions such as the “six days later” image attests to the school’s effectiveness in meeting its goals (112). The blanket is
a visual symbol of that effectiveness and its absence becomes a signifier for erasure of Indian identity.

Ladd’s use of the Indian children’s before and after images is also supported in the domestic imagery that is connected to White’s projected plan for the memorial school. Chris Wilson notes that “Stanford White moved in the same elite East Coast circles as Jackson,” and while they were not professionally associated, it is clear that the successful architect for McKim, Mead, and White were both upper-middle-class professionals. At the time of her death in 1887, Jackson had worked for the government’s Indian Office and maintained a long and successful career as a writer and political activist. Although women’s work as professionals and wage laborers were increasingly publicly acknowledged in the 1880s, middle-class white women’s roles were still rhetorically associated with the home (Simonsen 59). As Jane Simonsen observes, in the late-nineteenth century, eastern reformers interested in women’s rights were concerned that “the vagaries of the marketplace” would disrupt family life by forcing women to labor outside of the home to the neglect of family (55). While class status was mutable, especially by the 1880s, when new waves of primarily European immigrants to the United States began to change public ideas about both work and family, popular ideas about middle-class women’s roles were still formed around the idea of the middle-class home as the marketplace, which was dominated by men (Kirkland 55).

In keeping with contemporary ideas about home versus marketplace, women’s domestic roles, Ladd refers to her maternal image, quite literally at times, to appeal to the journal’s middle-class readers and potential school donors. Ladd connects Jackson’s surrogate motherhood for Indians to the proposed design for the school. Ladd’s
description of Helen Hunt Jackson’s “memorial room,” which forms a centerpiece for the school in White’s drawing suggests the relationship between Indian and white women at Industrial Schools. Ladd notes that White’s design for the building includes a memorial room dedicated to “H.H.” to be located “[o]pposite to the arched entrance to the front” (“Ramona Memorial” 8). This room would project “with bay windows into the court” (8). In the same issue of the journal, Ladd describes a painting of Jackson that would face outward upon the courtyard. The domestic rhetoric of the painting is hardly subtle. As described by Ladd the painting depicts

that gifted woman looking down at her left hand upon an Apache mother, who is sadly regarding her baby daughter lying in an Indian cradle upon her lap, while by gentle words she tries to cheer the sorrowing woman, and points to a beautiful Indian girl standing at her right hand, clothed in American garb, and bearing in her features the marks of mental and moral training, and the intelligence and virtues that adorn the purest Christian womanhood” (“Beautiful” 9).

The image is identified as the “skilled work,” “original design” and “proffered gift” of Mr. C.T. Webber, of Cincinnati (9). The message it conveys is unmistakable and further supports the “before and after” images of young girls at the Ramona School. Indian womanhood in traditional terms is a melancholic reminder of the past. The westernized Indian girl is the future to which Jackson points. Within the didactic architecture of White’s design, Jackson’s gesture would also be a constant reminder to Indian pupils of the relationship between Indian and white women.

The girls’ training at White’s Memorial School would be supervised by Jackson’s painting, which represents both the domestic role of mother and the role of middle-class professional. As a symbol of middle-class professional competence, the painted image of Jackson would survey students who would be directed by those professionals to perform what Joel Pfister has called “‘individual’ and ‘Indian’” in the context of Indian boarding
schools (35). Pfister argues that Richard Henry Pratt’s Carlisle Indian School was a “civilization mill” that structured Indian students’ sense of self- hood in the same way that a larger American ethos of self-making constructed a “compliantly aspiring American working class” (36). “Americanizing and individualizing,” which meant teaching Ramona School girls a nexus of ideas about property, domestic roles, ownership of objects, and ownership of self which were central to American notions of the individual (Pfister 36, 60). However the term “individual” had many meanings when applied to Native girls who were students at the Ramona Industrial School. As Tsianina Lomawaima has shown, when applied to Indian women in particular, the tenets of individualization through domestic training were also those of subordination. Lomawaima observes that for Indian girls “[r]espect was naturally engendered by productive manual labor” (83). “Subordination” in this case suggests surveillance.

Surveillance is suggested in the essay “What We Do and What We Need for The Ramona Girls?”. The anonymous author suggests the role of discipline and “training” Indians, observing that “[w]e all know the endless labor and vexation of spirit involved in teaching a ‘raw Irish girl’ domestic duties” (2). The author asks how much more effort must be put forth in the act of “patiently and lovingly civilizing and training twenty little savages,” whose “dark, dirty homes” have “scarcely ever” never caused them to “make beds, sweep rooms” or “dust neatly and thoroughly” (2). Like the students’ “grimy bodies,” which must be “disinfected and cleansed” upon arrival at the Ramona School, the Indian students’ dark homes will be replaced by the open and light institutional space of the Ramona Memorial School (2).

The disciplinary eye of white teachers is suggested by the way in which Stanford
White’s public buildings were designed to maximize surveillance of those who used the building’s space. Although White would not design the Boston Public Library until 1895, its layout and design are similar to his plans for the Ramona Memorial School. Both designs contain a central court and long hallways on either side. The library and the School also have grand entrancesways with rooms that face a courtyard. However, it is important to note that White’s design for the Boston Public Library did not include a separate reading room for women that Abigail Van Slyck has shown were often part of late-nineteenth-century public libraries (221). As Van Slyck shows, spaces separated by gender in libraries became increasingly unpopular in the 1890s. As women entered the library work at the turn of the century, and libraries became open to industrial working classes with more income and free time, “modern libraries equalized all clients and sought to facilitate surveillance by library staff” (240). Although the Ramona Memorial School design is not analogous to the Boston Public Library White would design, the principal of surveillance by staff can be understood within the Memorial School’s monumental design.

Public libraries may have been increasingly egalitarian spaces in the late-nineteenth century. However, the way in which the Ramona Memorial School’s design reflects McKim Mead and White’s design for the Boston Public Library shows how the open spaces of a public library become sites for surveillance when the same principals of design are applied to institutions for Indian education. In the case of the Ramona Memorial School, the designs made to reflect socially equitable use of space become those of authoritarian hierarchies. One aspect of this hierarchy is the ease with which the building’s design allowed students to be watched. As White’s plan reveals, students at
the school could easily be seen from a variety of locations, most notably the two rooms overlooking the courtyard. The rooms on the first and second floor that overlook the courtyard, labeled for the room’s sponsors, “Mrs J. B. Dickinson” and “Mrs A.H. Stone.” The first floor room would contain Jackson’s painting, while the second floor room would house the school’s matron. The figures suggest a panoptical, authoritarian gaze. Helen Hunt Jackson’s suggested gaze extends from the domestic space of her room into the courtyard, while the room of the school’s matron is in a similar position on the second floor.

The location of the rooms sponsored by Mrs. Dickinson and Mrs. Stone suggest that the women are symbols of professional and managerial authority rather than domestic examples for the students to follow. The central architectural roles of the matron’s room, as well as the room containing Jackson’s painting, imply that, as Jane Simonsen has noted, white women found in the “laboring bodies of Native American women, the structure of a professional identity founded on the twinned efforts of managing others while exhibiting the self” (93). The ideas of “managing” others, as well as the exhibition of the professional self are evident in the painting of Jackson position with respect to Native figures. As David Lubin has observed, in the late-nineteenth-century, members of the professional-managerial class were becoming interested in images of themselves (154). Jackson may not have commissioned the painting, but it is a reminder to those of her class of their assertion of professional authority and individuality over those of different races and classes. As it would function within the Ramona Memorial School, Jackson’s painting was at once an assertion of white women’s professional authority in the world of Indian education. By extension, it suggests an
entire class of professional men whose social roles were also as professionals, symbolized in the Ramona School by Superintendent Horatio Ladd and architect Stanford White. The role of Jackson’s painting in White’s Ramona Memorial School suggests that the Memorial School’s architectural style was meant to affirm the effectiveness of the Anglo-American professional classes.

Professional-managerial skill can be read in the relative size of spaces allocated to students, teachers, and officials in White’s plan for the Ramona School. The dormitories for students are located on the second and third floors. The rooms on the second floor contain a series of partitions that indicate each room was to contain two beds. When compared to the size of the rooms reserved for matrons, teachers, and the Superintendent, the students’ quarters look cramped and small, emphasizing the students’ lack of individuality within the context of nineteenth-century ideas about the private or domestic sphere. As David Wallace Adams has observed, reformers imagined that Indian schools should ideally provide private or semi-private rooms where children could learn the importance of domestic space (112). However, the reality was often much different, with many Indian schools being housed in facilities that were unacceptable from the point of view of hygiene or privacy (112). In contrast to the realities of architectural layout and design at some Indian boarding schools, White’s plan is an ideal that offered some private space to Indian pupils, whose beds are two to a room on the second floor. According to Caroline Romney’s description of the plan, the students would also have beds on the third floor in “small bed rooms for the older girls” near the large open spaces for “music and general exercises” (Romney 15). While white teachers and officials have larger, private rooms, the students’ lives are spent in indistinct groups gathered in the
Memorial School’s assembly rooms, school rooms, recitation rooms, the refectory, kitchen, pantry, or dormitory rooms. The teachers, whose individualized social roles are epitomized by the labels of the rooms, are segregated from the students, emphasizing the racial, social and cultural differences of teachers and students.

The work that the girls are instructed to do at the Ramona School reinforces their roles as workers rather than professionals in training. The industrial nature of work at the school is clear in a letter from Ramona School teacher Mary De Sette, who writes, “I am fully convinced that we ought to turn this place into the raising of poultry, small fruit, and dairy products” (23). Emphasizing the economic aspect of Indian students labors, she concludes that if these items were grown and raised at the Ramona School, “we would soon have a good market right here” (23). De Sette further emphasizes the students’ roles as potential wage laborers when she observes that “the only way to hold these girls longer than another year is to devise some way for them to earn their living” (24). De Sette may refer to the need for more money to pay for student tuition, which cost 150 dollars per student. However, it is more likely that there was a need to occupy the girls as well as making them useful producers of goods that would benefit the school. DeSette observes that she pays “forty cents for every can of good fruit I buy here” and wonders whether she could not set the Indian girls to laboring in a sort of “canning business” (24). As Joel Pfister has observed of Indian industrial education at Carlisle Institute, there was a difference between the “self-made” possessive individualism which the students were shown as an ideal, and the reality that students’ labor was used to benefit the school while reinforcing their futures as “exploited and rejected” workers (55). DeSette’s comments reinforce Pfister’s observations that physical rather than mental labor was the future for
Indian students.

**A Grand Scenic Region**

Like Stanford White’s design for the memorial school, *Ramona Days* drew upon Anglo-American ideas about the Southwest. Much as the building is a sign of progress and civilization in the Southwest, in *Ramona Days*, Native Americans are depicted in ways that suggest both progress and tradition. As Chris Wilson observes, by the 1880s, New Mexico Territory’s white governors were increasingly concerned with projecting a positive image of the state in order to convince legislators in Washington that New Mexico Territory should become a state, although this would require the United States to incorporate the territory’s diverse Native American population, as well as its Spanish-speaking peoples of mixed European, Native, and African descent. A territorial Bureau of Immigration was established in 1880 to “attract investors and new settlers” (81). The Bureau printed pamphlets that depicted an “Americanizing” territory, including a book-length *Illustrated New Mexico*, which went through six editions in the early 1880s (81). While the Bureau of Immigration focused on the ways in which New Mexico Territory was progressing and becoming more *like* the rest of the United States, it also used imagery from the past in order to attract visitors (81). Bureau pamphlets included images of Indians, Indian cliff dwellings, and Spanish-style architecture (82). These images were connected to a growing national fascination with the Southwest that was the result of railway travel that linked the Southwest to the Pacific. For armchair tourists, there was magazine coverage. *Harper’s Weekly* focused its coverage of the region on aspects of New Mexico Territory such as “sixteenth-century Santa Fe,” and “Cliff Dwellers” as the Anasazi (82). The statehood campaign, combined with a growing national interest in
the Southwest made the Ramona Memorial School’s Anglo-inspired Southwestern design particularly attractive to readers who were aware of the region as a tourist location.

An essay by Ladd is an example of his perception of the region as a tourist destination. In the October 1887 issue of the journal, Ladd published a travel essay under the title “correspondence with the Ramona Days” (Ladd “Among” 6). The essay, “Among the Navajoes in the Canon De Chelly: A Grand Scenic Region—Amid the Home of the Cliff Dwellers,” describes Ladd’s travels to the Canon, which includes a description of both the uninhabited cliff dwellings and the Navajo Indians that Ladd encounters: “We started up the main canon yesterday afternoon, and addressed quite a large company of Navajoes, who were gathered for a dance. The scenery was indescribably grand and inspiring” (7). When Ladd and his party gain access to one of the dwellings, he notes that its walls are “crumbling” and the “ruins” have no solid roof (7). Ladd associates the ruined cliff dwellings with the remains of those who later occupied them:

[T]hey are occupied now by the skeletons of several of the people who came ages after the cliff dwellers deserted their homes. The bodies were evidently those of Navajoes or some of the other Indian races who had been killed in the numerous fights that have occurred in this canon. The blankets which covered them were finely woven and covered, like the Navajo blankets of today. We found a loom of ancient make . . . lying beside the stone grave of one who had perhaps occupied that house centuries ago, and who was buried with the implements of his occupation that he might pursue it in another world. (7)

This description locates both people and places in the past in ways which suggest Wilson’s assertion that in the 1880s, tourism in New Mexico was a mixture of progress and antiquity” (81). In Ladd’s description, Indians, like the cliff dwellings, are associated with the past in a romantic way while their labor is placed in a similarly historical context as part of an idealized past that is removed from the contemporary historical context of
civilization programs. Ladd’s description of the looms and blankets in the cliff dwellings is nostalgic for pre-contact Indian labor. In particular, Ladd’s focus on the colorful blankets and the methods for producing crafts suggest the role that “traditional” Indians played in attracting tourists to the Southwest.

In *Ramona Days*, Ladd drew upon a growing Southwestern tourist industry to interest readers in the school. A tourist’s eye is implied in the image of a “Mescallero Apache Maiden” that accompanies Ladd’s essay on Canon De Chelly. Although Ladd’s essay does not talk about the Mescalleros, the girl’s image is perfectly placed in the context of Ladd’s essay, which discusses the colorful blankets of the cliff dwellers and contemporary Navajo. The young Mescallero woman appears with woven and ceramic pots. Her clothing and jewelry, as well as her location among the pots place her in a museum-like tableau that supports the contemporary views of Pueblo Indians as suitable objects of tourist attraction. As Martha Sandweiss has observed, only “in the Southwest, where the Pueblo Indians lived in long-settled communities that posed no threat to the growing American population of the territories, did photographers seem to imagine an enduring value for the quaint and decidedly non-threatening strangeness of native cultures” (239). This “enduring” value as something other than the romantic “vanishing” Indian of Edward Curtis’s photographic mood pieces, or the “before and after” images produced at Ramona School and other institutions for Indian education. According to Sandweiss, the touristic value of the Pueblo was their harmlessness, so that their culture and its products could be valued for the capacity to “entertain world-weary tourists” (239). When Ladd’s essay is read in the context of touristic fascination with the Pueblo, the Navajo are rendered similarly “non-threatening” and interesting to the middle-class
As Ladd describes them, the Navajo he encounters are “very friendly” and always ready with a “pleasant salutation,” for they are “never troublesome or discourteous in any way” (8). Ladd not only suggests the Navajos friendliness, he also emphasizes the picturesque qualities of their contemporary customs, noting that they are “the most interesting tribe of Indians, and today, as they are in their best rigs for the evening dances, appear, with bright new garments and paint, in attractive and tasteful garb for their surroundings and their native character” (9). In the essay “Why Should Missionaries Be Sent to the Navajoes,” Ladd comments on the products made by contemporary Navajo: “[s]o excellent are their manufactures, that one of the chief engineers of the first Pacific railroad urged the building of a branch road, in order to reach them and obtain their products for civilized markets” (10). The Navajo are described with a tourist’s eye for colorful detail that contrasts with the Ramona School’s rhetoric of transformation, which suggests that Ladd saw Native peoples in different ways—as both traditional and as in need of assimilation. However, both kinds of Indian could be utilized to attract support for the Ramona School, so that when the “Apache Maiden” is placed within the context of a non-threatening contemporary culture that is also associated with it architectural past, tribal specificity becomes irrelevant, and the Indian girl is subsumed into the tourist discourse presented in the essay.

The Apache girl’s image also helps to make the contemporary Jicarilla Apache whose numbers supplied the Ramona School with many of its students, as non-threatening as the Navajo. When the Ramona School was established in 1884, the Jicarilla Apache occupied the northeastern part of present-day New Mexico and consisted
of two groups, the Llaneros and the Olleros (Greenwald 96-97). Until 1870, Jicarillas of both groups lived on the 1.7 million acre land grant of Lucien B. Maxwell, who “played patron” to the Jicarillas who lived relatively undisturbed there, reciprocating for the peace by not contesting Maxwell’s title (98). In 1870, Maxwell sold his land grant to a Dutch and American company, which sought to oust the Jicarilla and replace them with rent-paying Anglo-American settlers (99). Subsequent to the disruption caused by the arrival of settlers on former Maxwell lands, the Jicarilla of both bands began to look for a permanent reservation. Eventually, they were removed to the Mescalero Apache reservation in southern New Mexico. Although the Llaneros, formerly the more nomadic of the two Apache bands in question, began to farm, participate in agency stock-raising programs, and attend schools, the Ollero protested being moved to the Mescalero reservation. Their continued resistance eventually resulted in a compromise. The Jicarilla, both Ollero and Llanero bands, were allowed to return to an earlier reservation, which had been set aside for them in an executive order from Rutheford B Hayes in 1880, and then abandoned (101). This narrow strip of land at Amargo, New Mexico, 164 miles north of Santa Fe became the Jicarilla home in 1887.

