WILLIAM GILMORE SIMMS AND ELIAS BOUDINOT:

A MULTICULTURAL SOUTH

by

HOLLY A. HENSON

(Under the direction of Dr. Timothy Powell)

ABSTRACT

This thesis attempts to discuss the overarching themes of Southern identity and the history of the South. This is a literature paper, in that the Southern author, William Gilmore Simms and his Yemassee is analyized. I also discuss another Southern figure, a newpaper editor, and one leaders of the Cherokee Nation, Elias Boudinot.

The First chapter introduces these themes and the struggle between a white southern history and a Cherokee southern history. The second chapter reveals the facts behind Cherokee removal and the Jacksonian policy of the removal. The third and fourth chapters reveal, through the writings of Simms and Boudinot, a new persective on Southern Identity, its past and its present. What we find is that the words “southern” carries such a distinct and unique meaning, yet it also includes a multicultural society.

INDEX WORDS: William Gilmore Simms, Elias Boudinot, Southern Identity

WILLIAM GILMORE SIMMS AND ELIAS BOUDINOT:

A MULTICULTURAL SOUTH

by

HOLLY A. HENSON

A.B., The University of Georgia, 1999

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2002

WILLIAM GILMORE SIMMS AND ELIAS BOUDINOT:

A MULTICULTURAL SOUTH

by

HOLLY A. HENSON

Approved:

Major Professor: Timothy Powell

Committee: Barbara McCaskill
Claudio Saunt

Approved:

Gordhan L. Patel
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to give a special thanks to Dr. Timothy Powell who guided me throughout the project and helped me immensely. I am in debt to all the scholars whose hard work and dedication in research allowed me to study this subject and write on this topic. My parents, Lynda and Clayton Henson, deserve much recognition: thanks for your support, patience and encouragement. Also, to my husband: I could not have done this without you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> For the removal of the tribes within the limits of the State of Georgia the motive has been peculiarly strong, arising from the compact with that State whereby the United States are bound to extinguish the Indian title to the lands within it whenever it may be done peaceably and on removable conditions…Experience has clearly demonstrated that in their present state it is impossible to incorporate [the Indians] in such masses, in any form whatever, into our system.[1]
>
> --James Monroe, *To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States*, Washington, January 27, 1825

James Monroe's address to Congress this January 27th is an essential yet often an unrecognized factor of the cultural wars during the first decades of the New Nation. The cultural wars in the post-colonial era of the southern United States are one of the most highly discussed topics in American history classes; yet one of the most influential cultures, Native American culture, is often overlooked. General history books such as American History and American Thought, History and American Society, and The Southern Front: History and Politics in the Cultural War discuss the race relations between whites and blacks from the colonial era to the end of the nineteenth century,

but omit Indians from their content all together.[2] All high school history textbooks chronicle white southerners defining themselves as a separate breed of people from white northerners, as well as the battling black/white relationship in the Old South, but the relationship between white southerners and the Indians living in the south is barely mentioned. Indians of the Old South are neglected in history books and are lucky if they even receive an entry in the index.[3] The fact is that something so very crucial to American history, such as Monroe's address to Congress and the removal of Indians in the south, is simply glossed over and sometimes even dismissed all together. If American Indians do receive any attention in textbooks they are usually lumped together as one group, rarely noticed as separate tribes. Smallpox is briefly mentioned, maybe even a few battles are jotted down, and then the subject changes with the next paragraph. For centuries the American Indian was purposefully removed from their native lands by white European settlers by any necessary mean possible and all of their culture gets in American history is a mere paragraph. Monroe's Address to Congress is only a small piece of evidence of the red/white racial anxiety felt in the south that has been neglected and silently discarded for years. It is the purpose of this paper to explore Southern American Identity that has been erased from history.

Monroe's speech on this particular day not only revealed the growing tensions felt by many white southerners about the "Indian problem" in the southeast, but also set an agenda to rid the United States of the Indians. Monroe was one of the first presidents that vocally promoted the Indian

removal policy in the state of Georgia, declaring that the Indians, or more specifically the Cherokee, were too uncultivated for the "arts of civilized life." While he claimed that the government would act with a "generous spirit" to insure the Cherokee's "welfare and happiness," there is no mistake that this policy ended with one of the most horrific acts in American history, the Trail of Tears. Monroe's ultimate message maintained that the policy of Indian removal was to "extinguish the Indian title," and while this may have meant only to buy the Cherokee's deed to their land, it actually "extinguished" the Cherokee's culture, traditions, prosperity, and freedom.

Monroe's speech to Congress should also be recognized in that it embodied the message of progress that was being stamped into the minds of Americans at that time by aristocracy and politicians alike. John R. Finger, author of The Eastern Band of Cherokees 1819-1900, explains this attitude of American progress by saying that "what usually impresses Americans is change rather than continuity." Sadly, he says, the American ideology "embodies not tradition but constant transmutation and progress."[4] No doubt the pressure to improve and to progress was more heavily felt in the south, as poor whites, local farmers, and plantation owners all alike watched their neighbors to the north grow wealthy from industry while they suffered through such hardships as the Tariff of Abominations.[5] The power of the industrial north was overwhelming, and the simple, white settlers of the south were pressured to improve, change, and prosper with the direct result being that the Indians lose their land, culture, and freedom. By "extinguish[ing]"

the Cherokee's liberty, white southerners would be able to compete with their northern counterparts in industry and prosperity. This idea of progress, although drastically conflicting with the sense of tradition in southern American culture, was an inevitable part of southern American history.[6]

Two southern gentlemen that were fully aware of the consequences of progress on both white southerners and the Cherokee were William Gilmore Simms and Elias Boudinot. Each of these men brought two culturally unique perspectives on the Indian Removal Policy through their literary works. In 1826, just a year after Monroe's speech, Boudinot, a Cherokee Indian, published a pamphlet titled "An Address to the Whites" that called for Cherokee Indian support in their campaign against Indian removal in the south.[7] Later, at the height of Cherokee Removal, Simms, a white southerner, published his 1835 work, The Yemassee: A Romance of Carolina, depicting the historical Yemassee War that had occurred a little over a century earlier.[8] These two works together represent a perspective on southern American history that has been overlooked and dismissed in history books and cultural nonfiction. Both of these men, while sharing the same regional relationship, as well as being great literary figures in their own time, are two extremely distinct and separate people both culturally and ethnically. However, taken together, these two authors say something about progress and history that changes the shape of southern identity as it is seen today.

Simms, son to an Irishman and reared in the heart of Charleston, South Carolina by his grandmother, gathered a white southern identity that is

implicated in his works. Growing up, Simms received the necessary southern education, which was minimal, but did go on to study law and was admitted to the bar in 1827.[9] Simms, however, would not be recognized as lawyer but rather an author, indeed the most prolific and realistic southern writer of his time. Simms was also canonized in his own time, but has been regarded until the past decade as an insignificant and even racist writer.[10] Recently, his works are being given the attention they deserve, but in the past his prejudiced views have been considered somewhat taboo to critics. Simms's The Yemassee for instance, was recognized in its own time, but since the turn of the century has not been given notice due to its racist attitude toward slavery. Thanks to critics such as John C. Guilds, it is now being recognized it for its individuality and realistic depiction of the social mores of the colonial period, but despite past readings that have elaborated more on its prejudiced and racist attitude toward both Indians and blacks.[11] A current reading of The Yemassee shows that it can be held as an accurate testament of the Southern ideology at that time.

What Simms did through his literary works was create a white southern perspective that no other author can claim. In their introduction to William Gilmore Simms and the American Frontier, John Caldwell Guilds and Caroline Collins emphasize Simms's importance to southern identity saying that "Simms is to the South's literary birth what Faulkner is to the region's literary renaissance: a central figure."[12] They also explain that it was the generation after Simms's that "began to formulate and incorporate

Southern identity in its school years," and it was authors like him that shaped the "Southern identity" that was being discussed in history classes.[13] Simms's The Yemassee, set in 1715, reflects on the beginnings of the ideas, prejudices, and sympathies of a Southern culture that had come to its peak in racial conflicts between the Indians and the whites. Most likely, Simms's romance was motivated by his rides with his father through Cherokee Indian country, and in an attempt to write the great Southern American "epic," Simms began to "[digest] the plan of an Indian tale—a story of an early settlement and of an old tribe in Carolina" that would reflect the animosity between the Cherokee Nation and the Georgia government in the late 1820s and early 30s.[14] Through The Yemassee, Simms helped shape the white southern identity for the American people during the 1820s and 30s, but since his neglect in criticism, this southern identity has been silently cast away along with Cherokee history and culture.

Like Simms, Boudinot is also a forgotten, yet central, figure of southern history and nonfiction. Born in Oothcaloga, Georgia, just two years prior to Simms in 1804, Boudinot was reared in a progressive settlement.[15] He received a privileged education at a Moravian missionary school as a boy and went on to the American Board School in Cornwall, Connecticut as a young man. Boudinot was recognized in his own community during his time, but not because the masses necessarily agreed with his policies or philosophies. He represented a progressive and "civilized" Cherokee ideology, whereas most other Cherokees were traditionalists. In her

introduction to Cherokee Editor, Theda Perdue says that "Boudinot's historical reputation is, at best, tarnished," due to the fact that he signed the treaty that prompted the Indian removal in Georgia.[16] Furthermore, he was assassinated by his own tribe members after the removal treaty was enforced on June 22, 1839. Mostly, he is remembered in history as the editor of the Cherokee Phoenix and as a chief of the Cherokee Nation. He was known for his superb oratory skills and for his most famous speech, "An Address to the Whites," he traveled to dozens of major cities including Charleston, South Carolina, Simms's hometown. His goal was to persuade whites that Cherokees were indeed a civilized and self-reliant people, willing to be a part of and contribute to American society.

There is no doubt that William Gilmore Simms would have been thinking of the Cherokee removal policy while he was writing his Yemassee. The Yemassee War that took place in South Carolina in 1715 is closely linked to the plight of the Cherokee during Simms's day. There are several moments in which the Cherokee are mentioned throughout The Yemassee, which insinuates that Simms had the conflict on his mind while writing; and although this conflict has been neglected in history books in the past, Simms would have been well aware of the tension felt by his southern compatriots about the want of a removal policy.[17] Although the removal of the Cherokee is often glossed over in history classes today, it was a hot topic of discussion in newspapers during Simms's time. 1835, the year when Simms's The Yemassee was published, was only three years before the Cherokee removal

and the end of Boudinot's campaign. Even if Simms had never heard of Elias Boudinot, he would have understood the importance and implications of a Cherokee Removal from his neighboring and fellow southern state of Georgia. With the discovery of gold in Cherokee territory and the push for progress in the southern states, Cherokee removal seemed like the only possibility for southerners to keep their way of life. Thus, Simms's "great American epic" portrayed a forgotten tribe, the Yemassee, to create a realistic and accurate picture of the racial and cultural conflict that was occurring during the Cherokee Indian removal.