At the time of the publication of Ramona Days, the Jicarilla Apache were not considered a threat to Anglo- and Hispano- settlers in New Mexico Territory in the way that the Chirichahua Apaches of the southern region were; however, they presented a consistent challenge to the notion of New Mexico Territory as an Americanized region prepared for statehood. Through Ramona Days, Horatio Ladd participated in a larger public discourse on civilizing New Mexico Territory by publishing images of Apache chiefs frequently in the journal. The same issue that contained the image of the “Apache
Maiden” and Ladd’s tourist essay on Canon De Chelly also featured an image of the Apache Chief Villarde. Next to the picture is another piece by Ladd, “The Apaches as Subjects of Civilization” (1). Villarde was a member of the Ollero band who had pressed the federal government on behalf of the Apache to file for claims on land in the public domain prior to their removal to the Amargo reservation in 1887 (Tiller 130). As an exemplar of what could be construed as either a willingness to adopt white land-use practices or a shrewd politician in search of territorial security for his people, Villarde was nevertheless participant in efforts to educate Apaches in American-style methods of agriculture and home making. In “The Apaches as Subjects of Civilization,” the companion essay to Villarde’s picture, Ladd notes that the Apache chiefs with whom he has spoken in visiting the Amargo reservation, have entreated Ladd and other white visitors for “doors and windows for houses that they were building, for ploughs, and wagons” (2). Additionally, the Apache chiefs request education for their children: “They have discussed with one another the good of schools; chiefs have commended them to their followers in earnest harangues” (2). A note that appears several pages later supports the idea that Villarde and other Apache leaders were ready to take up American social customs. The name Ye-atz-unde, is listed under the roster of new students. She is described as the “daughter of Augustine Villarde, the chief of the Jicarillas, whose picture is given as one of the illustrations of Ramona Days” (“Our New” 33).

When Villarde’s image is read alongside the image of the Apache girl he becomes a similarly non-threatening Indian. The bow he carries in his right hand, perhaps a ceremonial symbol of title and authority signify objects that have meaning within an Anglo-American context as objects that could, like the girl’s pots, be bought and owned
by whites. These images suggested the ownership and production of goods in a Native American context. However, any potential for a Native understanding of ownership is replaced by the notion of “possessive individualism” which C. B. Macpherson has identified as the notion of the ownership of property and the right to sell and accrue property as the primary ways in which individuals are recognized as citizens in Euro-American democracies (Carens “Possessive” 3). Through images like those of the Apache girl and Villarde, *Ramona Days* emphasizes the fact that Indians are objects, not Americanized individuals. By presenting their images in ways familiar to white readers used to “consuming” Indians through literature and visual images. As Cindy Weinstein has observed possessive individualism in the nineteenth century was connected to the the individual’s ability to maintain a “self-affirming relationship” to work (34-35). In *Ramona Days*, the Apache girl, as well as in the Navajo blanket weavers described by Ladd, labor is removed from the scene of Indian agency in producing goods, and placed within that of commodification and consumption. of *Ramona Days*. It can be inferred that the girl does not own the pots she produces, nor does Villarde own the bow he carries. Within the context of the civilization programs offered by the Ramona school, these objects suggest the concept of exhibiting Native Americans that was often a way of raising funds for Indian boarding schools. 13

As their images are presented in *Ramona Days*, Chief Villarde and the Apache girl are posed in a context familiar to readers accustomed to images of Southwestern Indians, particularly Indian women, as producers of crafts. Magazines with a middle-class readership such as *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine* and *Century Magazine* had

---

13 See Pfister and Adams on Pratt’s moneymaking schemes for Carlisle in *Individuality Incorporated* and *Education for Extinction*. 
published articles by ethnologist Frank Hamilton Cushing, whose studies of the Zuni in New Mexico, with whom he lived from 1879 to 1884. Cushing’s work popularized and aestheticized images of the Southwest and Southwestern Indians. Cushing’s *My Adventures in Zuni* (1882) depicted women decorating pottery. Many other images of New Mexican Indian women entered the public imagination through photographs, such as those taken by John K. Hillers as part of the Smithsonian Expeditions to Zuni Pueblo, led by Col. James Stevenson in 1880. As Barbara A. Babcock has observed, the image of a Southwestern Indian woman with crafts was “the authorized image of the ‘civilized,’ domestic, and feminized” Indian whose popularity was growing at the same time that the “wild” nomadic Apaches were still alluding General Crook (428). The image of the Apache Maiden in *Ramona Days* as well as that of Villarde become part of a nexus of images of the Southwest whose meaning was already interpreted for readers in popular culture through works like those of Cushing and Hillers. As Martha Sandweiss notes, the meaning of Indian portraits produced by whites for whites exists “in the aggregate,” in a larger “grid of visual and literary information” found in public discourse about Indians as “types,” in this case the “friendly” or “feminized” Indian (246-247). As Curtis Hinsley Jr. notes, the need to affirm Southwestern Indians, including Apaches, as “friendly” arose from the writings of white travelers “heavily influenced by the military ethos of their father’s generation” (463). Although white observations of Indians were influenced by militaristic imagery which predated the Civil War, the immediate experience of that war caused many “explorer narrators” to depict the Southwest in familiar war-like terms as “peaceful/warlike” or “domestic/nomadic” (464).

---

One way to assure the peacefulness of the Indians observed in the Southwest was to mix images of the past and present, so that the Indian subject was always connected to images of a commodifiable past that could be marketed to whites as art in the form of literature or crafts (Hinsley 464). The commodification of Indians at the Ramona School allowed excursionists to witness Indian skill in recreating the results of their industrial training. As Rosemarie Banks has noted, it mattered little to many white observers whether Indians were engaging in “official” or “commercial Indian displays” (597). At the Columbian Exhibition of 1893, for example, displays of learning by Pratt’s Carlisle Indian students existed at the fair alongside “performances” of “traditional” activities, such as basket weaving and cooking in the fair’s Anthropology Building as well as the Smithsonian Institution’s display of American Indian crafts and craft makers in the U.S. Government Building (Poignant 219). Ladd attracted their donations by drawing upon popular ideas of Indian display in the Southwestern context through references to “traditional” Southwestern Indians’ work in images like that of the Apache girl and in his essay’s references to the Navajo blanket weavers in *Ramona Days*.

Both contexts of tourism at the Ramona School—creating objects as well as demonstrating learned skills allowed white visitors to the school to assert their identities as individuals who “owned” the experience of witnessing Indian labor, and, by extension, owned Indians, through donations to the school and the purchase of goods produced by students in order to promote progress. As Jane Simonsen observes, the observation and consumption of Indian labor and its products at Industrial Schools was an “important component to . . . self-fashioning for middle-class white women” who “promoted, exhibited, sold, and purchased native women’s arts and crafts as part of their crusade to
promote progress” (93). This progress was part of the display of Indian artistry which excursionists and tourists experienced when visiting the Ramona School.

**Excursionists and Tourists**

The descriptions of the activities of Ramona students can be seen within a context of tourism through the phenomenon of “excursionists” to the Ramona School. An anonymous piece in the first issue of the journal mentions one such group of “excursionists” who visited the school in the autumn of 1886, noting that they had sent a “package” of toys to the Ramona School children for Christmas (“Glimpses” 13). Similarly, a letter dated February 4, 1887 from Elias Whipple, the Ramona School’s superintendent, notes that a group of “tourists” visited the school and gave “$10.25,” in addition to buying the “excellent bread” which the Ramona girls were learning to make (15). In another letter, Mary De Sette notes that the excursionists “filled my schoolroom all one morning,” and, after seeing the morning’s “exercises” were “so interested that some of them got out their pocket books and left us over thirteen dollars” (17). De Sette’s comments illustrate how the students at the Ramona School participated in a culture of display that assured potential sponsors that the Ramona Industrial School successful in its goal to educate and civilize Indian students.

A letter sent by Irving O. Whiting of Boston, Massachusetts to Ladd refers to “a party of Raymond tourists” who spend the Sabbath in Santa Fe and “among other places of interest visited your school for Indian girls” (36). Although he does not reveal what he saw at the school, Whiting’s letter mentions seeing some Apache making baskets at Amargo. Whiting suggests his role as tourist when he writes that he observes that what he has read about the Apache is true, they are “expert basket -weavers” (36). These
comments suggests that Whiting and his party understood the Ramona Students they saw at the school through the lens of travel writing and tourist experience which imply middle-class leisure and consumption. As Tzvetan Todorov observes, this tourist’s view of the indigenous person is as a “creator of objects” which “one might then possess” (175). This view of Indians as creators endows them with subjectivity, but only inasmuch as they remain “intermediary subjects” that must remain in their roles as “subject-producer-of-objects” so that do not become like the Euro-Americans who purchase their goods (176). By purchasing objects made by Indians or witnessing Indian work, white tourists and excursionists become part of an “authentic” experience that in turn authenticates them as individuals (Sears 10). This consumption of objects and labor endowed the Ramona School excursionists and tourists with a sense of self while leaving the Indians they observe in the role of indeterminate subjects whose place within the social order is one of limited individuality from the Anglo-American point of view.

The view that Indians had limited subjectivity was associated with notions of social evolutionary theory that were popular during the late nineteenth century and which became entrenched in ideas about Indian education. Lewis Henry Morgan’s explanation of the “stages” of social evolution: savagery, barbarism, and civilization (Eggans 4-5). The final stage of evolution was “individual property ownership,” a social formation that Euro-Americans believed Native Americans were traditionally unable to demonstrate (5). Although attitudes would change over time, in the 1880s, Indians were viewed “as a people moving from a lower to a higher stage of development,” and Indian schools were there to help them along the way (Hoxie 116). When the Ramona School was established in 1885, Indian education was viewed as a way of gradually converting American Indians
to “civilization” and at least nominal citizenship (Hoxie 58-59). Problematically however, the lessons of civilization taught in boarding schools never imagined Indian students as attaining anything more than limited citizenship. As David Wallace Adams has observed, the goal of boarding schools was to produce students who were “economically self-sufficient” future citizens who would not rely on the federal government for support (149). As part of New Mexico’s assertion of civilization and culturally coherent social formation, the Ramona School was an attempt at proving that Native Americans were from a social evolutionary point of view capable of assimilating, although they were at the beginning of their transformation into property-owning citizens. However, writing in the journal proves that there was much more ambiguity and uncertainty concerning students’ abilities to assimilate because of both racial and cultural differences between students and their white instructors.

**Teaching Objects**

Although Romero’s examples of Indian-white relations are taken from literature, they can be contextualized within the history of late-nineteenth-century Indian policy and boarding schools. While the Ramona School emphasized learning to read and write, like most boarding schools, it focused on training its mainly female students to be domestic laborers in Americanized homes. English language learning was central to the domesticating process at boarding schools because. Romney’s uncomfortable observations about Indian mimicry end in a vehement assertion of the need for Indian literacy: “They must be taught to read at once! In that way only can they acquire the language which they must learn before they can learn much else” (8). Within the context of the history of Indian education, what Romney means by “much else” is a basic,
industrial education. As Robert Warrior notes, the Carlisle School and other off-reservation boarding schools promulgated the educational philosophy that students should not speak their native languages as part of their physical separation from tribal homes and tribal customs (96). However, Indian pupils’ forced immersion in English was not meant to create Indian scholars and professionals. Weaver notes that schools like Carlisle were “split between very basic academics and industrial training” (96). Vine Deloria has observed that most Indian Schools were dedicated to “work, hard work, and relentlessly boring routine” (“Burden” 163). This observation applies to Indian education and the Ramona School and is supported by an editorial by Horatio Ladd in the April 1888 issue of Ramona Days. The editorial describes the goals of Indian education:

“Education for Indians should consist of instruction and training adapted to prepare them for the life of laborers. A few Indians will rightly be teachers and preachers, but the mass of them—nearly the whole number indeed—must work with their hands, as farmers and mechanics, and their wives” (“Education” 9). In a January 1888 issue on the same topic he observes of Indian education: “Let the children be taught simple industries which look toward gradual civilization rather than mental acquirements” (4). A statement about the “mental acquirements” needed to obtain “civilization,” and, by extension, citizenship suggests social evolutionary views of Indians as savages whose mental capacities required industrial training in order for them to gradually achieve equality with middle-class whites. Ladd’s comments are based on racial views less explicitly articulated in Romney’s essay. Ladd observes that Indians “as a race” are “distinctly inferior to white men in intellectual vitality and capability, and their wisest friends will advise them to look forward to the life of toilers, and to make their persistent appeal to the conscience of
the nation for the opportunity to make their own living by their own industry” (9). Romney reflects Ladd’s views of Indian education when she observes that the “reflective faculties” of the Apache children are “not so well developed . . . as in the whites. It will probably require the education of several successive generations to bring them up to the same standard, or even near it; but in all that involves the ability to earn a living by any handicraft, they already possess a native ability that only needs directing into proper channels, and a fair amount of special training, to develop it into remunerative skill” (7). Years of training might bring Indians to the level of whites; however, properly directed, they would be able to exercise their “natural” skill at making things.

The method of teaching Indians English was also indicative of the basic level at which Indians were understood to function in an evolutionary scale that ranged in contemporary discourse from the “savage” who might be skilled with his or her hands, to the “civilized,” Anglo-American professionals who made their livings in a hierarchical system of professions that ranged from those of architect to school president to school matrons and teachers. David Murray suggests the linguistic corollary to the hierarchies of work and labor suggested in Ramona Days. Murray notes that in the nineteenth century, Indian languages, and by extension Indians speakers, were viewed developmentally. Indians who learned English represented an earlier phase of human communicative evolution that had already been achieved by Euro-Americans. They were part of an evolutionary pattern of language development that began with “silence” and proceeded to develop “through gestures and signs to spoken words, to picture-writing to syllabic and eventually phonetic writing” (15). Writing by whites about Indian students at the Ramona School reveals that Indians were perceived as being at the beginning phases of this
evolutionary linguistic process.

In support of the ideology of evolutionary development, Indian educational doctrine as practiced at the Ramona School suggested the use of objects rather than abstractions to teach students English words. Romney observes that “Object teaching” is “employed to a great extent” at the Ramona School (9). As David Wallace Adams observes, boarding schools used this “so-called objective method of instruction” to teach Indian students English. Under this method “students first were shown objects such as books, pencils, and shoes; second, given the English word for the object; and finally, drilled in the proper pronunciation” (137). Corroborating Adams, Romney observes that in “taking up a new reading lesson . . . the meaning of every new word is explained by the teacher as fully as possible and illustrated; when a noun, by the object itself which it represents” (9). Adams’s and Romney’s observations about English language lessons underscore the real challenges of teaching non-English speakers whose Native languages shared no similar linguistic patterns with English (Adams 139). The Apache students Romney observes would have struggled with English, a language whose “morphological and syntactical frame of reference” was “fundamentally different” from their own (139). Although object teaching may have been the most effective way to teach students whose Apache language was unlike English, the way language instruction is presented in Ramona Days draws attention to the students’ primitiveness by emphasizing the closeness of the students to the concrete “objects” which they learn to name.

Within the context of Indian education programs, the students’ relationship to the concrete emphasizes their roles as future Indian citizens of the United States. The rhetoric of objectification permeates the journal to include Indians. The author of “Are
Our Indians Improving?” uses the language of objectification in referring to Indians’ roles as wards of the United States: “We are bound to consider the Indians within the limits of the United States as our Indians. They may be fairly said to belong to us” (5). The emphasis on “our” Indians shows that although the Dawes Act might have provided for Indians’ ability to civilize and own land individually, they were not yet equal to whites because under the stipulations of the Dawes Act, in which the Federal government held Indian lands in “trust” for twenty-five years, they were not yet owners of their own land. In support of the Dawes Act’s views of Indians, the author further observes that Indians should be considered “nominally citizens,” suggesting that Indians were being trained for something other than equality with whites (6).

“A Special Indian Girl”

A letter from Augusta Booth, secretary of the Plymouth Congregational Church Sunday School in Brooklyn, N.Y., suggests the roles which Indian girls roles as objects within the context of the Ramona School (43). Booth inquires whether is a “special Indian girl” who could be helped by the Sunday school (43). Although it is not clear what “special” qualities the girl would need, it is likely that the qualities would lead to being Americanized through being named by a white sponsor. A letter from Mary E. DeSette to the Congregational Sunday School at Hiawatha, Kansas shows that Ramona pupils were named by whites visiting the school. The relationship between naming and sponsorship of children is suggested when De Sette tells of the presents Ramona students received for Christmas in December, 1887. She observes that a “party of Philadelphia people, who had named a good many of the children, sent a great many nice things” (18). Although DeSette’s description of the Christmas celebrations is cheerful, the underlying
reality is that the children were treated as objects that were named without any evidence of the children’s active participation in the naming process. This situation underscores the extent to which the Ramona School participated in a process of removing Indians’ agency, even while upholding the idea that education would empower them. Naming was one way of remaking the Indian children in an Anglo-American model, but it also reaffirmed colonial power and helped to fragment Native cultures. As Taiaiake Alfred observes, the “imposition of labels and definitions of identity on indigenous people has been a central feature of the colonization process from the start” (84). In a colonial context, naming transforms Indian communities and further separate them from their tribal contexts. As Julie Gough suggests, naming “deliberately (linguistically then actually)” displaces “tenants in order to claim ownership and control” (90). Within the context of Indian education and the colonization of New Mexico Territory, naming helped to assimilate Indians and, by extension, New Mexico Territory into the United States.

The problem with naming the Ramona School’s Indian students is that it denies them what Patricia Crain describes as “interiority” (78). Because the “interior” self was the hallmark the “private” individual who could participate in “public” debate, as Habermas describes the bourgeois public sphere, it is then limited to those who have access to interiority. Within the public spaces of the Ramona school in its imagined or real forms, the Indian student had no public self-representation. The lack of a publicly recognizable private self is exemplified by the name of the school, which implies that all of the “Ramona girls and boys,” as they were sometimes called in the journal, were works of fiction. Within the imagined architecture of White’s Ramona School, which
was to be constructed as a memorial to Helen Hunt Jackson and her fictional vanishing Indian woman, the grand painting of Helen Hunt Jackson reflects the ultimate late-nineteenth-century professional individualist’s identification with the interior “self” (78). While Jackson’s image is the centerpiece of the fictional school and embodies both imagined feminine ideal of domesticity as well as a growing female professionalism, the Ramona students are provided with new names at the school and therefore given “surrogate” selves that are non-Indian (78). The Ramona School name, and the tendency in *Ramona Days* to call the students “Ramona” students implies that the institution was a method for providing a “surrogate” and fictional self, or a “representation of the self” (78). As Crain observes, through naming mission schools and Indian students white educators and reformers incorporated Indians “into white culture through a kind of sentimental cryptography” that in the case of the Ramona School was embodied in the name of Ramona itself. In this sense, the name Ramona suggests what Crain calls a “necronym,” the name given an Indian students in honor of a dead missionary. A necronym made a Native student a living “monument” within the Ramona Memorial School.

The idea of a new name for Indian students that would replace a Native one was also directly related to an idea of public and private space in New Mexico Territory. In an essay on Apache gender roles in *Ramona Days* locate the relationship between naming Indian children and displacing Indian claims to land. “Are Our Indians Improving?” misreads by the fact that Apache women were were land owners by placing them within an Anglo-American context. The author observes that the social position of Apache women is “very peculiar” (6). Noting the women are the property of their fathers until
they are married, the author observes that “[i]t is true, girls are usually sold as soon as
they arrive at the marriageable age, at about 10 or 12” (6). After presenting this
information, which may have been surprising to white readers of the journal, the author
proceeds to explain the peculiarity of Apache women’s position with respect to property.
The author observes that once the Apache girl is married, she “becomes a principal
property owner, and possesses a large share of land and personal independence” (6). The
author presents the situation as a “peculiar” Native-centered view of women’s roles,
because it suggests that Apache women assumed roles reserved for husbands in the
Anglo-American family.

Anglo-American misunderstanding of Indian gender roles is a historical constant,
especially when those gender roles referred to Indian women’s relationship to land. The
Jicarilla were matrilineal, and their homes were “matrilocal,” meaning that men moved
into the homes of their wives (Pritzker 14). In Jicarilla Apache culture, gender roles were
clearly defined, but not “enforced” in the way they were in boarding schools. Women
typically gathered and prepared food, built homes made from skins and other materials,
carried water, gathered fuel, made household goods such as blankets, and cared for
children (14). Men hunted, raided, made weapons, musical instruments, and also helped
with some activities related to gathering food (14). Andrea Smith has observed that the
history of Indian-white relations has shown that the conflicts between Native peoples and
whites stems largely from fundamental differences between men’s and women’s social
roles in European and Native societies in North America (22-23). In The Sacred Hoop,
Paula Gunn Allen similarly observes that colonizers early on recognized that in order to
successfully conquer indigenous people, Native women would have to conform to Euro-
American gender roles. Allen refers to the Jesuits in Canada when she observes that the job of the priests was to convince “both men and women that a woman’s proper place was under the authority of her husband and the man’s proper place was under the authority of the priests” (38). While Allen’s reference is to the patriarchal system of authority found in a particular Christian church during the eighteenth- and nineteenth-centuries, her larger point is that Euro-Americans felt that significant effort was required to assert the notion of hierarchies based on gender (38-39).

Similarly gendered hierarchies based on race were also apparent at the Ramona School, where white women exerted both authority over Indian women while also participating in a hierarchy of professions in which white women were still less elevated than their white male counterparts. This hierarchy is reinforced along racial lines when the editorialist goes on to emphasize the women’s skills in the “manufacture of garments” and the “weaving of blankets” which are often of “remarkable beauty” (6). Unable to understand the full extent to which women’s roles as property owners are based in Apache culture, the author focuses on female roles in producing household goods, a female role more familiar to Anglo-Americans during the period.

The production of household goods such as blankets, clothing, and food was equally the work of white and Indian women during the period, as the pages of Ramona Days makes clear. Letters from women such as “E.W.” of the Plymouth Congregational Church at Plymouth, Massachusetts that accompany a box containing “scarves knitted by members of the church” attest, white women also labored in the construction of clothing (15). Similarly, the same letter-writer observes that at the Ramona School, white women instructed Indian girls in the making of bread that could “win a diploma at the fair” and
other methods of cooking (14-15). These notices in the journal emphasize the roles white women played in their homes, and the ways in which industrial schools sought to train Indian girls in these American domestic activities. However, within the hierarchical system of the school, the domestic training of Indian girls was influenced by their lower status in the socio-economic hierarchy in which they were learning to participate as laborers. If the Apache women’s roles are found in producing blankets and baskets, then it is clear that they are not envisioned as doing anything different as a result of their education at the Ramona School. Unlike the white women described in American Missionary, who are able to become doctors and lawyers, Indian women are trained to be producers of objects, not ideas.

“I Write This my-self”

When Ramona Days reader Louisa Rose of Painesville, Ohio, writes to the journal that the Lake Erie Seminary had read aloud “extracts” from Ramona, she suggests the journal’s role in a public discourse about Indians (Rose 36). The seminarians described by Rose are members of a public sphere of religious women who, as Michael Warner suggests, “found an entry into public life . . . through discourses about privacy in reform, in nationalism” and in evangelical Christianity” (38). In other words, the journal’s readers were “private individuals” whose female roles represented the home and the nineteenth-century idea of the “domestic sphere.” However, in keeping with the Ramona School’s ideal architecture, the readers also embodied what Warner describes as an “interweaving” of “gender” and “publicness” (38). As a public of Ramona Days readers, Rose and others came together publicly to mark the journal’s successful construction of a reformer’s idea of the Indian.
Yet the Ramona students’ letters, the journal suggests another public, a Native public of letter writers and the Native parents who listened to their letters. In the March 1, 1887 issue there appeared a letter from a student’s mother sent from the Mescalero Apache Agency. The letter is prefaced with the comment that the mother of the student “Alta Reemy” is noted as being read aloud “through an Apache interpreter” (24). Heartbreaking in its details of longing, the letter nevertheless suggests a public sphere that was perhaps unintended in Ramona Days. The letter begins “Dear Alta: I am so poor that I cannot get a horse on which to go and see you” and asks the girl to “send me a letter” (24). Alta replies, “My Dear Mother: I love you very much and I was very glad to get the things you sent me. Is my sister well and how is Zhemi” (24). Not simply formal invocations of lessons learned at the Ramona School, the letters which pass between Alta and her mother are personal and suggest the intersection between a Native idea of what it means to be a “private” person and an other public whose location for listening is not a Christian seminary but an Indian Agency, a space that may have been created by whites but was nevertheless ground claimed by Native peoples. In closing her letter, Alta signs both the name given to her at the Ramona School and her Apache name, Chissaw-zu, suggesting an ongoing connection to the girl’s Apache heritage.

Although Ramona Days placed Indian students within familiar frames of social reference as “wards” of the government, wage laborers, and objects of tourist interest, student letters published in Ramona Days also suggest Indian independence from racial and social stereotypes and a related but limited rhetorical sovereignty that contradicts these stereotypes. The quotation above appears in a letter from Ohio, also known as “Maggie Howard,” a Ramona student. Howard’s letter appeared in the “Youth’s
Department,” a section of the journal that was introduced in the July 1, 1887 issue of *Ramona Days* (Howard 33). According to the editor, its purpose was to “awaken the interest and deepen the conviction in our American youth as to the rights and needs of our Indian population” (27). Accordingly, the department facilitated a communication of sorts between Indian students at the Ramona school and white readers of the journal. There are no letters of exchange between Indian students and white children published in the department’s columns. However, letters written by Indian students to their families appeared regularly.

Letters from Native students like Howard suggest the realities of life at Indian industrial schools like Ramona and call into question the nature of the Native self that asserted authorship of the letters. Although the ability to write was a sign of progress in Americanization, the letters from Ramona students to their parents suggest a sense of Indian resistance to assimilation through continuing ties to tribal life in the form of family relationships which the boarding school tried hard to erase. Maggie Howard’s letter attests to the efforts of Indian schools to remove the markers of identity found in native languages. The letter is signed “Ohio,” but the author writes below this signature “English name is Maggie Howard” (33). Ohio observes that she learns to “read and write” and is “glad to write a letter” (33). Although Ohio writes in English and her Anglo name suggests her Americanization, her letter contains many inquiries about the health of family members, and suggests the homesickness felt by Indian boarding school students. Ohio writes to her mother to ask “how you are” and “How is my little sister” (33). Although the letter says that Ohio has a “good time up here” at the Ramona school, more than anything, it is filled with questions about family: “How is my uncle Moncisco,” and
“How is my grand Mother”; “How is my little sister Cos-in-l and my little uncle Chun-da”; “How is my little neice [sic] Ko-in-nea” (33). Ohio acknowledges her homesick feelings when she says “I wish You would come here and stay,” and closes by saying “Get some one to write for you and send me a letter please” (33). Letters such as Ohio’s reveal the fact that Indian students continued to make connections to their tribes through writing, a tool of assimilation that could also be used by Indians as a way of communicating connections to Indian families and communities.

The students’ letters assert Native rhetorical sovereignty within the context of Ramona Days. As Craig Womack has observed, the tendency when discussing Indian literacy has been to place them in a “tainted/untained” binary which does not perceive Native Americans from the perspective of their “true legal status” which Womack observes is “as members of nations” (141). Indian students’ letters from the Ramona School were presented not only as signifiers of Indian progress but also as what Womack calls “cultural artifacts” whose significance is to demonstrate Indian progress in Americanization (141). However, the Indian children’s English is clearly inflected by their primary Apache language. As William Leap has observed in American Indian English, there are “community-specific ties between Indian English and ancestral language grammar” that demonstrate connections between Natives and their languages, even at language “immersion” sites like boarding schools where the goal is to eradicate Native speakers’ connections to their language and culture (3). As Leap suggests, students at boarding schools did not learn English in the fashion that instructors hoped they would, instead learning to communicate orally and in a written English that was heavily inflected by the students’ Native language grammars (162). Although Leap’s
focus is on the influence of Indian grammars on “Red English,” the varieties of English spoken by Native Americans, his observations are important to an understanding of the students’ letters in Ramona Days.

As representations of Indian students’ Apache language, student letters suggest that students were much less Americanized than Ladd asserted in Ramona Days. A letter from Onondeh Ah, who also signs her letter “Anna Day” suggests the influences of the Apache language on her English. Onondeh Ah writes to her mother:

I would like to know how you are. . . . We have eighteen girls in the school. They are all Apaches. When Apaches get flour so many Indians come here that we see our friends very often. I bought candy up town. Miss De Sitter is our teacher . . . I have a red dress like this and a cloak like this I have new stoking too. There are three Mescalero here I have a good. Time I have two nice dolls . . . I would like very much to go to E margo. . . . (25)

The letter is signed “Your loving daughter” with the girl’s Apache name in capital letters: “ONONDEH AH” followed by the signature “English name is Anna Day” (25).

The letter is prefaced by a comment from Horatio Ladd, whose editorial voice assures readers that the letter from Ononhdeh Ah and the other Apache girls is reprinted “without change, from the neatly written copies sent by the pupils who are all under thirteen years of age” (“First Letters” 25). The heading for the letters “First Letters Home From the Ramona School” suggests that the letters operate in the same way as the before and after pictures in the journal do by suggesting the rapid transformation from illiterate Indians to literate Americans which a Ramona education ensures. As Robert Warrior observes in discussing the role of the Indian Helper, the weekly journal published at the Carlisle Indian school, the purpose of calling attention to the work of Indian students in the journal—such as their writing in the journal or their work as printers, was to emphasize the “advanced training” and educational effectiveness of the
school (*The People* 103). However, Onondeh ah’s letter suggests something more than the “muffled” Native voice that Warrior observes can be heard in Indian boarding school journals which generally spoke “for” and “about” students (98). Onondeh Ah talks about the Apaches at the school, noting the fact that there are Mescaleros there, which suggests that she is either a Mescalero or a Jicarilla and recognizes the linguistic and cultural differences between the southern Mescalero and the northern Jicarilla. She also mentions that she wants to go to “E Margo,” a rendering of the name “Amargo,” the reservation to which the Jicarilla moved in 1887. The young student also mentions activities that suggest contemporary tribal life. Although it is not clear where the Apaches Onondeh Ah speaks of “get flour,” her statement suggests the familiar activity of buying staple foods either at Indian agencies or in Santa Fe, where many Native people came to purchase goods.

As Onondeh Ah’s voice is rendered in *Ramona Days*, it also suggests a counterpoint to the discourse of Indian progress in assimilation. Like Alex Posey’s Fus Fixico letters, which were written in the voice of a full-blood Creek, the Indian students’ letters reveal a worldview that contain what Craig Womack, in discussing Posey’s letters, has called cultural and political “’misunderstandings’” that are manifested in the form of “mispronounced words” (156). However, these so-called “misunderstandings” underscore the “failing of white progress itself” (156). While the speakers in Posey’s letters are adults, and Posey’s tone and use of dialect is intended satirically, the effect is similar because in both Posey’s and the Ramona students’ letters, Indian speech calls the reader’s attention to “different ways of looking at the same event from varying reference points” which result in the “translation of white ways into the semiotic system” of Native
Onondeh Ah calls attention to the things that matter to a child: new clothing which is “like this,” a statement that suggests the girl’s speech and the girl’s perception of the world. The lack of detail in describing what the girl means by “this” suggests a Native American perception that is contingent upon trying to make sense of the boarding school experience. It implies what Bhabha has called the “performativity of the text” which opens a “narrative strategy for the emergence of those agencies” such as that of the Apache girl, which are beyond the strictures of the savage/civilized binary constructed through discussions of education in the journal. In her letter, Onohndeh Ah does not explain what the cloak and items of clothing are like, but her statement directs reader to her perceptions in the journal’s narrative context, which is overwritten by white ideas about Indians as “savage.”

The political ramifications of the girl’s letter can also be understood as a Native response to the nominalist tradition of Euro-American colonialism in North America, which David Simpson has observed gave order to an “otherwise chaotic world” through acts of naming (255). Onondah Ah suggests a Native-centered organizing strategy when in her letter she re-names whites, in an inversion of naming Indian children. Miss De Sette becomes “Miss De Sitter” and Amargo is “E Margo.” This suggests that Indians are operating within a cultural setting that is contingent on the combination of both Apache and Anglo-American cultural forms. The “Red English” of the girl’s letter is an example of the larger issue of New Mexico Territory’s hoped for voice in Ramona Days. Mary De Sette voices her concern about this voice in a report on her classroom instruction, she notes that she feels a “growing necessity of more help” in teaching the Apache students “pure English” and to show them how to “make glad the waste places,
and to cause the wilderness to blossom” (25). The racialized language of De Sette’s comments about language and the connection she makes between language and land use suggest that the Indian students’ are examples of rhetorical sovereignty, which represent localized, Native connections to place which contradict the argument presented in Ramona Days that New Mexico Territory was an increasingly culturally and racially homogeneous place.
CHAPTER THREE

“THAT IS A HOME PAPER!”: OUR BROTHER IN RED’S
“MATERNAL COMMONWEALTH”

While Ramona Days offers little room for Native voices to debate the terms of Native American relationships to New Mexico Territory’s places, fictional newspapers provide a venue for Indian resistance in Muscogee (Creek) author S. Alice Callahan’s Wynema: A Child of the Forest (1891). In a scene of newspaper reading from Wynema, the novel’s Native heroine Wynema Harjo finds her white teacher Genevieve Weir reading an article about allotment in Indian Territory. Wynema looks over her teacher’s shoulder and exclaims “Oh, that is a home paper! Surely it cannot mean allot our country?” Wynema’s recognition that the newspaper is a “home” newspaper suggests that it is a tribal journal and therefore representative of the Muscogee (Creek) nation. While her statement implies the political role that tribal newspapers played in Indian Territory, newspaper reading in this scene reveals the imposition a white voice to express Native political views. Genevieve Weir summarizes arguments from the newspaper, while Wynema is described as “her listener.” In this scene of reading, the newspaper is connected to Indian education through Genevieve Weir, who agrees with an anti-allotment piece in the newspaper, observing, “Do you think the western tribes sufficiently tutored in the school of civilization to become citizens of the United States, subject to its laws and punishments?” Although Wynema has articulated a pro-allotment position, she quickly capitulates, observing “Oh, no indeed! Far from it! What a superficial thinker I am not to have understood this!” (52). While the exchange between Genevieve and

15 The terms Muscogee and Creek are both used to refer to this tribe. I follow Lavonne Brown Ruoff’s usage in discussing Wynema and use Muscogee.
Wynema may suggest that Callahan favors white voices over Native ones as expressions of resistant Native points of view, their dialogue can be understood as indicative of an inclusive Native public sphere of print that includes novels and newspapers. In allowing Genevieve the anti-allotment point of view, Callahan introduces the idea of an inclusive and unexpected debate about allotment in the novel, one whose scenes of discussion between whites and Natives often depict newspapers as symbolic of an inclusive public sphere of political activism that originates from Native women.