The colliding of historical and literary texts, such as Monroe's speech, Simms's The Yemassee, and Boudinot's "An Address to the Whites," creates a contradiction in southern identity. In an essay, "The American Frontier: Romance and Reality," Eliott West discusses how the "romantic frontier" and the "historical frontier" were two very distinct and even contradictory places during the 1820s and 1830s. The American ideology, or what West calls the "romantic frontier," is a country where "lines and lessons were clearly drawn."[18] The historical frontier, however, is a "glorious confusion" and a "turbulent, bloody, and fascinating mess." Monroe's address to Congress, along with other works like Simms's The Yemassee and Boudinot's editorials and speeches, demonstrate the romantic ideology of the1820s and 1830s in the Old South. When he claimed that Indian removal would be preventing the "degradation and extermination" that would surely be "inevitable" if the Indians were to stay in the south, Monroe was only doing what many authors

and writers do, using language as a "shaping force" that clearly draws "lines and lessons."[19] West points out that this romantic frontier, or rather this use of language, was a kind of "bending" of reality and a "shaping force in its own right." By juxtapositioning history with the words of the United States' Government, Simms, and Boudinot, one finds the "historical frontier" that has been concealed and silently hidden behind the "romantic frontier." Simms once said in his letters that he knew what it meant to be a "true" southerner, or what he calls a "Southron," but by joining the history of past events and the fiction of both Simms and Boudinot, the idea of being "Southron" is something completely evolved from what it meant in the 1820s and 1830s.[20]

In the following chapters, this thesis aims to do some historical re-thinking of the peoples and societies living in the South. It is only after some historical information and facts have been established that an analysis of Simms and Boudinot can be expressed. Thus, chapter two will discuss only the historical background and the events that led up to the Cherokee Removal. In chapters three and four, Simms, Boudinot, and their fiction will be brought into the foreground. Chapter five will consists of the conclusive remarks of the author, which will examine the significance of both history and fiction in the shaping of the South.

ENDNOTES

[1]James Monroe, "To the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, January 27, 1825," ed. James D. Richardson, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1896). All following quotes from Monroe were obtained from this address.

[2] See Bert James Loewenberg, American History and American Thought: Christopher Columbus to Henry Adams, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972), Don E. Fehrenbacher, History and American Society: Essays of David M. Potter, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), and Eugene D. Genovese, The Southern Front: History and Polictics in the Cultural War, (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1995).

[3]For an analysis on the neglect of Native American culture in the United States see Charles M. Hudson ed., Red, White, and Black: Symposium on Indians in the Old South, (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1971), p.2.

[4]John R. Finger, The Eastern Band of Cherokees 1819-1900, (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1984), p. 9.

[5]See John M. Murrin, Liberty, Equality, Power: A History of the American People, Volume I: to 1877, {Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1996), p.380. The Tariff of 1828 was called the "Tariff of

Abominations" since it hurt the south by "diminishing cotton exports and other staples by raising the price of manufactured goods." This demonstration of power over the south outraged southerners and they called it "unconstitutional."

[6]Grady McWhiney, author of Cracker Culture, argues that white southerners valued tradition and were sometimes even stubborn in upholding their customs. For a complete culture analysis on the stereotypes and actual truths behind white southerners and their origins see Grady McWhiney, Cracker Culture: Celtic Ways in the Old South, (Tuscaloosa and London: University of Alabama Press, 1988).

[7]Elias Boudinot, Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot, ed. Theda Perdue, (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1996).

[8]William Gilmore Simms, The Yemassee: A Romance of Carolina, ed. John Caldwell Guilds, (Fayetteville, Arkansas: The University of Arkansas Press, 1994). All references to The Yemassee refer to this edition and will be given parenthetically within the text.

[9]For a quick synopsis on Simms's life and publishing dates see John C. Guilds's "Chronology" in the above edition.

[10]For a collection of essays on Simms and his neglect in criticism, see John Caldwell Guilds, ed. "The Long Years of Neglect," (Fayetteville, The University of Arkansas Press, 1988).p.?

[11]John C. Guilds in "Introduction" to William Gilmore Simms, The

Yemassee: A Romance of Carolina, ed. John Caldwell Guilds, (Fayetteville, Arkansas: The University of Arkansas Press, 1994), p.xix.

[12]See David Moltke-Hanson, "Between Plantation and Frontier: The South of William Gilmore Simms," in William Gilmore Simms and the American Frontier, ed. John Caldwell Guilds and Caroline Collins. (Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1997), p. 5.

[13]Moltke-Hanson, p. 5.

[14]The Letters of William Gilmore , ed. Mary C. Simms Oliphant, Alfred Taylor Odell, and T.C. Duncan Eaves, (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1952-1956), vol. I, p.61.

[15]For biographical background information I am indebted to Theda Perdue in "Introduction" to Elias Boudinot, Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot, ed. Theda Perdue, (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1996).

[16]Perdue p. 31.

[17]See Simms, pp. 60-61, 63, 223, 243, 286, and 410.

[18]Eliott West, "American Frontier: Romance and Reality," in William Gilmore Simms and the American Frontier, ed. John Caldwell Guilds and Caroline Collins. (Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1997) p.39. All following quotes from West were obtained from p.39 as well.

[19]Quoted from James Monroe's "To the Senate and the House of Representatives"

[20]The Letters of William Gilmore Simms, eds. Mary C. Simms Oliphant, Alfred Taylor Odell, T.C. Duncan Eaves (Columbia, The University of South Carolina Press, 1952-1956), vol. I, p. 159.

CHAPTER 2

THE ROMANTIC FRONTIER

> [The red man] is unwilling to submit to the laws of the States and to mingle with their population. To save him from this alternative, or perhaps utter annihilation, the General Government kindly offers him a new home, and proposes to pay the whole expense of his removal and settlement…May we not hope, therefore, that all good citizens, and none more zealously than those who think the Indians oppressed by the subjection to the laws of the States, will unite in attempting to open the eyes of those children of the forest to their true condition, and by a speedy removal to relieve them from all the evils, real or imaginary, present or prospective, with which they may be supposed to be threatened.[1]
>
> --Andrew Jackson's Case for the Removal of Indians
>
> December 8, 1829

1829 was the metaphorical beginning of the 1838 Trail of Tears for the Cherokee, and with his speech, Jackson buried the "uglier actualities" of the removal and smoothed over the "historical frontier" of the Old South.[2] While he never actually names specific tribes of Indians in his address, he does point to the land in question, the south, and therefore leaves no doubt that the Cherokee, being the only tribe left in the south by the year 1829, are the people in need of a

"speedy removal."[3] The history, or "the facts," of the Cherokee Nation's existence while in the south reveal a story that conflicts with what Jackson relates in his Congressional address. While Jackson portrays the Indians as uncivilized "children of the forest" who are "unwilling" to obey laws and ignorant of their "true condition," the actual existence of the Cherokee while in the Old South is quite the opposite. Evidence shows that the Cherokee were extremely cultivated within their own community, and while they, as well as their neighboring tribes, were forced to eventually move west, their time spent in the Old South with white settlers displayed anything but uncivilization. The Cherokee were considered the most civilized of the tribes in the south, and were willing to cooperate with the white colonists and the United States Government.[4] Despite the evidence that the Cherokees could coexist with the white southerners, Jackson and the southern states refused to believe that the region in question could incorporate both cultures as a whole. Thus, in his First Annual Address to the 21st Congress, Andrew Jackson "ben[t]" reality and concealed the "fascinating mess" of "historical frontier" of the Cherokee Indians and the southern state of Georgia.

The Indian as a "noble savage" had become a convenient stereotype during the early 1800s and an opportune excuse for Indian removal. Former presidents, as well as Jackson, used the stereotype in speeches to Congress as a faithful crutch to lean upon. Jackson's First Annual Address rhetorically asked Congress, "what good man would prefer a country covered with forests and ranged by a few thousand savages to our extensive Republic, studded with cities…embellished with all the improvements which art can devise or

industry execute?" Here, Jackson "bend[s]" reality in order to persuade the public to see the Indians as a "few thousand savages" in need of a "speedy removal." In his book, Thoreau and the American Indians, Robert F. Sayre explains the rationale behind this stereotype. He quotes Thoreau from "In Savagism and Civilization," saying whites believed that "'the (Indian's) lack of improvements must stem from laziness and lack of mental curiosity…His failure to adopt the higher arts of civilization is a melancholy proof of his noble adherence to his traditions.'"[5] By romanticizing the Cherokee as primitive and uncivilized, Jackson perpetuates the stereotype that a "lack of improvements" equals savagism. This convenient stereotype was used throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and created a "romantic" reason that justified the removal of the Indians out of the south.

The romantic idea that the Cherokee lacked "improvement" was actually an idea that was superimposed by Eurocentricism. European settlers often felt that if one did not have cities "embellished with all the improvements which art can devise or industry execute" that one must indeed be uncivilized. However, Sayre counter-argues that

> Savagism…was not a very accurate description of reality. It was not based on how the natives of America described themselves but how the white conquerors and missionaries and travelers described them. These descriptions, moreover, had been written and repeated so many times that they developed a history and existence of their own, shaping later men's judgments and perceptions."[6]

Basically, the idea that Indians were uncivilized at all is quite subjective. Henry Thompson Malone's study of the Cherokees in Cherokees of the Old South reveals that some of the customs held by the Cherokees could be considered as quite advanced. He notes that when white traders first came into frequent contact with the Cherokee "more than 800 species of plants were known and used by the Cherokee for food, medicine, and crafts." Furthermore, they were already cultivating such foods as "corn (maize) and beans, supplemented by peas, pumpkins, strawberries, tobacco, potatoes, squash, and gourds." Even more interesting is the fact that there was "striking equality between the Cherokee sexes," and that women "participated in council meetings and elections of chiefs, and they frequently took part in Indian Warfare."[7] These findings represent that the Cherokee were, in some aspects, more advanced than their white neighbors. When Europeans came to America for the first time they had no natural awareness of the terrain or the wilderness that surrounded them.[8] It took white people in the United States almost 150 years before deciding that women could vote in elections and even longer to let them serve in the military. Thus, when Jackson called the Indians "savage" he was repeating a Eurocentric stereotype, and therefore "shaping" a false history by burying the truth in the "romantic frontier."

Cherokees, despite all the stereotypes that claimed they were uncivilized savages, did begin to adopt European customs in order to conform to white people's standards. Even white southerners realized that the Cherokee were not the ignorant people that the Government had portrayed,

and many became outraged by their progress.[9] Jackson's statement that the Indians knew not of their "true condition," was essentially a propaganda tool used for their removal. Despite Jackson's claims, the Cherokees were quite aware of the circumstances surrounding their potential removal, and thus began to adapt to Europeans' standards of civilization. Ronald N. Satz says in American Indian Policy in the Jacksonian Era that "the Cherokees provide[d] an outstanding example of the success of the federal efforts to civilize the Indians," and that "they had deliberately embarked on a program to adopt many of the patterns of white society in order to earn respect as a civilized nation." He goes on to say that the Cherokees wanted to "preserve their tribal integrity and land" by showing the whites that they could learn to farm, read, write, and exist just as other white southerners.[10] Thus, the tribe had embarked on a plan to retaliate against white encroachment by becoming more and more what whites deemed as "civilized." Log homes were built. Agriculture and cropping took place of hunting; farms were established; and most amazingly, a written language and a newspaper were developed and distributed.[11] These changes demonstrated that they understood that in order to live and keep their lands they would have to "improve" and to "progress" just as white southerners were doing. Jackson's speech romanticized the Cherokees as innocent, uncivilized "children of the forest," but the Cherokees efforts to adopt the ways of white people proves that they were not ignorant of what whites deemed as "civilization."