As an early novelistic articulation of a Native American woman’s political voice *Wynema* is important in the context of the nineteenth-century women’s reform fiction. Although late-nineteenth-century Native American women writers such as Paiute author and activist Sarah Winnemucca had argued for political reform in her work *Life Among the Paiutes: Their Wrongs and Claims* (1884), *Wynema* has been identified as the first novel published by a woman of Native descent. The work was published by H.J. Smith of Chicago in 1891 and was given a brief notice in Muskogee, Indian Territory, in *Our Brother in Red*, the newspaper for which Alice Callahan acted as an editor. The notice, from June 6 1891 notes that Alice Callahan is “an intelligent Christian lady and we look forward with pleasure to a time when our other duties will permit us to read the book. It is certainly cheap, at 25 cents per copy” (“Announcement” 4). As Lavonne Ruoff notes, this rather brief notice was apparently all the publicity *Wynema* received ("Editor’s” xvi). Despite its unknown sales and its potentially limited circulation, the intended reading public for the novel can be inferred from Callahan’s dedication of the book. The author dedicates *Wynema* to the “Indian tribes of North America” “who have felt the wrongs and oppression of their pale-faced brothers.” She suggests the novel’s political goals when
she writes of her hopes that *Wynema* “may serve to open the eyes and heart of the world to our afflictions.” In identifying herself as Native through the reference to “our afflictions,” Callahan suggests that the “world” to which she would express Native American political struggles is one of white readers. Siobhan Senier supports the idea of the novel’s largely white readership when she observes Callahan’s “direct addresses to non-tribal readers” throughout the novel, for example her occasional explication of Native cultural customs through asides to “my reader,” indicate the novel’s intended “circulation among reform-minded whites” (“Allotment” 424). While these characteristics of the novel suggest that Callahan hoped to reach a primarily non-tribal. Yet the novel’s insistent dramatization of Native-white discussion about Indian rights, including the issue of allotment, suggest that the novel is a Native woman’s construction an inclusive public sphere, one in which Natives and whites alike enter into a public debate that offers the possibility for dialogue rather than a single point of view about Indian politics, particularly through her invocation of newspapers and newspaper reading.

Callahan’s fictional representation of newspapers as symbolic of a Native public sphere can be contextualized in her editorial role at the Methodist newspaper *Our Brother in Red*, which was published at Muskogee in the Mucogee Nation from 1881-1900. During 1891 Callahan edited the Women’s Christian Temperance Union column in the journal, the content of which shows that *Our Brother in Red* is a journalistic counterpoint to the potentially inclusive Native public sphere that newspapers represent in *Wynema*. As an organization, the Women’s Christian Temperance Union posited a “maternal commonwealth” of women who advocated for limited suffrage around issues of temperance reform (Epstein 12). As Caroline Foreman observes, Callahan was a member
of the WCTU branch founded in Muskogee, which was established after WCTU leader Frances Willard spoke there in 1888 (“Mrs. Laura” 182). Because the organization did not contain an Indian women’s branch, it is possible to see Callahan’s involvement in the organization as creating a Native women’s “public voice” through the organization’s temperance agenda. I argue that the WCTU column in Our Brother in Red, like the fictional teacher Weir, indicates that its Native readers as well as Callahan herself were not “superficial” readers of texts as Wynema self-consciously describes herself as a reader. In the novel, Wynema becomes an increasingly competent and skeptical newspaper reader, and her increasingly critical readings of Indian politics are used to better understand both white and Native arguments about Indian Territory (Mollis 114). Similarly, as editor of the WCTU column Callahan chose pieces that in different ways instructed Indian and non-Indian readers that texts, including newspapers, were not always reliable in constructing stable social identities, and that debate alone could foster an inclusive Native public sphere.

The WCTU column suggests a Native public sphere because it includes fictional pieces that suggest the necessity of relying on bodily signs to extend the meaning of texts in ways that suggest the interposition of both a Native American oral tradition as well as a feminist political rhetoric that belonged to acculturated Muscogee women like Callahan, one which used images of the body to indicate women’s roles and ideas about home that suggest reformist women’s identities in the public sphere of temperance politics. When issues of gender and race in the WCTU pieces are read within the context

16 As Valerie Sherer Mathes notes in “Nineteenth Century Women and Reform: The Women’s National Indian Association,” the WCTU worked with the Women’s National Indian Association, a reform group of mainly white American women who advocated for Indian women’s rights. However, there is no evidence that the WCTU organized chapters of Native women in Indian Territory. See Mathes, 10-11.
of Callahan’s mixed-blood Muscogee heritage, they suggest the presence of an inclusive Native public sphere of women and men whose role was to question the validity of texts in constituting both Native American and American national identities. In particular, the WCTU pieces suggest an invitation for readers to interrogate and even challenge the adequacy of the written word to represent a single point of view about how Indians should conduct their political affairs. In the context of Our Brother in Red and Wynema, this questioning of a single meaning for texts suggests that the novel like the newspaper represent vigorous public sphere debate about the identity of Indian Territory.

“Religious and Educational Subjects”:
Teaching an Idea of Indian Territory

While it ultimately fostered debate about the political and cultural makeup of Indian Territory, Our Brother in Red’s slogan “Christian Education the Hope of the Indian” conveyed an idea of Indian Territory that aligned with Elias Boudinot’s ideal of Native journals as teaching whites and Natives alike an idea of civilized Indianness (Murphy 172, Perdue 15, 31). Our Brother’s white audience may have responded to the religious authority of its founder, Theodore Brewer, a southern Methodist minister who came to Indian Territory in 1881 to establish Methodist schools in the Muscogee Nation (“Theodore Brewer” 322). Brewer conceived of the journal in connection to the Harrell International Institute, the school for Indian and white students he established at Muskogee in 1881 (“Theodore Brewer” 323). Brewer characterized the journal in a letter to Muscogee Chief Samuel Checote, in which he asked permission to establish a journal that would keep readers informed of “religious and educational subjects” and

---

17 Our Brother was never the official journal of Harrell. It had its own official journal, The Harrell Monthly.
“permit no political articles” (Brewer “Letter” 1). The letter to Checote, who was also a Methodist, suggests the long history of Methodism among the Muscogee in Indian Territory. However *Our Brother in Red* largely represented an Anglo-American interpretation of the faith and avoided discussion of Native Methodists, their views on religion, or their views on political issues. By avoiding political issues in *Our Brother in Red*, Brewer largely kept his promise to Checote about the content of the journal, avoiding the political topics found in newspapers such as the *Indian Journal*. In its promise to avoid political issues, *Our Brother in Red* offered moral and religious order as an antidote to the political conflicts of the period in which it was founded, a time of conflict over the issue allotment.

The journal was established at a time when the Native Nations in Indian Territory were increasingly surrounded by whites, a situation which represented the political and social environment that resulted from Indian Removal and the Civil War. In 1836-1837, the Muscogee were removed to present-day eastern Oklahoma from their traditional homelands in Alabama and Georgia through the combined effects of treaties and land grabbing whites. Removal severed Muscogee cultural connections to the southeast that were found in Muscogee origin stories that were rich in geographic detail. As historian Claudio Saunt observes, the Muscogee were one of the Indian peoples who lived along
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18 *The Indian Journal* was established at Muskogee, Creek Nation, in May, 1876, by the Indian International Printing Company, which consisted of some of the most influential citizens of the Indian Territory. The printing company, chartered by an act of the Creek National Council and signed by Principal Chief Samuel Checote on October 16, 1875, included Lochar Harjo, Ward Coachman, and Checote (Creeks); William Potter Ross and Samuel Taylor (Cherokees); Coleman Cole and Joseph P. Folsom (Choctaws); B. F. Overton (Chickasaw); and John Chupco and Jumper (Seminoles). *The Journal* received appropriations from the Creek Council in 1877, but after that the Creek government gave no official support to it.
rivers in Alabama and Georgia.\textsuperscript{19} Saunt notes that the Native Americans who lived along these rivers in the “Deep South” had “no single word” to describe themselves (Saunt 13). The British, with whom the Muscogee came into contact in the eighteenth century, distinguished between the Muscogee living along the Coosa and the Tallapoosa rivers in Alabama and those living along the Chattahoochee and Flint rivers in Georgia, calling them “Upper” and “Lower” Muscogee (13). Saunt observes that the term Muscogee, or, “Muskogee” was a name “imposed” from “without” by whites—probably as a transliteration of an Algonkian term, \textit{Muskogulge}, meaning “people of the swampy ground” (14). While the Muscogee were defined as Upper and Lower by the British, the people themselves tended to define locally, around the concept of \textit{Italua}, the concept closest to “nation” contained in the Muscogee language (Sturtevant “Creek into Seminole” 93, 97). The \textit{Italua} was not a “nation” in the European sense of people associated with a common ruler of a written code of laws. Rather, it was associated geographically with the ceremonial town center, which formed the basis for the Muscogee identity (Saunt 14 n.11). That identity from its beginnings was formed around the notion of verbal persuasion, revealing that the “teaching” of persuasive words was directly related to a specific home place.

An origin story of the Muscogee of the Kashita town shows that the people emerged from a “mouth in the ground” (Saunt 15). The Kashita journeyed east and, after proving victorious over unnamed enemies, met with the ancestors of the Appalachicolas—residents of another Muscogee town (Covington 1). Although the Muscogee brandished a red club the Appalachicola persuaded the Kashita to follow the

\textsuperscript{19} For specific information about the rivers and their tributaries see Saunt, \textit{A New Order of Things: Property, Power, and the Transformation of the Creek Indians, 1733-1816}. 13.
“white road” of peace, the Appalachicoal accordingly buried the under their cabin in a ceremony of peace symbolizing union between the Kashitas and the Appalachicolas (Saunt 15). As Saunt observes, persuasive words were at the heart of Muscogee origin stories, antidotes to violence in establishing home.

Over the course of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-centuries, violence was associated with maintaining a Muscogee home in Alabama and Georgia, as white colonists, including the Spanish, the British, and later, the Americans, pressed on their lands. When persuasive words in speeches and treaties failed, the Muscogee resorted to violence, even with one another. As a result of white encroachment on Muscogee lands in Alabama and Georgia, an increasingly forceful but small minority of wealthy Creek men began to assert power not only over their own towns and others, establishing a centralized Creek power in a national government (Chang 23). Part of this centralization of power was associated with a notion of private property and peaceful relations with the United States (24). Many Muscogee rejected this centralization of power, and a civil war ensued, called the Red Stick War, after the more traditional Red Stick Muscogee faction who rebelled against white influence and advocated rejection of white culture (Davis, 611-615). The Red Stick War concluded with the intervention of army commander Andrew Jackson and the Treaty of Fort Jackson in 1814. There, the Muscogees ceased hostilities and signed away 23 million acres—half of their remaining land, an incident that illustrates the long history of unreliable words in deciding the fate of the Muscogee home (Chang 24). Although no side “won” the Red Stick War, the private property advocates of the “Lower Towns” of the Creek Confederacy of Alabama and Georgia prevailed. Yet the unified council form of government they advocated was not respected
In essence, although the Creek Nation was “sovereign” from the American perspective, there was no settled or unitary whole Creek Nation (25).

Threats of violence and were hidden in the written words of treaties that continued to mark the Muscogee Nation prior to their removal West of the Mississippi. William McIntosh, the half-Scottish Chief of the Lower Muscogee, who represented the more acculturated bands of mixed European and Muscogee descent, was murdered at his home for signing the Treaty of Indian Springs in February 1825 (Debo Road 89-90). This treaty, which exchanged all Muscogee land in “Georgia and much of Alabama” for a “tract in Oklahoma” was rejected by the Muscogee Council, which asserted that McIntosh had been too easily persuaded by the promises of whites, as indicated by “a supplementary treaty” in which McIntosh would receive “$25,000 for his residence” and “1,640 acres” of his “improved land” (Debo History 115, Road 89). McIntosh paid with his home and his life—his house was burned and he was shot, because by Muscogee law anyone who sold land without the approval of the council received the death penalty (Debo Road 90).

While the majority of the Muscogee Nation would remain in Alabama after the Treaty of Indian Springs, Andrew Jackson’s Indian removal legislation of 1830 reminded the Muscogee that the written word was often accompanied by forceful persuasion, extreme suffering, and violence. The Muscogee signed a removal treaty in 1832 which stipulated that tribal members could receive allotments on their remaining lands in Alabama or exchange them for lands in Indian Territory (Green, Perdue 127). However, verbal and written miscommunication followed. As Angie Debo observes, “misrepresentation, the Indian not knowing what he was signing; the use of intoxicants;
the misuse of notary seals on blank instruments, to be filled in at the swindler’s convenience; outright forgery” as well as “the bribing of some subservient Indian to impersonate the owner and gin in his place” all led to violence (Road 118-119). Another civil war ensued in 1835 when, Opothle Yahola, the Chief of the Upper towns in Alabama was preparing to remove to Oklahoma with his people (119). Some of the towns erupted into desperate acts of violence, “stealing food, burning houses” and killing white settlers (119). The secretary of war immediately ordered the removal of the whole tribe as a military measure and the governor of Alabama ordered all Muscogee men who did not want to be treated as enemies of the United States to fight against the “hostiles” (119). Muscogee killed Muscogee until the resistance was broken in the summer of 1836. Debo sums up the results of these violent methods of persuasion succinctly: “The men were placed in irons and with their wailing women and children—a total of 2,495 people—were transported to Oklahoma and, literally naked, without weapons or cooking utensils, were dumped there to live or die” (119).

The process of rebuilding a Muscogee Nation after this violent removal was partly a textual one. Like the Cherokee before them, the Muscogee established a written constitution and code of laws, which represented the Muscogee nation rhetorically as unified—an important issue when the constitution was created in 1867. The years prior to the adoption of the constitution were marked by political divisions among the Muscogee (Chang 40, Saunt 34). These differences reached a crisis during the Civil War when the Lower Muscogee, some of whom owned slaves and land, increasingly supported the Confederacy, while the Upper Muscogee, who could loosely be defined as “traditional” in their cultural practices were generally supportive of the Union. The 1866
Treaty of Peace with the Federal Government forced the Muscogee to cede the western half of their country as a home for other Indians (Debo History 182 Chang 41). In a partial response to land losses and political divisions that resulted from the Civil War, the Muscogee constitution reunited Muscogees rhetorically around an idea of nation.

S. Alice Callahan’s *Wynema* takes place several decades after removal, in the late 1880s during a time in which the federal government agitated for the allotment of Native lands in Indian Territory which had been exempt from the Dawes General Allotment Act (1887). The Dawes Act divided up tribally owned land, which could be sold after a statutory period of 25 years (Hoxie A Final 32, 44, 46, Prucha American 659). The land was eventually sold to American buyers at low cost (Prucha American 227-264). Additionally, land deemed to be “surplus” beyond what was needed for allotment was opened to white settlers, though the profits from the sales of these lands were often invested in programs meant to aid the American Indians (Prucha American 659). The novel addresses the issue of allotment in Indian Territory by illustrating both Native and white responses to allotment.

Although little is known about Callahan’s life, the novel’s political themes are in part a result of Callahan’s personal responses to Indian politics. Evidence for her interest in politics can be found in her biography as well as in her fiction and role as newspaper editor. In addition to being a writer and newspaper editor, her WCTU membership also indicates that she was politically active in women’s issues. Lavonne Ruoff underscores Callahan’s feminism when she observes that Callahan reacted to contemporary women’s politics, observing that during the 1890s, “women increased their efforts to gain recognition of their rights, including suffrage” (“Justice for Indians and Women” 249).
Ruoff observes that her politically active Muscogee father, Samuel Callahan and her awareness of larger women’s political issues would have made Callahan “well aware of the injustices under the law endured by both Indians and women” (249). Callahan’s political point of view about Indians’ and women’s political issues are expressed in Callahan’s depiction of strong female characters in *Wynema*, both Native and white. In keeping with her public role as newspaper editor and author, she introduces a political identity for Muscogee women in her novel, through the Creek character Wynema, who is also a member of the WCTU, and ultimately a proponent of Indian sovereignty despite early allegiances to allotment in the novel.

Callahan’s interest in issues of allotment as suggested by *Wynema* and her investment in women’s reform issues as exemplified by her editorial role *Our Brother in Red’s* WCTU column were the result of a family legacy of involvement in Muscogee politics and a Muscogee culture of print. Both Alice Callahan and her father Samuel Callahan were involved in Muscogee journalism at the nineteenth century that resisted white constructions of Indian identity. The print culture of journalism and reform novels in which Samuel and Alice Callahan participated was a result of the Muscogees’ long legacy of writing as a way to assert national sovereignty. As historian Claudio Saunt has shown, in the eighteenth century, the Muscogee became “preoccupied with the literacy of the European colonists,” understanding immediately its power and its ability to misrepresent (187). Jack Goody notes that in the North American colonial context in which oral cultures come into contact with colonialists’ writing, writing assumes a “coercive” aspect (11). When the balance of power in a situation of cultural difference is roughly “transcultural,” which means that two or more cultures participate in a
“dialectical exchange” of cultural values (Herskovitz 151). When the colonizing culture becomes more powerful than the colonized, then the colonizer’s modes of communication, including writing, have the potential to become methods of cultural domination. Yet as Claudio Saunt observes, the history of Muscogee adaptations of writing show, although the introduction of writing into their communities produced a “reordering of Creek values,” the people adapted quickly to writing and used it for their own purposes (190-191). Saunt suggests this adaptive quality when he describes eighteenth-century Muscogees’ request for “copies of their talks as a way to confirm them to those who were not present” (191). In this sense, they ask for physical confirmation through the material fact of the text, a situation that is predicated on both the text and the speaking situation that produced it in the first place (191).

While early Muscogees who traded and made contact with colonists insisted on oral accounts of written documents, showing the ability to combined writing and speech in important ways to assert a political presence, the nineteenth-century Muscogee furthered this innovative use of writing to assert a notion of sovereignty. In the mid-nineteenth century, a Muscogee Christian convert worked with a Moravian missionary to develop a Creek alphabet based on the Roman, but with sounds that were distinctly Muscogee (Haas 180). Although the alphabet contained some letters recognizable to readers of European languages, the letters were often re-oriented on the page, and they represented Muscogee language sounds distinct from those they represented in English or European languages (180). This linguistic and chirographic sovereignty had its corollary in political writing when the Muscogee Constitution of 1867 appeared in the Muscogee alphabet (180).
The Muscogee cultural history of innovation and blending of Euro-American forms to suit particularly Muscogee concerns can be seen in the cultural heritage of Alice’s father, Samuel Callahan, whose work as a newspaper editor suggests the importance of print journalism to Native nations in the post-removal era. Callahan was born in 1833 to James Callahan, who was of Irish descent, and Amanda Doyle, who was of Muscogee descent on her mother’s side (Foreman “S. Alice” 314). According to traditional Muscogee matrilineal culture Samuel Callahan would have been counted member of his mother’s maternal clan. In an acknowledgement of a different system of national identification, he was registered by white record keepers as “one-eighth Creek” on tribal rolls at the end of the nineteenth century (314). His family located early in Texas, where he attended schools and edited a newspaper, the *Sulphur Springs Gazette*. In 1858, he married a white woman and established a large cattle ranch with headquarters at Okmulgee, Indian Territory (Ruoff xiv). A successful businessman, he was also well respected in the Muscogee political community. During the Civil War, he joined the Confederate “First Creek Mounted Volunteers” and became a Muscogee delegate to the Confederate National Congress in Richmond (Foreman “S. Alice” 314).

As Muscogees of mixed European and Native descent, Alice and Samuel Callahan represented the heritage of some of the many politically and culturally diverse groups present in the post-removal Muscogee nation. Historian David Chang has described the Muscogee nation in Indian Territory as “complex and cosmopolitan” in the post-removal era (45). Chang observes that there were three main regions in the Muscogee nation west, the “Arkansas river valley in the north, the Canadian River Valley in the south, and the valleys and hills of the Deep Fork district in the west” (45). The
Callahans, like many Muscogees of mixed European and Native ancestry, lived in the Canadian River Valley, which Chang describes as a “center of life for wealthy and commercially oriented” Muscogee (48). Yet families who owned land and businesses were not always like the Callahans of mixed European descent, and the Callahans lived alongside those who practiced traditional Muscogee farming methods, were “small farmers,” and who “grew their own food” (48). Large landholders and small farmers alike, many of whose ancestries were a mixture of African, Native, and European, identified culturally as Muscogee (48). The diversity of the Muscogee nation registered in Muscogee accounts of their people. Many in the nation considered the people of the Deep Fork district “among the most conservative” in their maintenance, despite removal, of Muscogee cultural traditions (47). This group of people were described in English, even by other Muscogee, as “full bloods” yet the term, as Chang notes, was meant to refer to the “dedication to tradition” rather than actual ancestry, which was often mixed (47).

The emphasis on categories other than biology to designate a Muscogee identity were registers of traditional Muscogee forms of self-identification. As Eva Marie Garoutte has observed, “blood quantum” identifications such the tribal roll denoting Callahan’s Muscogee heritage, were the result of the imposition of white ideas of race as well as “efficient” methods for identifying degrees of Indiannness in the late-nineteenth century, when tribal enrollment became important to identifying Indian land claims (15). While this was an imposition of legal/racial identification of Indians from a white perspective, the Muscogee had historically maintained a cultural concept of national identity. As Theda Perdue notes in her work on the Cherokee, the history of racial
identification for peoples of mixed Indian, European, and African descent in the southeastern tribes was heavily inflected by Native concepts of adoption of people outside of the organizing principle of the Muscogee nation, the town, into the tribe. This practice of adoption often took place through the taking of prisoners to replace clan or townspeople (Mixed 4). As Perdue observes, in the eighteenth century, the Muscogee accepted non-Muscogee into their towns and clans and “traditionally” had “no concept of race” (4). Rather, the concept of a Muscogee identity was based on matrilineal heritage and cultural rather than racial concepts.

Based on Samuel Callahan’s maternal lineage, both he and Alice were Muscogee. Yet Alice Callahan’s references to her Muscogee heroine in Wynema as a “dusky” Indian “maiden” indicate that S. Alice Callahan, like Sioux author Charles Eastman and Ojibwa author George Copway, was aware of the Anglo-American racial categories that informed literary tropes which appealed to non-Indian readers. From a theoretical perspective, Alice Callahan’s identification of Wynema through her skin, as well as Samuel Callahan’s blood-quantum identification as one-eighth Msucogee on tribal rolls, illustrate Euro-American racial definitions of the Indian. It also suggests the complexity of Indian identification in the Muscogee nation. Gerald Vizenor suggests a way of understanding what is at stake in these racialized representations through his concept of the indian. Vizenor shows that the indian is a “simulation” which has no basis in lived Native experience or identity. Because the Muscogee had no original idea of “race,” this term, like “blood,” are aspects of what Vizenor calls the indian because categories of “race” and “blood” are imposed upon Native peoples by whites (Fugitive 74). While Alice Callahan drew upon stereotypical images of Indian race through her reference to
Wynema’s skin, she appeals to her potential white readers’ ideas about Natives. In this sense, Callahan’s representation of Wynema can be understood in the context of similar appeals to white readers on the part of other nineteenth-century Native writers. In one such appeal to stereotype, George Copway referred to himself as an “child of the forest” in his autobiography, a self-reference which can be seen as both a resistant sign of self-naming as well as an appeal to white readers. While Callahan does not write autobiography in *Wynema* she and Copway write within a familiar framework of literary images of Indians. From the theoretical perspective of Native self-representaiton in literature, Samuel Callahan’s quantified Muscogee identity and Alice Callahan’s reference to Wynema’s skin were two instances of the *indian* based on white racial categories. Vizneor notes that “*indian blood quantum* authenticity” is “nonsense” and that Native identity is constituted by artistic creations that come from a lived Native experience, which, as Vizenor notes, is difficult to ascertain because in the colonial context, Native representation is always in danger of becoming a “simulation” (75). An example of this “simulation” was the category of race, which can be contextualized as a construction of nineteenth-century discourse about Indians. Authors such as Callahan worked within this world of literary simulation in their writing exploited it in an effort to communicate Native concerns to white audiences.

Although categories of race may have been Anglo-American social constructions, from a Muscogee perspective, Alice and Samuel Callahan were Muscogee through maternal heritage. Although they claimed a Muscogee matrilineal heritage, they were not socially identifiable as “traditional” Muscogee whose land use practices conformed more closely to those of historically communal farming practices. The Callahans were
members of a segment of Muscogee society that also identified culturally along Anglo-American lines of class. This “Muscogee aristocracy” often lived in the eastern portion of the nation in “comfortable homes” and “great ranch houses” (Ruoff xv). Because they were literate—Samuel Callahan was educated in Texas and Alice in both Texas and Virginia as well as in Indian Territory, they were influential in constructing an idea of the Muscogee nation in print (xv). The issues of Muscogee identity in the writing of literate, acculturated Muscogee like the Callahans is suggested in an essay on the writing of mixed-blood Muscogee George Washington Grayson. Grayson was an acquaintance of Samuel Callahan and a fellow editor on the same newspaper, the Indian Journal (Littlefield, Parins “Indian Journal” 191). Although Grayson and Callahan could attribute their roles in Muscogee print culture as part of their cultural heritage as educated, mixed-blood Muscogee, Robert Sayre argues that in a nineteenth-century context, the term “blood” as used in reference to “mixed bloods” like Grayson and Callahan is an “ideological prejudice” that “masquerades as a kind of racial theory” (161). According to the late-nineteenth-century ideology of “blood,” mixed bloods were considered “closer to civilization” and thus “presumably more ‘adapted’ and ‘advanced’” than full bloods (161). However, Sayre notes the racialization of “blood” is usually part of “glib” attempts to define Native identity for the purposes of acquiring Native lands (162). As Sayre observes, mixed bloods like Grayson resisted federal policies, writing against in his 18?? autobiography the federal drive to take “self government from people who had been self governing for centuries” (170). In other words, as Sayre observes, Grayson used literacy and social position in the Muscogee community to assert Muscogee sovereignty (170). Samuel Callahan, like Grayson, can be understood as both
defined by “blood” but also by their desire to assert Native sovereignty during a post-
Civil War period in which Native lands in Indian Territory were threatened by federal
policies of allotment (162).

As Sayre’s description of Grayson’s writing suggests, questions of identity are
also questions of textual representation. In the Muscogee nation after the Civil War,
newspapers became a site for asserting this resistant sovereignty in the face of threats to
the Indian nations, which included expanding railroads in Indian Territory and debates
over the issue of allotting Indian lands in severalty (Chang 71-81). One such expression
of sovereignty was the Indian Journal, for which Samuel Callahan worked as managing
editor from 1887-1889. Callahan’s position as a businessman, land owner, as well as his
work in the Muscogee government granted him authority within the community of
newspapers in Indian Territory. The interconnected power structures of text and political
life are suggested in an editorial column from the January 1887 issue of the journal,
which presented Callahan’s credentials to readers: “S.B. Callahan as editor” observed
“Judge Lerblance of the Creek Nation,” “needs no introduction” (Lerblance
“Introduction” 2). Lerblance continues, noting that Callahan is a “citizen of this Nation, a
man of education, and his ability will be shown through these columns” (2).

The Indian Journal was established by order of the Indian International Printing
Company, at Muskogee, in 1876 (Ray Early 54). The “Printing Company” was chartered
by an act of the Creek National Council, and the Council gave the Journal official
appropriations in 1877, after which point it received no official support from the Council
(Littlefield, Parins 188). Although the printing company was pan-tribal—its members
were Creek, Cherokee, Choctaw, and Seminole, it contained news of local disagreements
between tribes in Indian Territory and the federal government (188). When he took the editorial position in 1887, Callahan retained the same basic editorial policies of his predecessor, Leo Bennett, who was a Muscogee citizen by marriage (192). Bennett’s editorial goals indicate the tenor of the Journal. The first of these goals was to counteract the effects of “one-sided” and “unfair” coverage of Indian affairs in the press (Ray 55, Littlefield, Parins 192). While they were undoubtedly aimed at non-Indian newspapers’ coverage of Indian affairs, Bennett’s statements were also directed at other Native newspapers, suggesting the insistence of “official” tribal voices in Native newspapers, even those like the Journal that did not have support from specific tribal governments.

Like his father, Indian Progress editor Elias Cornelius Boudinot fell afoul of “official” tribal views, and, although he was not murdered for his sentiments, the Muscogee Council ordered the journal’s printing press removed (Ray 55). In the first issue, Boudinot had asserted that Indian Territory should be opened to white settlement (Ray 55). It was for this view that he Progress was ordered closed after its first numbers by order of the Muscogee Council, who disagreed with Boudinot’s political views (Littlefield, Parins 214). The unified tribal position of the Muscogee toward Boudinot’s journal was also reflected in the Indian Journal’s other editorial goals, which were maintained by Callahan during his tenure from 1887-1889. It was anti-allotment, which Callahan considered to be as disastrous for Indians as removal, and it also emphasized Native national sovereignty. It argued that the right to determine citizenship in the Indian Nations rested with the people of the Indian nations alone. Similarly, it argued against the idea that “citizens of the Indian Territory could be made citizens of the United States by congressional fiat” (Littlefield, Parins 192-193).
“Christian Education, the Hope of the Indian”:

*Our Brother in Red’s* Light in a Textual Terrain

While the *Indian Journal* suggests Samuel Callahan’s politicized role in representing an “official” Muscogee voice, *Our Brother in Red* asserted another official voice in describing Indian Territory, the Methodist Church, south. Reflecting the context of the Muscogee religious primers printed in both Muscogee and English, such as the one published at the Union Mission in 1835, *Our Brother* contained some Muscogee language pieces and was religious and didactic in purpose. As a tool for moral and religious instruction, the newspaper helped readers impose order where there was social change and sometimes lawlessness after the Civil War and the arrival of the railroad. The journal’s masthead, “Christian Education, the Hope of the Indian,” indicated the educational and religious context for the newspaper. Brewer, who was not Muscogee, had come to Indian Territory to work in the post-Civil-War Indian education effort. The context for which was an increasingly shrill federal Indian policy that simultaneously forwarded allotment and education programs for Indians as a anecdote to post-Civil War demands for western lands.

When Brewer established *Our Brother in Red* the Indian nations throughout the western United States were increasingly surrounded by whites, a situation that was often recast by the American press as a story of white victimhood and Indian savagery. As John Coward has shown in *The Newspaper Indian: Native American Identity in the Press, 1820-90*, major newspapers during periods of white conflict with Indians on the plains during the 1870s often pieces contained splashy headlines like “Redskin Murderers” and
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20 Get something here about lawlessness due to white settlements—excerpt from OBR (occasional though they were) discussing death by murder. Then talk about the Native newspaper’s relationship to death—Boudinot.
“Cunning Chiefs,” and were often used as terms to define Indians, constructing an image of Native barbarism in the American press (199). Frederick Hoxie has shown that some of these journalistic attitudes towards Indians were changing in the 1870s and 1880s to account for a larger American sense that Indian policy was a failure (A Final 6). In Indian Territory during the 1880s, Native American national newspapers such as the Cherokee Advocate engaged in the war of words with the American press, consistently registering their position as representative of the “civilization” which the five tribes of Indian Territory, thus distancing themselves rhetorically from less civilized western tribes (Coward 168). Although it was not a national newspaper, Our Brother in Red also participated in this rhetoric of civilization because it hoped to represent the reformist power of the Methodists to “civilize” Indian Territory and prove their importance in the context of other religious groups that hoped to spread their influence throughout the United States by civilizing Native Americans. In the 1880s, the rhetorical task of representing religious “brotherhood” with Indians in the Territory was one of ignoring local conflict through the rhetoric of Christian unity.

When the journal was established in 1881, white encroachment was once again causing chaos for the five tribes. Beginning in 1880, homesteaders and speculators, known as “Boomers,” ventured over the Kansas-Indian Territory border to seize land (Chang 76). The result of white land seizure and the establishment of railroad lines through towns like Muskogee were disastrous. According to Angie Debo, “Muskogee presented the hardest problem” (231). During the land-rush era, it had a population of “few if any . . . Creeks” and many whites who had no rights to citizenship (231). In Muskogee and other towns near railroad hubs like Eufaula, also in the Muscogee nation,
the “intoxicants” were “freely dispensed” despite longstanding tribal and federal bans on alcohol trade and consumption. When the Creeks and other Civilized Tribes were removed to Indian Territory in the 1830s, each of them passed legislation “regulating the behavior of members” through judicial systems that enforced the laws (Klein 17). Although powerful and substantial, tribal anti-liquor laws encountered difficulty in enforcement because white squatters on Indian land were not subject to tribal law (17). As always, there was a direct relationship between white encroachment on Indian lands and lawlessness. Tribal governments requested help from the federal government in ejecting non-Indians from their lands, but because a few federal officers were expected to cover the entire region, enforcement was uneven and slow (17). In Indian Territory, whites sold liquor to both Indians and non-Indians in Indian Territory without fear of prosecution. The argument against liquor sales and consumption in Indian Territory was largely levied by middle-class white reformers against a growing working-class population of whites in the Territory (6). The construction of railroads in Indian Territory after the Civil War and the creation of Oklahoma Territory in 1889 attracted a “significant working-class population” of whites to the region (6). Liquor was legalized in Oklahoma Territory, and “saloon towns” bordering the Seminole and Chickasaw nations to the east and south gained a violent reputation (18).

In the context of such social disruption, Our Brother in Red represented moral order. The newspaper’s masthead image depicts a light radiating from its place on stacks of books. Near the books are written documents, as well as a pen. The image of writing and reading suggests that the journal played an exemplary role in bringing the “light” of civilization to Indian Territory. The masthead image also implies that Our Brother in Red
was an exemplar for other journals, a moral light by which readers could navigate the potentially uneven textual terrain of newsprint in Indian Territory. This guiding role was asserted in an 1891 editorial, which Brewer observes that Our Brother was “sound on moral issues” and would not publish “bad or objectionable advertisements” (1). An editorial in the newspaper’s May 16 issue shows how editor Theodore Brewer offered the journal as a moral guide and teacher to readers. The editorial “Hard Up” recalls a protest lodged by Our Brother against the Wynnewood Herald for agreeing to advertise for saloons. In the editorial, Brewer quotes the Herald’s editorial claims that it cannot reject advertisements for saloons because “it takes money to run this sheet,” to which Brewer responds that any newspaper editor who “indiscriminately” admits advertisements to its pages does not know how to “run a newspaper for the elevation of his race” (4). The reference to race in Brewer’s response indicates that the Wynnewood Herald was not a religious journal, and for this reason did not provide an exemplary role for potential Native readers, or for whites interested in Native American civilization. While historical evidence does not reveal whether the editor of the Herald was Native American, the comment suggests that the editor of Our Brother in Red was aware of the role of print journalism in teaching, or at least representing a way of civilizing and, from a non-Native perspective, “uplifting” Native Americans.

While the tone of the journal was morally didactic, readers of Our Brother in Red found some political news in its pages, however. The June 13 1891 issue contains an article on the Cherokee debate over allotment that is politically neutral. It observes that the “First guns of the great political battle to be fought in the Cherokee Nation were fired at Blue Jacket . . . by three candidates for principal chief and other leading politicians”
(4). The piece names those Cherokee who were in favor of allotment as “Messrs Bushyhead, Bell, and Morgan” while those opposed are listed as “Chief Mayes, Capt. Jackson” and “Judge Walker” (“Local Politics” 4). Although further comment on the issue of Cherokee allotment was not forthcoming in 1891, other issues of political comment were the acquisition of the Cherokee Outlet by the United States. This piece of land comprised roughly 6 million acres in what is now northwestern Oklahoma. It was not contiguous with lands where the Cherokee resided in 1891 but rather was originally ceded to them as an “outlet” to their hunting grounds (Alston, Spiller 85). Under a Treaty in 1866, the Cherokee acquired incomplete property rights to the Outlet lands, and the United States government reserved the right to use the lands for other purposes, in particular to resettle other Native peoples in the area (85). The U.S. government also retained the ability to enforce property rights in the Outlet (85). When post-Civil War boom in ranching reached surrounding states, including Kansas, the land values increased and the Cherokee sought to benefit from their partial title to the land by leasing or renting it to ranchers (85). However, this caused problems between Cherokees and ranchers who questioned the Cherokees full title to the land. Eventually, in 1891, the U.S. government made a “forced” purchase of the Outlet and in 1893 it was opened up to white settlement (85). An editorial from December 1891 comments on the situation. An editorial piece from the December issue observes that there are “6,000,000 acres of this ‘Strip’ land, and it will make a handsome addition to the booming territory of Oklahoma, which will soon begin to assume the proportions, and we hope the rights, of statehood” (Dec 3 p3). The piece was not attributed to another journal, which indicates that its commendation of statehood represented the views of Our Brother in Red’s editor F.W. Moore, who had
replaced Theodore Brewer as editor in November 1891.