These stereotypes and romantic ideas about the savage "children of the forest" were a part of the federal and state governments' efforts to remove the Indians without disturbing the nation's "historical frontier" or to reveal any "uglier actuality" that needed to be kept concealed. Former presidents, such as Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Adams, had temporarily suppressed a conflict by giving tribes sovereignty. The treaties of 1817 and 1819 honored this sovereignty, which allowed the federal government to purchase Indian land without forcing a removal. This passive policy appeased the public and "was to benefit the national interest without staining the nation's honor" (Satz 1). However, by Jackson's inauguration, the public was becoming extremely impatient for the turnover of Cherokee lands. Georgians were growing angry at the federal government's neglect in carrying out the 1802 compact that agreed to remove the Indians.[12] Later, the discovery of gold in Cherokee territory exacerbated the situation, and white Americans became eager and greedy for the land.[13] However, Jackson and the southern states were most enraged by the ratification of the Cherokee Constitution and a declaration of the Cherokee Nation in 1827. The new Constitution and declaration of themselves as an independent nation made Jackson and the Georgia government nervous, and even though most whites still believed that the Indians were not as "civilized" as themselves, the image of the "savage Indian" was fading before their eyes. Thus, the anxious white settlers called for a more direct and forceful policy, which Jackson was definitely willing to administer. By the end of the year 1830, Jackson's Indian Removal Policy

was approved by Congress, and with this policy came a whole other set of rationalizations and romantic concealments that the government imposed upon its citizens in order to find a way to dispossess a new nation of "civilized" people.

The consequence of the Cherokees proving their progress to the United States' government, was that Jacksonians were forced to create a new tactic for promoting the removal of the Indians so as not to disgrace the South and the United States. Satz iterates that the Jacksonian removal policy provided southerners "with a convenient humanitarian rationale…by equating removal with the preservation" of the Indians. In his words, "they could stand on high moral ground while relieving the Indians of their land east of the Mississippi River" (Satz 55). Jackson wanted to promote removal in the South thereby gaining support for himself, without saying or doing anything that would seem "blatantly immoral" (Satz 64). Thus, when he offered to move the Cherokee west of the Mississippi in his Congressional address, he expressed that this was "not only [a] liberal, but generous" policy to administer. Even before Jackson's first annual address was given, the New York board for the Emigration, Preservation, and Improvement of the Aborigines of America were purposefully told to arouse religious support to remove the Indians so that the public would consider removal a religious as well as a moral policy (Satz 15). Jackson as well as the public adopted the romantic idea that by removing the Indians, they would be preserving them from annihilation. With this thought to ease their minds, the citizens of the south could justify a

"speedy removal" as well as claim to have the Cherokee's best interests at heart. This changed the face of the "historical frontier" by simply covering up the "uglier actualities" behind their true want of a Cherokee removal, creating a "romantic frontier" within which they felt morally comfortable.

To administer their romantic policy that the Cherokees must be removed for their own preservation, Georgia immediately enacted a series of laws that spread their jurisdiction over Cherokee territory on December 19, 1829 and more later on December 22, 1830. Although Georgia government claimed that these acts were to protect the Cherokees, they actually intruded on the Cherokees' freedom in that it called for

> all laws, ordinances, orders, and regulations of any kind whatever, made, passed, or enacted by the Cherokee Indians, either in general council or in any other way whatever…[to be] herby declared to be null and void and of no effect, as if the same had never existed.[14]

Thus, the Georgia government declared void all previous treaties and commitments made between the United States and the Cherokee Nation. Likewise, Jackson declared that the federal government could not protect the Cherokees from the Georgia state government, and that he lacked the authority to recognize them as a sovereign nation.[15] In other words, Jackson could have simply said that a Cherokee Nation "had never existed." This, together with the Indian Removal Act of 1830, literally erases the Cherokee Nation out of the Old South. However, by breaking treaty agreements with

the Cherokee Nation, Jackson created a blemish on his romantic portrayal of the Indians that can not be erased. Here, one can see that Jackson's "romantic frontier" is severely undercut by the "turbulent" and "bloody" historical frontier of the Old South.

In retaliation against the Indian Removal Act of 1830 that made official Jackson's offer to remove the Indians west of the Mississippi, the Cherokees chose to sue the state of Georgia, also creating a contradiction in the Eurocentric romantic frontier. The opportunity to prove their independence came about when a Cherokee Indian by the name of George Tassel was taken by Georgia state authorities inside Cherokee country and speedily convicted of murder. Despite the Cherokee's appeal that Georgia laws did not extend over this matter, Tassel was executed by the Georgia government before the case could even be brought to court. By the time the case hit the Supreme Court, the Cherokee's were moving for an injunction against the state of Georgia for the total violation of their freedom and sovereignty, not just the infringement on the Tassel case.[16] However, John Marshall's decision, or rather non-decision, in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* fell enormously short of satisfying the Cherokees' demands that they were a sovereign nation with their own constitution, law enforcement, and language. His ultimate statement was:

> If it be true that the Cherokee nation have rights this is not the tribunal in which those rights are to be asserted. If it be true that wrongs have been inflicted, and that still greater are to be

> apprehended, this is not the tribunal which can redress the past or prevent the future…the motion for an injunction is denied.[17]

Here, Marshall's lack of decision and evasion of responsibility creates a horrible position for the Cherokee. He declared that the Cherokees were "domestic dependents," and because they were not exactly a "foreign nation," they could not sue the state of Georgia. At this point, the Cherokee could no longer fight as an original and independent government, and the State of Georgia was able to implement its laws as well as its romanticized version of their need to be removed.