The most likely readers for the journal, missionaries and those interested in Christian progress in Indian Territory, also wrote letters to the newspaper. Littlefield and Parins note that the journal was distributed to 354 post offices. Of these, 91 were in Indian Territory, and the others were in thirty-nine states and territories (Littlefield, Parins 290). A regular “Notes from the Field” column, which contained letters from missionaries in Indian Territory support Littlefield and Parins observation that the journal’s purpose was to “provide the East with news of missionary efforts” in Indian Territory (290). Based on letters written to the “Notes from the Field” column during 1891, the “field” as it appears in Our Brother was mainly the Creek Nation, although one missionary writes from the “house of a Christian family” in the Cherokee Nation (Smith “Letter” 2).

A similar preoccupation in the newspaper with defining geographic territory can be found in the “Children’s Corner” column, which appeared from 1887-1893. This column contained letters from children around Indian Territory that referred to the newspaper’s editor as “Uncle Marcus” and to themselves in their letters as “cousins,” “nieces,” or “nephews.” The familial context of these letters suggests the paternalism of Indian politics and the educational circumstances for Brewer’s work in Indian Territory. The “cousins” letters do not indicate specifically Native writers (and readers) through cultural references, such as names or tribal customs, nor does the English in the letters indicate specifically “Red” English dialects. However, it is possible that some of the
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21 According to the January 1883 issue, the total circulation for the journal was 1500 (January 1883 p4). Subscriptions slowly increased over the next six years. In January 1889 the circulation was 1700 (January 1889 p4). By January 1891, when Callahan’s name first appeared over the WCTU column, the circulation was listed as 1950 (4). Six months later fifty more readers brought total circulation numbers to 2000 (May 17 4).
children were from acculturated families like S. Alice Callahan’s. Their letters typically reference letters from other “cousins” who write seeking information about Bible passages. In keeping with Uncle Marcus’s request that the students note the towns or regions in which they live, the young letter writers always inform Uncle Marcus of their geographic location in Indian Territory. Brewer’s preoccupation with demonstrating the geographic reach of readership in Indian Territory indicates that Our Brother was creating an image of the Muscogee nation and Indian Territory as civilized and Christian.

“No Schism in the Body”: Sentimental Discourse and the Maternal Commonwealth

If editor Brewer considered the newspaper a textual exemplar for Indian Territory, then “Miss Alice Callahan” helped to create the journal’s exemplary quality. Her name first appears as “Editress” in the January 17 1891 issue of the journal. Although Callahan’s scant biography and the WCTU’s pages contain no record for her duties as editor of the three column WCTU page, it is likely that she chose the short pieces excerpted from other journals on temperance or other morally instructional topics that were included on the WCTU page. The WCTU columns contained some original fiction and essays; however, none of them were attributed to Callahan. Her editorial role as one who pieces together texts suggests the masthead image’s light among books and manuscripts. Callahan had come to Our Brother in Red from a teaching position at the Harrell International Institute, where she also edited the school’s newspaper, the Harrell Monthly (Foreman “S. Alice” 7). While documentary evidence about the nature of Callahan’s editorial role at Our Brother in Red is not detailed, the role that newspapers played in Callahan’s brief life indicates that for Callahan, as for Native American writers such as Cherokee Phoenix editor Elias Boudinot, newspaper provided not only moral
instruction but a public voice. In addition to the Harrell Monthly, Callahan was also an editor for Wealaka Wit and Wisdom, the newspaper of the Wealaka Boarding School for Creek children at Muskogee, for which she served as superintendent (Foreman 7).

By the time S. Alice Callahan began to write her novel and work as an editor for Our Brother in Red in 1891, the Muscogee nation was in a compromised position over the issue of allotment. Beginning in 1880, homesteaders and speculators, known as “Boomers,” ventured over the Kansas-Indian Territory border to seize land (Chang 76). Although these squatters were removed by federal troops at the request of Creek authorities, they were eventually allowed to “make a dash for a choice piece of ‘unassigned land’” in the Land Rush of 1889, in which 50 million acres of now unassigned lands which had been taken from Native nations after the Civil War were opened up for settlement (76-78). Much of this land was the same that the Creek had given up under the treaty of 1866, when Muscogee lands were taken as punishment for the Confederate sympathies of some of the nation’s members. By the early 1890s, the Creeks were “surrounded by white farmers” (78). Indian Territory itself had shrunk in size due to the acquisition of the Cherokee Strip, which was added to Oklahoma Territory. Thus enclosed and compromised, the Muscogee and other nations in Indian Territory were under pressure to allot. The Federal government wanted Indians in the Territory to agree to the allotment of their lands. Non-Natives in Oklahoma Territory, which was organized under the Organic Act in 1890, agitated for that Territory’s statehood (Stewart 327-335). Indian nations had experienced internal and external political pressures since removal, and newspapers were a place for nations to express their political views.
A religious piece from the January 17 WCTU column suggests *Our Brother in Red’s* instructional role and the possibility of Native readers who can be imagined as students of the journal’s moral lessons. The piece is titled in English “Our First Parents Driven From Paradise,” but it appears in the Muscogee language only (6). The title of the Native language essay refers to the Garden of Eden and suggests the Native “paradise” Callahan refers to in her introduction to *Wynema*, where she describes the “obscure place” which is Wynema’s home (1). The word “obscure” implies Callahan’s view of traditional Muscogee life from the point of view of acculturated, mixed-blood Muscogee society. It also reveals a lack of experience with traditional Muskogee culture in evidence throughout the novel. Callahan appears to refer to popular images of Plains Indian peoples when she observes that Wynema’s parents “dwelt in a teepee” surrounded by a “village of tents” (*Wynema* 1). As Craig Womack has pointed out, Callahan does not present an accurate picture of traditional Muscogee culture (*Red* 111). While Womack’s criticisms question *Wynema’s* expression of Native sovereignty and the continuance of Native culture, he also observes that it is impossible to dictate any authoritative or Muscogee perspective (111). It is possible that by refusing to describe Muscogee life in any detail and instead in this reference presenting white readers with expected stereotypes of tepee-dwelling plains Indians known from contemporary images of plains Indians such as the Sioux, Callahan once again makes a point about the openness of the Native public sphere to political debate while refusing to reveal her culture to further white scrutiny and potential exploitation.

While she may have refused to stereotype traditional Muscogee culture as she knew it, her assimilated cultural position within Muscogee society suggests that the light
Alice Callahan sheds on the “obscure” place of the Muscogee Nation is one of an educated Christian woman’s perspective on Muscogee life. In Wynema, Callahan participates in a language of savagery and civilization that was part of nineteenth century discourse on American Indians often used to appeal to whites on behalf of Indians in favor of “lifting” them out of ignorance and savagery. She uses this language of uplift when she initially describes Wynema as a “little savage” who “tramps” through her idealized Native homeland, which Callahan describes as a “home like unto the one your forefathers owned before the white man came upon the scene” (1). Although the country of the “forefathers” is a pre-contact America, it could also be the lands promised to Indian nations in treaties with the United States. When her reference to the forefathers’ lands are read in this way, Callahan’s statements about pre-contact America become politically charged comments about colonialism and the damaging potential of allotment.

The descriptions of Natives and their homes in Wynema indicate Callahan’s awareness of popular images of Indian “primitives” and “savages” that were used to appeal to whites. When the “forefathers” home is described, however, Callahan appears to speak directly to Indians. This reference to a Native audience may simply be a rhetorical device, but it suggests that from the perspective of Callahan’s acculturated Muscogee class, less acculturated Natives like the fictional Wynema do not fully understand their threatened position. Callahan’s didactic method is suggested in the same opening paragraph, where she observes, “Ah, happy, peaceable Indians! Here you may dream of the happy hunting-grounds beyond, little thinking of the rough, white hand that will soon shatter your dream and scatter the dreams” (1). The “dream” of Indians is to be left untouched by whites. The role of newspapers and newspaper reading is to educate
Indian readers so that they can read and understand the “rough white hand” that will disrupt the dream of maintaining Indian homes. Instead of simply speaking for Natives who are represented as not literate, Callahan’s suggestion is that literacy can allow them to more fully participate in the inclusive Native public sphere that she develops in the novel.

Despite Callahan’s potentially resistant aims in *Wynema*, some of the religious passages in the WCTU column that refer to place show that through Callahan’s editorial choices, potential Native readers were being taught to understand a particularly Christian, Anglo-American way of conceiving their homes. In the January 17 column, under the article “Our First Parents Driven From Paradise” is a passage from the New Testament, John 14 3, which appears in the Muscogee language only (6). According to The King James version of the beginning of Chapter 14, verse 3 begins, “And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also” (St. John 136). While it was meant to provide a religious lesson, it is important to speculate about Bible passages used in the context of contemporary politics. As Bernd Payer notes in his work on Indian writing in Christian contexts, European legal ideology was based on the written word, a legal reliance on writing that can be traced in part to the Bible (*Tutor’d* 10). In a colonial context, the shift away from Native oral-legal traditions to written ones introduced a set of “abstract rules listed in written codes,” which resulted in a more impersonal relationship between the ruler and the ruled (10). In the case of the passage from the Book of John the abstraction is evident in the textual nature of the excerpt; however the abstraction of the textual reference is undermined by the oral relationship assumed by the reference to the “I” and the “you.” On the printed
page of the newspaper, the direct reference to the reader as “you” assumes a personal relationship that suggests an oral tradition that calls upon a relationship between a speaker and listener.

While the oral quality of the passage from John suggests orality and Native contexts, the textual nature of the direct speaker-listener relationship becomes questionable and unreliable in the context of Native identity. In the context of the newspaper’s circulation, the “I” could be interpreted as the journal with its potential to circulate among Native and non-Native readers and to locate them in a specifically textual landscape that describes the nation and helps them to understand their place in it. Described in letters from readers as a “welcome visitor” and a “faithful friend,” the textual “I” of the newspaper can be gendered with reference to its editor Brewer. However, if it is read within the context of Alice Callahan’s role as editor, the “I” is one of acculturated Indian woman articulating a public voice that asks Native people to question the sources of textual power in the public sphere of print. As LaVonne Ruoff has observed, the Callahans were of a class of Muscogee who were “in control of Muscogee politics” (Wynema xv). While this class of Muscogee owned businesses and land and shared in the same material wealth as white counterparts of a similar class outside of Indian Territory, they also held responsibility for publicly representing the Muscogee Nation through print (xv). If the relationship between mixed bloods and full bloods as imagined by Callahan is one of teacher to pupil, then Bible readings represent a way of teaching Native readers how to understand the press as a form of print sympathetic to those it seeks to uplift, an important point for Native American communities for whom the printed word was unreliable, often represented by broken
treaties and false agreements.

The unreliability of printed text as well as an idea of a gendered public sphere is suggested in the short fictional piece “My Little Newsboy” by Ada Melville develops the notion of newspapers as a site for understanding sympathetic power relations through newspapers. Melville was herself an “editress,” having been an editor for the WCTU’s children’s journal *The Young Crusader*, which was published from 1887 through the 1930s (Parker 137 n18). As Allison Parker observes of the literature in the *Crusader*, its fiction demonstrated that women reformers’ saw their writing for children as an alternative to increasingly popular sensational fiction for young people (138). In keeping with what Parker calls the *Crusader*’s literature as exemplifying a “cultural hierarchy that prioritized morality as a crucial component of aesthetics” journals like the *Crusader* allowed women to produce texts of both “civic” and “class” identity (137). The short story “My Little Newsboy” indicates that the WCTU column offered morality as a social framework but that it also emphasizes a middle-class identity as well as a civic identity for women. Crucially, if it is read as a fictional choice made by S. Alice Callahan as editor for the WCTU column, it suggests the role which Native women played in the WCTU’s public sphere of reform.

The themes of “My Little Newsboy” are indicative of the WCTU’s preoccupation with morality and social behavior. As in *Wynema*, newspapers are connected to social uplift; however, they are unreliable tools for improvement until a middle-class white woman intercedes to interpret their value. The story follows “Curly Charlie,” a young newspaper seller of “six or seven” who supports his ailing mother after his drunken father “starved the family almost to death” (“My Little” 6). The narrator discovers Charlie in an
unnamed city selling the “mornin’ papers” near a railway station. Charlie’s role as family breadwinner shows how the WCTU’s column united the public sphere of newsprint with the private realm of sentimental feeling that is embodied in the family. The narrator appears to be an exemplar of the WCTU’s idea of the “maternal commonwealth,” the organization’s network of white, middle-class women involved in temperance work, specifically as part of the WCTU’s “home protection” movement (Marilley 126). Barbara Epstein has described “home protection” as the WCTU’s advocacy to “defend the family” through women’s anti-saloon activities and working among the poor and immigrant communities to educate them about the dangers of alcohol (Epstein 129). The idea of “home protection” privileged middle-class ideas about the family, emphasizing women’s roles as mothers and the “moral role of women in the family and society” (129). The argument that the sexes should be governed by middle-class women’s ideals of morality merged with a similar argument that “men should become more like women, more nurturing and sympathetic” (127). This feminization of society was a rhetorical strategy in the nineteenth century that Ann Douglas has shown combined convincingly with urbanization and industrialization to disguise the changes in family structures, such as an increasingly professionalized middle-class male, and increasingly working-class female workforce whose employment took them away from home for many hours, isolating and disrupting traditional family units after the Civil War (Feminization 12). In “My Little Newsboy” it is possible to see how the narrator stands for both female and male family roles, suggesting the need for stereotypically male gendered traits for women’s public self-presentation. As “Newsboy” reveals, men are absent or feminized so that they become male versions of the female protagonist. As a
representative of the WCTU’s female public sphere, the protagonist of “Newsboy” is cast as both man and woman, a hybrid figure whose masculine traits allow her to interpret both the disembodied political news which Charlie’s newspaper conveys and the sentimental culture which his body represents.

The female narrator of “My Little Newsboy” is both a middle-class mother and replacement father for little working-class Charlie. The narrator’s gender is not learned until several paragraphs into the short story. At first, she is coded as male through images of work. We first encounter the narrator, who “alights from a train” at the station where Curly Charlie is selling newspapers with the cry “read all ‘bout the ‘l’ection” (6). The narrator does not buy a newspaper but instead goes to an “office,” where, although initially “haunted” by the boy’s “soulful brown eyes” the narrator observes, “business was absorbing, the politics of the time exciting, and the curly headed child who had so filled my thoughts was being quickly forgotten” (6). The reference to politics suggests the content of the newspaper Charlie sells. The narrator’s statements also suggest a convergence of the masculine public sphere of politics and the traditionally feminine world of sentiment and the family. Business and politics remove the narrator from the realm of feeling for the sad figure of the urchin Charlie (4). At the point of her retreat to the office, we do not know that the narrator is female. It is only when she finds Charlie sobbing near the railway station and the boy refers to her as “m’am” that her gender is made clear.

A closer examination of how the narrator “reads” Charlie, his family, and the working poor among whom he lives is illustrative of the intersection of what Glenn Hendler has called the “disembodied” world of male-dominated politics and the
feminized and privatized world of sentiment (37). The narrator does not react to the boy’s sales pitch about the newspaper, selling the unnamed “l’ection.” Instead, she notes that it is his physical action, the “frantic wave of a ragged old handkerchief” that gains him a customer (4). Rather than reacting to the newsprint Charlie sells, the narrator reacts to his corporeal signs, suggesting the dominance of stereotypically feminine bodily signs of signification rather than the abstraction of the printed word, which in Habermasian terms is the public sphere of “rational-critical” debate that is the purview of male citizens.

Equally as significant as the narrator’s reaction to Charlie’s body is the “ragged handkerchief” that he waves. While its color is not designated, it suggests a tattered version of the white ribbons worn by WCTU members to indicate their allegiance to what Frances Willard called the “white life,” or the life of middle-class moral purity and temperance (Marilley 120). The tattered handkerchief suggests the struggles of the working class to conform to Willard’s hopeful vision of pure middle-class family life. However, the narrator’s reaction to it also suggests the middle-class woman’s ability to misread indicators of class and interpret them as in need of reformation. In this sense, then, Charlie’s waving handkerchief is a sign of the difficulty in forming stable families for the working poor in industrial America. Contemporary narratives about the urban working poor, such as Stephen Crane’s 1893 novel “Maggie, A Girl of the Streets” indicate that the working classes were often identified through their materially obvious contrasts with the middle class. For example, Crane identifies Maggie with her failed attempts to decorate her home in what she believes to be a middle class way—her “faint attempts” to decorate “dingy curtains” are “piteous” (48). Yet if Charlie’s handkerchief signals his poverty, it also suggests a flag of surrender. If it is read in this way, then the
novel’s depiction of reading becomes about the narrator’s reading Charlie from her political perspective as a reformer as willing to be uplifted through middle-class women’s efforts.

As a signal of surrender, Charlie’s handkerchief indicates his willingness to follow the “white life,” or the WCTU’s middle-class interpretation of domesticity. In the context of nineteenth-century feminist-abolitionist discourse, if the narrator of “My Little Newsboy” reads Charlie’s handkerchief as a sign of surrender to the WCTU’s cause, then “My Little Newsboy” suggests what Karen Sanchez-Eppler describes as reformist women’s groups’ “annihilation” of those they wished to support (4). At the end of “Newsboy,” when Charlie dies of grief of the death of his mother, the narrator sits by his coffin, reading his death with sad sighs of an “inevitable decline” (6). Charlie’s death fulfills the expected trajectory of a middle-class woman’s reformist efforts because through these efforts, death is the only inevitable outcome of poverty, making way for the middle class. While the narrator has made attempts to draw Charlie and his mother out of their lives, the mother’s and Charlie’s subsequent physical illnesses indicate that they are unfit for the “white life” of the WCTU. Thus it is not surprising when the narrator gives Charlie a “few pennies” for him to give his mother, since he has not sold any newspapers, we see the replacement of male roles of work replaced by a middle-class woman’s power over the working-class family (6). The narrator alone provides the support that Charlie needs, only gives pennies to the young Charlie after he has been unable to sell newspapers, not while he is selling them in order to help him support his working-class family. Thus, the narrative conclusion of “My Little Newsboy” is that unless strong efforts are made on the part of middle-class women to reform the domestic lives of the
poor, they must inevitably disappear.

The role of the narrator in suggesting that texts that represent the laboring poor are in a fundamental way illegible and therefore cannot be represented reflects the role that sentiment played in making women’s public and political roles “safe” for the majority. Although writing may have been circumspect when it represented or was sold by those who were of the laboring classes, it was the primary way for middle-class white women in the organization to assert themselves publicly through the circulation of temperance literature. As one aspect of the WCTU’s textual maternal “empire,” *Our Brother in Red’s* WCTU column allowed Callahan to assert this political public role for Native women. “Republican” motherhood is an idea that Linda Kerber has described as “an apparent integration of domestic and political behavior, in a formula that masked political purpose by promise of domestic service” (43). In the context of late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century American politics, the Republican mother’s “socializing” role within her family impacted society by “refusing to marry unpatriotic men, by raising their sons to be next generation of virtuous citizens” (Kerber 15). This definition of women’s roles is essentially defined by their roles in the home, even as it suggests that women’s roles extended beyond the domestic sphere of the home (15). As Kerber asserts, “women were citizens of the nation; they could be naturalized; they were subject to its laws; as single adult women, they were vulnerable to taxation” (264). In this sense, their presence challenged the notion of “coverture,” the system of law that transferred a woman's civic identity to her husband at marriage, giving him use and direction of her property throughout the marriage” (264-265). Their presence as citizens was “incompatible with revolutionary ideology and with the liberal commercial society
developing in the early republic” (265).

The WCTU provided a public expression for American women in the late nineteenth century that did not threaten social order, because, like the eighteenth-century Republic Mother ideal, the WCTU asked only partial political representation for women, through limited suffrage rights on temperance issues (Epstein 118-119). As Carol Mattingly notes, in fostering the WCTU’s role in educating women about issues of temperance and family values through the “white life” ideal, WCTU president Frances Willard created a “formal network outside of the recognized establishments for education” that allowed women a public voice (44). In a public sphere effort to literally give women a voice, the WCTU’s educational organizations instructed women in public speaking techniques through courses in rhetoric, in which women took on publicly articulate political voices and public personas (44).

Although it is not clear that Alice Callahan attended any WCTU educational meetings, through her editorial role at Our Brother in Red she gains both a political voice and a public persona that extends the development of her public and political roles through authoring Wynema. As a WCTU member, Callahan complicates what has been identified as the WCTU’s segregated and racist stance on African American and immigrant rights by articulating a Native woman’s role within the organization (130-131). As Barbara Epstein observes, Willard made public statements about immigrants and anti-lynching laws in The New York Voice that were attacked in another journal by Ida B. Wells (144). Willard publically apologized in the WCTU’s newspaper The Union, indicating that newsprint was integral to the formation and circulation of the WCTU’s ideals.
While the issue of race drew negative publicity for Willard, her apology in *The Union* suggests a recognition of the importance of non-Anglo American women to the political image and message of the WCTU. Although Willard advocated for segregated WCTU organizations for African American women, and rallied in their support, the WCTU offered no such organization for Native women. Willard toured Oklahoma and spoke there in the early 1890s. The WCTU had formed unions in Indian Territory by the 1890s, establishing a union in Muskogee in 1890. However, the WCTU also relied upon non-white members for regional strength of representation, and Willard’s activism in the South brought southern women black and white into the public world of reform (*Frances Willard: A Biography*, Ruth Bordin 113). WCTU had established local unions in Indian Territory by 1890, having created a union in Muskogee, the site publication for *Our Brother in Red* in 1891.

**“For God and Home and Native Land”:**

*Our Brother in Red* and a Muscogee Woman’s Public Sphere

As an extension of the “maternal republic,” Callahan’s WCTU column suggests an acculturated Native woman’s public sphere that articulates Native women’s suffrage in both Native and American terms. In this sense, the column is an extension of the discussion of Muscogee women’s proposed political roles in *Wynema*. Through her discussion of suffrage in the novel, Callahan links a discussion of temperance reform in Indian Territory with Muscogee women’s suffrage. In a scene in which *Wynema*

---

22 Other locations for WCTU chapters in Indian Territory were Tahlequah, Atoka, Vinita, Wagoner, Claremore, Prior Creek, and Poteau. Klein 112.
discusses both temperance and suffrage issues with the white missionary Robin Weir, Callahan describes the need for temperance legislation in Indian Territory in racial terms. Wynema comments that “‘firewater’ is an awful thing among your people who are more civilized than we are, and you can imagine what a terrible influence it exerts among my people” (44). Wynema’s comments suggest the racial component of the temperance agenda, since the term “civilized” refers to both the cultural and racial differences between whites and Indians, and the late-nineteenth-century context of social evolutionary theory in which Indians were less developed as a result of racially inherent qualities (Pfister 129). The ensuing dialogue on temperance between Robin Weir and Wynema indicates her allegiance to the woman-centered racial and class biases of the WCTU. When Robin comments that it is “against the law of the United States to carry whisky or any intoxicant” into Indian Territory, Wynema’s response suggests that the WCTU sought to cast itself as a sentimental, and thus corporeal, extension of the abstract “laws” of the United States. Wynema’s response indicates the bodily aspect of the WCTU’s temperance rhetoric when she states that despite the punishment of whisky smugglers, the punishment does not “materially affect the unholy and unlawful practice” (44). The reference to the material is also a reference to the bodies of the punished, and Wynema further describes the material results of whisky trade in racial terms: “Only last Christmas . . . drunken Indians and white men were to be seen on the streets of all our towns” (44). The cross-racial alliance that is suggested by the Indians and white men reflects the WCTU’s fears of male threat that are the basis for what Frances Willard’s “feminism of fear” (Marilley 126). This concept was based on Willard’s view that the emphasis should be placed on women’s “security” against oppressive male behaviors that
were the result of their “primal instinct of self-preservation” (126). Within the context of the WCTU’s “feminism of fear” Wynema’s comments suggest that Native women participate in the WCTU’s public rhetoric in which working-class and non-white men are either placed under women’s supervision so that the threat of their difference is ameliorated through discipline or they are eliminated altogether (127).

While the scene between Wynema and Robin Weir extends the WCTU’s public sphere of women’s discourse on temperance and partial suffrage to Native women, Callahan shifts the discussion away from temperance toward Muscogee women’s political representation. Wynema’s statements about temperance legislation cause Robin Weir to remark that Wynema would make “a staunch Woman’s Christian Temperance Unionist, for that is their argument” (45). In response, Wynema observes that she is “a member of that union,” observing that “We have a small union in our town and do all we can against the great evil—intemperance; but what can a little band of women, prohibited from voting against the ruin of their husbands, sons, and firesides, do, when even the great government of Uncle Sam is set at defiance?” (45). In the scene, Callahan appears to take the WCTU position that women’s votes on local temperance issues would help maintain familial and thus national unity; however the scene is further complicated by the fact that Callahan turns the discussion toward Indian politics, and, in particular, about Indian women’s roles in the WCTU’s campaign for suffrage. When Robin exclaims, “I am afraid you are regular suffragist” Wynema responds vehemently the remark, “So I am . . . but it does me very little good, only for the principle’s sake. Still, I believe that, one day, the ‘inferior of man,’ the ‘weaker vessel’ shall stand grandly by the said of that ‘noble lord of creation,’ his equal in every respect” (45). Robin’s response suggests
Craig Womack’s assertion that Callahan silences Creek voices. Robin remarks “How much the ‘cause’ loses by not having you publicly advocate it! Say, didn’t sister teach you all this along with the rest? I think you must have imbibed those strong suffrage principles and ideas from her” (45). Robin’s comments suggest what Womack sees as Callahan’s inability to express true Muscogee agency in the novel because Robin assumes that his sister Genevieve is the orginator of Wynema’s position on women’s suffrage.

Yet Callahan turns this conversation into a brief reflection on the nature of Indian women’s political representation. Wynema responds to Robin by asserting a Native point of view: “Your sister and I hold many opinions in common, and doubtless, I have imbibed some of hers, as I have the greatest respect for her opinions; but the idea of freedom and liberty was born in me” (45). In the context of the discussion of women’s suffrage, Wynema’s statement affirms white and Indian women’s equality. Callahan further appeals to Anglo-American ideas about Native peoples as “natural” by suggesting that because she is Indian, Wynema has an innate knowledge of freedom. Callahan implies that Genevieve’s beliefs about suffrage are socially constructed and therefore less compelling than those of the Native American woman.

Wynema’s assertion about Indians’ “innate” understanding of freedom and liberty have culturally specific relevance within the context of popular representations of Native peoples as “natural” but also in context of Native intellectuals’ use of stereotypes for politically resistant ends. If Callahan’s editorial role for the WCTU column is read within the context of the author’s statements about Native women’s political roles in *Wynema*, the WCTU column’s heading “For God and Home and Native Land” gains new
meaning. The “homes” and “Native lands” it refers to become coded as locally Muscogee rather than broadly national. If Callahan’s Muscogee identity is part of her role as “Editress,” then the “home” to which the column heading refers suggests the Italua, or the town that is the basis for Muscogee society, whose source was the matrilineal inheritance of land which surrounded the town (Chang 21-22). Callahan’s criticism of allotment in the novel brings up the question of foreseeable alternatives to Muscogee relationships to land, and the role that women would play in constructing those relationships. While Callahan does not present Wynema’s character as a matrilineal inheritor of lands, a system of land claims which were also still in place in 1891, the concept of Muscogee land holdings that are connected directly to women’s political power is culturally embedded in Callahan’s novel. As David Chang observes, while post-removal nineteenth-century Muscogee people pursued a variety of land use styles, including those that followed plantation models and those that were small holding farmers, the Muscogee had historically followed matrilineal land inheritance practices (21-22, 94). In this sense, the importance of Wynema’s assertion that “freedom and liberty are born in me” is important for its public articulation of Native women’s rights in both textual and geographic territory through free speech and political representation in the public sphere of print.

Callahan articulates a Native woman’s public sphere in Our Brother in Red and Wynema in which Native women can speak for themselves and in concert with other Native voices resistant to allotment. Siobhan Senier has observed that although the novel does not offer strong tribally based alternatives to allotment, it nevertheless registers “the existence of viable tribal institutions and Indian protests against assimilation”
In what can be read as a subversive move on Callahan’s part, public debate about alternatives to allotment are proposed not by Wynema but by her white teacher, Genevieve Weir. Callahan’s use of Weir’s character to speak against allotment is the source of what Craig Womack in *Red on Red* sees as the “ventriloquization” of Wynema’s voice (108-109, 111). However, I would argue that the novel does not ventriloquize so much as offer a discursive public arena in which women and men, both Native and white can debate questions of Native rights in a “rational-critical” debate about the future of Indian Territory. In this sense, Callahan’s novel is an example of an inclusive Native public sphere. Where Womack sees complete cultural appropriation and Native capitulation to cultural and political dominance in Wynema’s character, it is possible instead to see her voice as one of many in a novel that is a public sphere document of debate about issues related to allotment and Native representation. In this sense, the “multiple voices and perspectives” which Lavonne Brown Ruoff identifies as being part of the novel are essential to its value in presenting a full picture of contemporary public debates about allotment.

An example of such critical debate occurs in the invocation of newspapers, which often form the basis for the characters’ discussion of allotment, as in the scene of newspaper reading alluded to in the opening scene of this chapter. As Genevieve Weir and Wynema Harjo discuss a newspaper editorial on allotment, the women engage in a “rational-critical” debate over whether it is appropriate for Native peoples. When Genevieve reacts to a newspaper editorial on allotment, she takes the anti-allotment viewpoint, observing that “It seems to me a plan by which the ‘boomers’ who were left out of Oklahoma are to be landed. For years the U.S. Senators and citizens have been
trying to devise ways and means by which to divide the Indians’ country” (50). Genevieve’s position resembles the minority opinion on the Dawes Act (from the Commission on Indian Affairs in 1880). According Genevieve, the pro-allotment perspective “was to gain control of Indian lands and open them up to settlement” (50). She provides further criticism of allotment, observing that “the provisions for the apparent benefit of the Indians are but the pretext to get at his lands and occupy them” (50). She concludes that if “this were done in the name of greed, it would be bad enough; but to do it in the name of humanity, and under the cloak of an ardent desire to promote the Indian's welfare by making him like ourselves whether he will or not, is infinitely worse” (50). Although these anti-allotment views are those of a white woman, Genevieve’s point of view is nevertheless powerful in its straightforward criticism of allotment policies. Instead of ventriloquizing the voices of resistant Natives, as Craig Womack alleges, it is possible to see Genevieve’s arguments as Callahan’s wish to complicate expected discursive norms. Callahan does not present the expected plot of white women’s assimilationist arguments. Instead, she suggests that the anti-allotment argument can belong to a character who might otherwise have represented a wholly assimilationist voice in the novel.

To further suggest the role that the novel, and, by extension its fictional newspapers, play in dramatizing an inclusive Native public sphere of rational-critical debate, Wynema suggests the opposing view of allotment, which was essentially the view of the “Red Progressives,” who felt to varying degrees that allotment was a necessity for Indians if they were going to maintain some sense of cultural integrity. In reaction to
Genevieve’s statements about the editorial, Wynema observes, “I don't see how dividing our lands can materially damage us,” noting that the Muscogee would have their “own homes” (50). According to Wynema, allotment would not ruin Muscogee “fortunes” but “mend them” (51). She concludes with a typically pro-allotment point of view of Native land use:

There are so many idle, shiftless Indians who do nothing but hunt and fish; then there are others who are industrious and enterprising; so long as our land remains as a whole, in common, these lazy Indians will never make a move toward cultivating it . . . while, if the land were allotted, do you not think that these idle Indians, knowing the land to be their own, would have pride enough to cultivate their land and build up their homes? (50-51)

While Wynema’s statements are pro-allotment, they also suggest that Callahan’s novel offers a public sphere debate that is truly inclusive because it presents multiple Native points of view and places them in concert with white political perspectives.

Based on Callahan’s rhetorical strategies of placing unconventional views in the mouths of Native and white characters, the novel can be seen as a public sphere statement that is politically resistant and even radical because it focuses on the voices of women, especially Native women, who would normally be excluded from what Habermas terms the “privilege of abstraction” granted to white male property holders is important (Miller 237). That Callahan was aware of the political power of the inclusive Native public sphere she imagines can be described in the terms articulated by Genevieve Weir’s former fiancé, a southerner who rejects Genevieve’s suffragist and anti-allotment views. He notes that if Genevieve’s radical points of view on Indian rights were “held by all, would be injurious to the commonwealth” (55). As the representative of yet another

*Fixico* letters as examples of a Native nationalist position. However, it is possible to say that Posey and authors represented a group of pro-allotment, acculturated Native intellectuals during the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.
public in the novel, that of southern white male land owners, whose own
“commonwealth” was compromised by the Civil War, Callahan’s use of his voice to
express resistance to women’s and Indians’ rights is unsurprising but suggests Callahan’s
recognition of the relationship between multiple subject positions and potential publics
represented in the novel.

The reference to the “commonwealth” also suggests Callahan’s WCTU column
and its expression of the organization’s “maternal commonwealth” within the larger
public articulation of Indian Territory in Our Brother in Red. If Callahan can be read as
imagining an inclusive public sphere in Wynema, then it is possible to read her editorial
position at Our Brother in Red as gesturing toward an inclusive public sphere for Indian
Territory, one in which newspapers play a role in articulating Native points of view. The
importance of journalism to the Native reading public in Indian Territory is evident in a
Wynema in a letter from “Masse Hadjo” a Muscogee who writes to a newspaper in
defense of the Ghost Dance movement, a cultural renewal movement led begun by
Wovoka or Jack Wilson, a Northern Paiute. The movement became popular among
Native peoples, particularly in the Great Plains and the U.S. military’s nervousness led in
part to the massacre of Lakota Sioux traveling to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation on
December 29, 1890, in South Dakota (Prucha Great 727). Hadjo’s letter is an example of
Native public resistance and in this sense extends the power of the Ghost Dance
movement itself as a public act of defiance. It is also important that Callahan excerpted
the letter in its entirety from an actual newspaper, The Chicago Tribune. Masse Hadjo’s
letter appeared in the Tribune on December 5, 1890 and was titled “An Indian on the
Messiah Craze” (6). The letter is signed “Masse Hadjo” or “John Daylight” and appears
almost in its entirety in *Wynema*. The letter opens with force, as Hadjo comments a *Tribune* editorial about the Ghost Dance, which noted that if United States army were to “kill a thousand or so of the dancing Indians there would be no more trouble” (6).

Hadjo’s response suggests the resistant potential for journalism:

> You are doubtless a worshiper of the white man's Saviour, but are unwilling that the Indians should have a Messiah of their own. The Indians have never taken kindly to the Christian religion as preached and practiced by the whites. Do you know why this is the case? Because the Good Father of all has given us a better religion—a religion that is all good and no bad—a religion that is adapted to our wants . . . If our Messiah does come, we will not try to force you into our belief. We will never burn innocent women at the stake, or pull men to pieces with horses because they refuse to join with us in our ghost dances. You white people had a Messiah, and if history is to be believed, nearly every nation has had one. . . . The white man's heaven is repulsive to the Indian nature, and if the white man's hell suits you, keep it. I think there will be white rogues enough to fill it. (6)

In the letter, Masse Hadjo refutes the image of Christianized Indians found in the literature of the Dawes era and reverses the hierarchical valuation of Christian faith versus Native religious beliefs. His people, he says, have a Messiah. But he is hardly presenting them as assimilated to Christian ideals. Instead, they are able to encompass the language of Christianity without sacrificing Indian self-representation and sovereignty.

What is perhaps as important as what Hadjo says, however, is where he says it. His letter is a public statement in a newspaper and it shows that as a Native person he reads and reacts to newspaper representations of Indians. With this scene, then, Callahan circles back to the image of Wynema and Genevieve’s discussions of newspaper editorial on allotment to suggest that newspapers are sites for public sphere discourse and Native resistance.