John Marshall's decision in *Worchester v. Georgia,* however, represents a historical contradiction in the face of Jackson's romantic frontier. When the State of Georgia enforced the law that all white missionaries must be removed from the Cherokee lands, Marshall was again called to make a crucial decision. This time, he recalled his former decision and stated that Georgia's extension of state law over the Cherokee Nation was unconstitutional. Marshall's decision goes as follows:

> The Cherokee nation, then, is a distinct community, occupying its own territory, with boundaries accurately described, in which the laws of Georgia have no right to enter, but with the assent of the Cherokees themselves.[18]

Literally, Marshall's decision meant that the Cherokee Nation did indeed exist and that their title could not be extinguished unless by their own accord.

Jackson of course was infuriated by the court decision, and in the end, blatantly ignored it.[19]

Symbolically, the decision to ignore the Supreme Court's decision, meant that the Cherokee Indians were disinherited from the south, for more reasons than what Jackson's romantic policy had been claiming. So when Jackson chose to ignore the court decision, he was only reinforcing the United States' idea that "a culturally diverse conception of the nation [remained] unimaginable."[20] The fact was not that the general government thought that the Cherokees *could not* coexist or even assimilate with the colonists, they simply did not want them to even try. For Jackson and white southerners, this case, *Worcester v. Georgia,* was only a kink in the chain of events that led to the signing over of Cherokee lands and the Trail of Tears in 1838. Jackson's decision to force removal on the Cherokee only pushed the "uglier actuality" of a undeniably multicultural society farther west along with the Indians and drew Georgia the clear "lines" that it had always wanted.

A signing of the Treaty of New Echota in December 1835 literally signed the death warrant of over 4000 souls in what is called the Trail of Tears. The ramifications of Jackson's decision to completely and purposefully ignore the Supreme Court and the Cherokee nation's existence were an atrocity to both Cherokees and white southerners in that it tried to erase a part of the South's identity and history. What is so horribly fascinating is that the atrocity itself has gone unrecognized, compared to other major historical markers, for more than a century. Writers of history

textbooks and the following presidents after Jackson desperately tried to conceal the fact that this was the only time in the United States' history that a president totally disregarded a Supreme Court decision, which ultimately led to the decimation of one-fourth of a people. What can no longer be concealed is that Jackson's actions speak louder than his words. His address may have created a "romantic frontier" that was accepted because it was more comfortable than acknowledging the "uglier actuality" of removal, but the act itself, the Trail of Tears and the deaths of thousands of Cherokee men, women, and children, will never be erased. What will be examined in the following chapters is the role that Simms and Boudinot play in revealing what Jackson and the United States tried so desperately to conceal. Through the pages of Simms's and Boudinot's fiction, a multicultural complexity, in which underlies shame, concealment, and narcissism is revealed. By looking at this "confusion" of historical and literary texts, the South's native identity, the existence of the Cherokee Nation, and the "uglier actuality" of the Trail of Tears can no longer be concealed between the pages of history.

ENDNOTES

[1]Andrew Jackson, "First Annual Address to the 21st Congress, 1828" All other quotes from Jackson throughout the text refer to this address.

[2]This phrase is borrowed from Nathaniel Hawthorne, "Roger Malvin's Burial" in The Complete Short Stories of Nathaniel Hawthorne, (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1959), p.376-389, in which he describes the shame and concealment of the bloody attack on an Indian settlement in an incident now called Lovewell's Fight. Hawthorne satirically says that "imagination, by casting certain circumstances judiciously into the shade, may see much to admire" in the attack, but ultimately the reader finds that there are "uglier actualities" behind the attack, and in reality nothing is "much to admire."

[3]The Creek Indians had already signed over the last of their lands in 1826-7.

[4]See Anthony F.C. Wallace, The Long Bitter Trail: Andrew Jackson and the Indians, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), p. 58-63).

[5]Robert F. Sayre, Thoreau and the American Indians, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977), p. 4-5.

[6]Sayre, p. 4.

[7]Henry Thompson Malone, Cherokees of the Old South: A People in Transition, (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1956), p.3,17.

[8] In J. Leitch Wright, Jr., The Only Land They Knew: American Indians in the Old South, (Lincoln: university of Nebraska Press, 1981), p.12, Wright says that "during the winter of 1609-10 Jamestown settlers living right on the river experienced the rigorous "starving time," when their numbers shrank from some five hundred to sixty. The Jamestown experience made it obvious that whites had much to learn from the natives."

[9]Finger, p. 9-10.

[10]Ronald N. Satz, American Indian Policy in the Jacksonian Era, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1975), p. 2. All references to American Indian Policy in the Jacksonian Era and arguments by Satz refer to this edition and will be given parenthetically within the text.

[11]Finger, p. 60.

[12]Theda Perdue and Michael D. Green, ed. The Cherokee Removal: A Brief History with Documents, (Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martins Press, 1995) p.58. Georgia had made an agreement with the federal government that she would sell them her territory to the west, which at that time extended all the way out to present day California. In return, the federal government was to buy up the Indians' territories in the southeast, thus removing them from the region and giving the land to the Georgia.

[13]Malone, p.172.

[14]Perdue and Green, p.63

[15]Murrin, p. 380.

[16] For the background information concerning *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, see Malone, p.174.

[17]John Marshall, *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, January 1831

[18]John Marshall, *Worcester v. Georgia*, March 1832

[19]Murrin, p.380, Jackson is infamous for having said after the court decision, "John Marshall has made his decision, now let him enforce it!"

[20]Ibid, p.380

[21]All basic information regarding the Trail of Tears was found in Earl Boyd Pierce and Rennard Strickland, The Cherokee People, (Phoenix: Indian Tribal Series, 1973).

CHAPTER 3

"WHO ARE THE SOUTHERNERS?"

> "Two men are of the same nation if and only if they share the same culture, where culture in turn means a system of ideas and signs and associations and ways of behaving and communicating…Two men are of the same nation if and only if they *recognize* each other as belonging to the same nation."[1]
>
> --Ernest Gellner, Nations and Nationalism, 1983

The word "Southern" in the United States conjures emotions and images that are unique and distinct from any other area in the world, and the idea of being a "Southerner," or what Simms would have called a "Southron," symbolizes a person that has been born into a unified "system of ideas" or rather a symbolic "nation." The South, although a part of the United States, is a region that holds the same "sentiment," "patriotism," "political principle," or in other words, the same "ways of behaving and communicating" that slightly vary from the United States as a whole.[2] These characteristics are all a part of what Gellner, in his Nations and Nationalism, considers as constituents of nationalism. Thus, from the time of the United States' birth, the South was its own "nation" within the Nation, but never in this distinct "nation" or identity was meant to be included the American Indian. William Gilmore Simms's The Yemassee: A Romance of Carolina depicted the stirrings of this distinctly

"Southron" culture and frames and even shapes, white Southern "sentiment" and the ideological behavior of his region through his fiction. What must be remembered, however, is that his great Southern epic is centered around the Yemassee people, a "culture" that was never meant to be included in the "romantic frontier" of the United States. By centering his Romance of Carolina around the Yemassee and the American Indian, Simms presents a Southern identity that severely undercuts Jackson's "romantic frontier" that meant to "extinguish the Indian title" from Southern American society. Thus, his Yemassee shows that the symbolic "nation" of the Old South is a "glorious confusion" of multicultural complexity despite its monocultural "sentiment."

Because the American Indian is physically included in the Southern "nation" in Simms's The Yemassee, his fiction actually reveals a more accurate picture than that of most historical readings today. William Gilmore Simms, as a writer of fiction, played a major role in the process of history writing that framed the Southern "nation" and/or ideology. The idea of the "South" being a region with its own customs, ideas, and culture was a relatively new subject at the time of Simms's birth in 1806, and even though there were obvious differences in environment, social mores, and ethnic origins since their arrival, European settlers did not begin to discuss the region that is now called the "Old South" in letters, literature, and history books until after the Revolution.[3] The American Indian's "culture" is one that was not "recognize[d]" in American society as being a part of Southern identity and history. This neglect is extremely ironic in that American Indians were not

only a part of American history, but the very existence of American culture stems from these indigenous people. In fact, they were a major ingredient of what is now regarded as the "Old South's" history as well as its distinct identity. Most histories centered around white southerners and how they influenced others and how their customs came about in the post Revolutionary era.[4] What makes Simms's fiction so historically accurate is that the American Indian is included in the picture of the Southern culture despite the South's will to erase them from history. Simms's fictional romance, The Yemassee can be seen as a testament to the "culture" and nationalistic character of the South. Thus, his picture of the South was quite different from Jackson's in that he wrote the American Indian into history rather than writing him out of history.

Whereas a reading of Simms's fiction in 1835 would have reflected a "Romance of Carolina" and its white settlers, at present, it actually makes a bold and definite statement concerning the American government's rationale behind the Cherokee Indian Removal controversy that was taking place as Simms was writing. Although Simms and other Southerners would not have considered the Cherokee as being a part of Southern identity, he certainly included the American Indian in his "Romance of Carolina," which shows that despite Jackson's "romantic frontier," they were indeed a part of Southern society. Simms's narrator reveals the importance of fiction in history making when he says:

> Where history dare not go, it is then for poetry, borrowing a wild gleam from the blear eye of tradition, to couple with her own the wings of imagination, and overleap the boundaries of the defined and certain…[5]

Simms's view of the Cherokee situation is formed by his "borrow[ing]" of past historical events and joining them with current ones through dialogue, romantic plot, and "poetry." He "couple[s]" the Yemassee War with "imagination" to form a story that reflects the white ideology behind the1835 Cherokee Indian Removal.

Simms's The Yemassee is both a work of "romance" and realism in that its romantic vision or purpose is monocultural, but its realistic characters are multicultural. As a whole, it is should be considered an epic that framed elite white southern ideology during the time of Cherokee Removal. Simms regarded his Yemassee as a romance, "not a novel," but as he explains, "the modern Romance is the substitute which people of the present day offer for the ancient epic."[6] As many other critics and historians have pointed out, the actual Yemassee War was not as Simms described it.[7] However, the emotions, philosophies, and violent acts of the whites and Indians in the epic are very accurate and horrifically realistic. Simms contended "to be truthful, a true writer—an earnest man, full of his subject…must lay it as bare as possible."[8] This creed enabled Simms to display some of the harsher realities of white southern ideology. This unveiling of such a severe perspective is surely the reason why Simms has been purposefully forgotten and buried over

the past several decades.[9] Nevertheless, Simms wrote in his letters that his "novels aim at something more than the story."[10] Simms's The Yemassee "aimed" to truthfully capture the stirrings of a white southern "nation" through an historical and controversial event. What makes The Yemassee an historical epic is that Simms conveys a realistic portrayal of white southern ideology through a justapositioning of history, "poetry," and fiction.