A final piece from *Our Brother in Red* proves the existence of a Native public sphere in non-tribal newspapers. “Indian Logic” is a short response of “Chief Tocawonis
Jim” to the federal government’s statement that the “Wichitas have more land than they need” and therefore that “it should be taken from them and opened up for settlement to citizens of the United States” (6). In response to attempts to allot Wichita land, the Tocawonis Jim observes that “Many of you white men have big piles of dollars more than you can use, but we do not go there and tell you that you must divide it up with us, who do need it. You do not need our land. Your money is yours; this land is ours, and we are not ready to talk about selling it” (6). As Tocawonis Jim’s letter shows, Our Brother in Red presented as a form of “logic” or “rational” discourse the written statements of a Native person who enters into a public debate on Indian Territory. The letter suggests that while Our Brother in Red constructed an idea of Indian Territory as Anglo-American, Methodist, and potentially ready for allotment, other, Native voices entered into the debate about the future of Indian Territory. When the journal is read in the context of Callahan’s novel, her WCTU column suggests that Our Brother in Red contains within it an inclusive Native public sphere. As an embodiment of a public sphere, Our Brother in Red represents an idea of Indian Territory that is more inclusive of Native voices and Native ideas about relationships to land than its editor Theodore Brewer intended.
CONCLUSION

VIRTUAL SOVEREIGNTY

Now in its tenth year of online publication, *The Cherokee Phoenix* recently celebrated the tenth anniversary of the Cherokee Independent Press Act, which called for the *Phoenix* to remain a tribally funded newspaper but become “independent from any undue influence and free of any particular political interest” (Chavez “Independent”). While the act officially freed the journal from direct influence of the Cherokee government, debate continued in the online version of the journal about whether the Act would really allow for the journalistic freedom. The discussion of freedom of the press for online journals suggests an ongoing negotiation of a public sphere for Native journalism. According to Elias Boudinot, nineteenth-century Cherokees were “threatened to be blessed” by the liberty of the press. His comments suggest that one of those so-called blessings was the ability to participate in a Native public sphere that spoke in resistance to federal policies regarding Native Americans. In the twenty-first century context of the journal online, the public sphere has gone digital, but it continues to express rhetorical sovereignty and assert a Habermasian “rational-critical” debate of issues relating to Cherokee politics and a “liberty of the press” in the context of governmental control of Cherokee journalism.

The *Cherokee Phoenix*’s twenty-first-century reporters and readers discuss similar issues of journalistic freedom to those discussed 180 years ago. Today’s online *Phoenix* suggests a Jurgen Habermas’s “sphere of private people come together as a public” (51). It is a discursive arena that exists outside of direct state and political control where readers can come together to discuss issues of importance (51). In a recent editorial,
Senior *Phoenix* Reporter Will Chavez suggests the ongoing challenge for Native journalism in defining a public sphere through journalism: “We have a free press now, but will never truly be an independent newspaper until we are financially independent” (“Free”). Chavez continues his arguments about freedom of the press when he notes that “[w]e depend on the council and administration to fund us, and are our advertising revenue goes into the tribe’s General Fund” (“Free”). Reflecting upon the *Phoenix*’s past, often conflicted relationship to the Cherokee government, Chavez comments, “I wonder sometimes about the future when we have a new chief. Will he or she honor the Free Press Act or take us down that road again the first time the *Phoenix* is critical of the administration? I hope not” (“Free”). If a democratic Cherokee public is allowed to articulate its views online without government censorship, then the online version of the journal will succeed in establishing a critical public sphere of readers free to debate issues of importance to the nation.

While questions about the viability of the *Phoenix* as an articulation of a public sphere are as insistent as they were in the 1820s, its publication online raises questions about how twenty-first century Native journals construct an idea of the public in connection to specific places. The title of Chavez’s article, “Free Press in Indian Country is Rare,” demonstrates the connection between space and place online. Chavez’s “Indian Country” is both a rhetorical construction and a material reality. While he does not define “Indian country,” his comments suggest that Native journals help to create an idea of it. Chavez suggests this when he observes that other Indian journals, including the *Navajo Times*, are ideal because “they are not controlled by tribal councils” (“Free”). Similarly, his allusion to “Indian country” suggests the title of *Indian Country Today*. 
Founded by Tim Giago in Rapid City, South Dakota 1981, *Indian Country Today* is an Intertribal journal which is a leading American Indian News Source. The *Navajo Times*, established in 1959 as the official newspaper of the Navajo Nation in Arizona, became officially independent in 1972 (92). As Chavez’s comments about journalism in “Indian country” suggest—the interconnection between journals creates an idea of Indian country is an example of what Benedict Anderson calls an “imagined community” that is “*imagined* because the members . . . will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (6). However, as an “imagined” community, Native American readers maintain direct ties to their local communities and fellow journal readers in those communities. These connections are suggested by Chavez’s piece on the freedom of the press. By defining the idea of Indian country as through an ideal of a free press, Chavez embodies the notion of Habermas’s “rational critical debate” in a Native context. In this sense, the *Phoenix* and the Native journals Chavez references are part of what Marcia Stephenson in her discussion of an indigenous Bolivian public sphere as a “discursive and territorial arena” (99). Stephenson’s perspective is that public activism by Bolivia’s indigenous peoples takes place in an “autonomous spatial and territorial arena where oppositional cultural and political identities can be enacted” (104). In the case of Native North American online journals, the “spatial and territorial” location is virtual but maintains direct links with material local places.

The *Cherokee Phoenix* online articulates these local connections despite what has often been characterized as the temporally and geographically disruptive aspect of online communication. One way of understanding online Native journals like the *Phoenix* is to
think about the relationships between time and virtual spaces. Doreen Massey argues that the Internet leads to “time-space compression,” in which Online methods for communicating disrupt the continuities of place and locally specific forms of communication by emphasizing the short amount of time it takes for information to travel to diverse groups via the Internet (147). Because information can now “overcome spatial barriers” and globalize ideas about specific geographic places, it is difficult to ascertain what we mean by “places” and “how we relate to them” (147). Massey asks “How, in the face of all this movement and intermixing, can we retain any sense of a local place and its particularity? An (idealized) notion of an era when places were (supposedly) inhabited by coherent and homogeneous communities is set against the current fragmentation and disruption” (147). She argues that the fragmentation that occurs in online communication results in the generalization of the specificity of place as it is lived by individuals.

However, in contrast to Doreen Massey’s view that online communication is temporally and geographically disruptive, the twenty-first-century Cherokee Phoenix online constructs an idea of the nation as connected to the Cherokee Nation’s history, geography and culture. The Cherokee Phoenix online shares many section headings with the nineteenth-century version of the journal. There is a section which covers Cherokee nation news on the home page, labeled “Home,” a “News” section which, in its twenty-first-century version is divided into “Education,” “Health,” and “Sports.” There is also a section on “Culture,” which includes pieces on the Cherokee language and Cherokee arts. Other major sections include a “Council” section, which covers news from the Cherokee council, as well as an Opinion section. Each of these pages allows readers to participate in discussions of the articles through online responses. The ability to respond is an
invitation to participate in the public sphere constructed by the *Phoenix.* While some of the responses come from non-Cherokee, many more are from Cherokee readers, some of whom no longer reside in the Cherokee Nation in Oklahoma.

In the September 7, 2010 issue of the journal, for example, responses from a reader in Oregon to an article by reporter Will Chavez on the Dawes Act suggests how geography is made politically local through *Phoenix’s* online version. It indicates how through online sources, indigenous journals maintain a sense of place that is not eroded by what Susan Massey sees as the “time-space compression” that occurs through the Internet. Although the reader who responds to Chavez lives in Oregon, her letter reveals that connections to Oklahoma are specific and constructed through a tribally specific memory of conflicting Native and non-Native constructions of place. The reader’s letter, titled “Bravo!” applauds a piece by reporter Chavez on allotment and reflects on the meaning of being Cherokee despite living outside of the Cherokee Nation:

Thank you (Senior Reporter Will Chavez) for telling people “how it really is.” I have been researching my family tree for 40 years, so I feel I do have some knowledge. I am a tribal citizen. I live in Oregon and I also have a Cherokee Nation license plate in the back window of my car. People are always stopping me asking how they can enroll and get “all that Indian money.” My grandpa was born in Stilwell, Okla., in 1896 and remembered the Dawes people coming around. He said it was a joke. They would walk into a house and point at someone and say, “you are an Indian” and then point to a full sibling and say, “you are not an Indian.” His mother and aunt were denied enrollment, but the Dawes Commission used their sworn testimony to admit their full brother. Go figure. The final rolls are full of errors that, unfortunately, can never be corrected.

Patt Stanek
Portland, Ore.

Stanek’s letter suggests the arbitrary nature of official Anglo-American interpretations of Native identity and relationships to place. However, the response does not suggest that Cherokee readers of the *Phoenix* online share the sense of “fragmentation
and disruption” that Massey observes is a result of online communication. Rather than “fragmenting” readers, I argue that the journal allows for a greater connection between readers who are engaged by the issues at stake—creating a tribal definition of place that is specific to the Cherokee Nation. As can be seen from Stanek’s letter, what Massey refers to ironically as an “(idealized) notion of an era when places were (supposedly) inhabited by coherent and homogeneous communities” is a reality for Stanek, whose grandparents lived in Silwell Oklahoma. For Stanek, the Dawes Act continues to have an impact on the Cherokee understanding of place, and Stanek’s interpretation of its impact is one example of how an online environment for Native journals constructs an idea of “Indian Country” that has local and historically specific points of reference.

One of the features of the nineteenth-century version of the journal was that it was bilingual. Today’s version of the journal is in English. This is in part because English has become the dominant form of communication for many younger Cherokee in the late-twentieth and twenty-first centuries (Bender 8). However, as Daniel Heath Justice observes, “Cherokee literature in English is deeply rooted in Indigenousness” and is important to Cherokee sovereignty. However, he also observes that the “Cherokee language itself” is a “powerful reflection of self-determination and agency” (13). Cherokee language revitalization programs sponsored by the Cherokee Nations East and West suggest that language revitalization is part of an expression of sovereignty. In this sense, it is also a connection to place. In the Cherokee Phoenix the Cherokee language is the subject of an entire section of the Phoenix, which falls under the “Culture” heading as “language.” While the dominance of English in the contemporary journal may suggest the loss of Cherokee language speakers, the willingness of advocates for language
revitalization within the Cherokee community to adapt new technologies to disseminating the Cherokee language suggest the role which technology plays in constructing an idea of Indian Territory as a linguistically specific place.

The September 3, 2009 issue of the journal carried an announcement that a Cherokee language application was now available for “iPhone” and “iPod touch” (“Update”). According to staff reporter Jami Custer, “Thornton Media Inc. has developed an iTunes application that allows the Cherokee language . . . to be downloaded onto . . . MP3 players and cell phones” (“Update”). In the September 24, 2010 issue of the Phoenix, Custer provides further comment on the reasons for the iPhone Cherokee language application. According to Custer, the Cherokee Nation has worked with Apple on developing software that includes the Cherokee syllabary (“Cherokee”). Now available from iTunes, the application is described by Joseph Erb, who works with Cherokee children in the Nation’s language immersion schools, as “one of the most innovative things to happen since the printing press because it puts the Cherokee language in the pockets of so many children” (“Cherokee”). The ability of children to hear the Cherokee language is important to an understanding of what Wai Chee Dimock identifies as the power of the “aural” to suggest “diachronic historicism,” or a continual sense of presence through the “vibrant openness” of representation found in the sounds of words (1061, 1068). Dimock’s larger argument is that sound and the spoken word in literature emphasize the possibility for self-representation through speech in a democracy (1068). In promoting the language through the iPhone application piece, the Cherokee Phoenix online suggests the role which online technology plays in connecting readers to other technologies that suggest the promise of the original Phoenix’s “rebirth” through a
declaration of sovereignty in print.

In the article on the Cherokee language Application for the iPhone and iPod, Custer cites Cherokee Nation chief Chad Smith, who observes that Sequoyah, who created the Cherokee syllabary in the early nineteenth century, “knew that the strength of non-Indians was their ability to communicate in a written language” (“Cherokee”). And while Smith observes the Cherokee may “not have been aware of . . . the lasting impact of our written language,” it continues to “carry with it” the meaning of “our culture, our history, and our belief system” (“Cherokee”). While the printing press revolutionized Cherokee Nation in the nineteenth century, Smith suggest that applications for new technologies like the iPhone will once again foster a sense of Cherokee sovereignty through language.

The comparison between Sequoyah’s syllabary, its use in the first Cherokee printing press, and a twenty-first-century software application do not suggest that these new technologies are analogous in importance. From the perspective of public sphere theory and the Habermasian idea of news media consolidation and the increased influence of the media corporations in news and political discussion, personal electronic devices such as iPhones are part of the comodification of the media in the twenty-first century. As Habermas observes, rational-critical debate, the key feature of the public sphere, was replaced in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by the concept of leisure time and consumption (193). In this sense the iPhone or other personal electronic devices are perfect for the conveyance of “public opinion,” which Habermas sees as the end product of the false debate created by “special-interest associations” in control of the news media (200). However, in the case of Cherokee language revitalization and the
Phoenix’s role in fostering it through news coverage, these otherwise circumspect technologies become tools for asserting Native sovereignty despite the tendency of technology to commodify communication and representation.

Yet the relationship between technology like the iPhone and consumption place language in the context of an apolitical consumer culture rather than an idea of a Native public politicized through cultural practices. It also brings up questions about access to technology. Proving that Native American peoples’ access to technology is a matter of debate, one reader responded negatively to an article from August of 2009 announcing the availability of the iPhone application. The letter writer observes, “I do not have the ability to get this on my phone” and “I don't own and iPod. Please continue to offer the classes online” (Letter August 6 2010). The reader observes that the language classes online, which are officially sponsored by the Cherokee Nation, are “[v]ery helpful and I need to have my grandchildren and children learn the language” (Letter). Yet it is clear that the idea of technology and the idea of a public are linked in the Cherokee Phoenix. Jami Custer closes her on the Cherokee language applications for the iPhone and iPod with an invitation to the public. She notes that “the public can access the Cherokee language” by updating their iPhone operating system, which will enable them to download the language application for free (“Cherokee”). Suggesting a new connection between public and private that Habermas suggests, Custer’s comments reveal how even in a culture in which print culture is commodified and privatized, an idea of the public and of Native sovereignty is possible.

The issue of access to technology is central to the discussion of a Native public sphere and an idea of journalism in “Indian Country.” In her discussion of an indigenous
Bolivian public sphere, Marcia Stephenson notes that while the Internet has facilitated “networking and collaboration” among Bolivia’s indigenous activist groups, it has also “reinforced preexisting social structures in places where a lack of resources and technology make electronic communication prohibitively expensive” (111). The issue of indigenous peoples’ access to technology was emphasized in an April 1, 2009 National Public Radio interview with Tim Giago, who founded the Native Sun News in 2009. In the interview, Giago provides a definition of Indian country that suggests a direct connection between text and the material realities of life in Indian country. When asked about the impact of the recession on Native journals, Giago observes:

Well you know, it's tough, but if people think that recession is tough in America, they should try living on an Indian reservation, where it's almost always that way. Reservations are isolated. You know, the Pine Ridge Reservation is 100 miles long and 50 miles wide. It is still one of the poorest counties in America, and a lot of the people on a reservation can't . . . afford a computer” and “they sure can't afford to even pay the monthly Internet fees to keep it going. So the majority of my readers are going to be those people who read papers the old-fashioned way. They go down to the local store, they buy their paper, they take it home and pour themselves a cup of coffee and sit down and read it. And I think it's a really erroneous assumption for most Americans to believe that everybody is hooked into the Internet because out here in Indian country, that's not the case at all. (“Giago”)

Giago’s comments indicate that the realities of life in some parts of Indian country, as it is defined through journals still link the material object of the newspaper with a specific geographic location, in this case, the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. Giago’s observations suggest that Indian country as defined in journals is geographically and socio-economically divergent. While the one to one relationship between a material object—the newspaper, and the place it is read, a kitchen table on a reservation, suggest a more “real” relationship than the online version of the Cherokee Phoenix, I would suggest that there are similarities between the Native Sun newspaper and the Cherokee
Phoenix in constructing an idea of Indian country.

This sense of place is literally connected to language through writing in a

Cherokee Phoenix piece from July 2009, which describes the Cherokee Language

Revitalization Symposium, a quarterly meeting which represents the combined efforts of

the Eastern Band and Cherokee Nation (western) band to “discuss and debate what

Cherokee words could be used for a list of English words” for which the groups need

translation (Chavez “Eastern”). The Cherokee Nation (abbreviated as CN in the article)

are the Cherokee who live in Oklahoma, while the Eastern band is made up of Cherokees

from Western North Carolina who are descended from those who were able to hold on to

land they owned during the removal period, those who hid in the hills, defying removal,

as well as others who returned to the East. These Eastern Cherokee now have a sovereign

nation of 100 square miles (Bender 17-18, McLoughlin 61, 63, 66, 262).

The piece on the Cherokee Language Revitalization Symposium describes the

combined Cherokee Nation and Eastern Cherokee efforts at translation and suggests that

the geographic separation of the two bands has created changes in their spoken

languages. In the Cherokee Phoenix piece on language revitalization Eastern Band

Language Development supervisor Gil Jackson observes, “‘We decided the languages are

different now. You guys (CN speakers) use sounds and words that are different’”

(Chavez “Eastern”). While Jackson points out that the differences are often only in the

final vowel sounds of a word, they should be noted in writing. If the two consortiums

“agree to pronounce a word differently” the word is “written out both ways and an ‘E’ is

placed next to the Eastern Band preference and a ‘W’ (for Western) next to the CN

preference” (Chavez “Eastern”). The act of noting the location of the band next to its
preferred method of pronunciation suggests the way in which writing, in this case the
Cherokee syllabary, can literally represent a place.
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