Simms's depicts the South's monocultural "sentiment" and "Southron" ideal through his protagonist, Master Harrison. Harrison, who in the end turns out to be Charleston's Governor Charles Craven, is depicted as a man who "only lived for great occasions" and times of patriotic duty (Simms 201). His leadership and skillful strategy wins him the battle and the girl. As a whole, he is the ultimate cavalier, willing to defend honor and country, while keeping his dignity. Simms makes it clear that Harrison is the hero and an ideal candidate for a representation of his "Southron" nation. Louis D. Rubin, Jr. argues that Craven represented Simms's idea of the successful southerner:

> …the gentleman-planter would be the Cavalier who replicated the landed aristocrat of Old England, the symbol of successful achievment.[11]

As Rubin suggests, through the character Charles Craven, Simms demonstrated the image of the Southern Cavalier. However, Simms did not reveal that Master Harrison was governor until the very end of The Yemassee. Before this moment Simms emphasizes Harrison's character rather than status. This supports the argument that Simms's idea of the ultimate cavalier

was actually a self-made man. Simms himself was not born of a wealthy or noble family, and his message is that the simple white settler could be just as gallant and successful as the white elite. What Simms's Harrison does not portray is a recognition that the American Indian could also be part this Southern ideal and the "symbol of successful achievement." Thus, through Master Harrison, Simms argues for the progress of the self-made Southerner, just so long as he is white.

The Yemassee's monocultural "sentiment" is expressed through this message that "true Southrons" only consist of the white cavalier, but the South's multicultural complexity is shown through the character, Sanutee. Simms's treatment of the Yemassee character Sanutee expresses the South's contemporary burden of the Cherokee's presence through the theme of acculturation versus extermination. He uses the Indian character Sanutee to describe the southern rationale of removal. He writes that "[Sanutee] well knew that the superior must necessarily be the ruin of the race which is inferior—that the one must either sink its existence in with that of the other, or it must perish" (Simms 14). Although Simms portrays Sanutee as a very wise and noble leader of the Yemassee, it is obvious that Simms considers the American Indian as the inferior race. Simms's portrayal of the American Indian as inferior had of course long been a convenient stereotype and Eurocentric idea used against the Cherokee that he reinforced through his character, Sanutee. Despite the message that the Cherokee must "sink its existence in with that of the [whites], or "perish," Simms recognizes that they

are not ignorant of their "true condition," as Jackson suggests, in terms of their place in progressive America. In fact, Simms's Sanutee is portrayed as keenly observant, a master of the forest and nature, and ultimately he shows that he recognizes the complexity of the circumstances surrounding acculturation and/or extermination. Simms's characterization of Sanutee shows that white southerners were conscious of the fact that the Cherokee were not the ignorant savages that they had been portrayed as by Jackson, but still could not overcome their monocultural "sentiment" and build a Southern "nation" that would include multicultures.

The Yemassee reflects the white southern perspective of preserving ones culture as a unique and special entity through maintaining a monocultural society. Throughout The Yemassee, Simms degrades the character of Pastor Matthews as being a "bigot" and a narrow-minded man because he thinks that people and cultures should be universal. Simms describes Pastor Matthews as "wedded to old habits and prejudices, and perhaps like a very extensive class, one who, preserving forms, might with little difficulty be persuaded to throw aside principles" (Simms 50). Simms leaves no room for liking this character, but through Pastor Matthews, Simms shows that what is important to southerners is a maintaining of "culture," tradition and variety. He writes that the Pastor

> could not be brought to understand that climates and conditions should be various, and that the popular good, in a strict reference to the mind of man, demanded that people should everywhere differ in manner and

> opinion…but he perfectly agreed with those in power that there should be a prescribed standard by which the opinions of all persons should be regulated" (Simms 50).

Here, Simms is arguing that people should be allowed to uphold their own culture and traditions without a breach of rights. Simms, while his ulterior motive may be that he wants to uphold his own monocultural white society in the South, indirectly argues for the maintaining of Indian culture and tradition. His contention that "people everywhere should differ in manner and opinion" does reflect tolerance, but still does not "recognize" Indian culture as influential or as being a part of his own symbolic "nation." The South was unable to think of a society as being multicultural.

Although Simms's The Yemassee is monocultural in its "sentiment," it does present a multicultural region with characters of many different ethnic backgrounds and colors. Charles Craven, of course, represents only a fraction of "real" southerners at that time, considering that most people dwelling in the South were backcountry farmers, poor whites, black slaves, and ultimately, American Indians. Most white southerners in 1715, or 1835 for that matter, were far from being aristocrats, plantation owners, or even from "Old England." Besides the fact that Simms overlooks blacks and Indians as Southerners, he hides that most white southerners were not even English, but were actually Scotch-Irish.[12] In fact, Simms's own father was born an Irishman and was a self-made man. Thus, the protagonist, Charles Craven, is merely a highly valued and aspired stereotype, not the reality. While the elite

may have had more power and political sway than the average white farmer, Simms's Cavalier is diminished by the fact that the majority of southerners consisted of American Indians, black slaves, and poor whites. In his Foreward to Plain Folk of the South Revisited, John B. Boles suggests that there were many different types of white southerners apart from the elite plantation slaveowner which contributed to the "plain folk" of the Old South.[13] In the antebellum era, northerners considered most southerners to be "courageous, lazy, lustful, quarrelsome, violent, ignorant, superstitious, drunkards, gamblers, and livestock thieves."[14] More interesting still is that most of these "savage" southerners, whether Scotch-Irish or black, were not even native to the United States. They were indeed foreigners in a "nation" that they called their own. What Simms did in his fiction was turn this reality of the non-native southerner in to the patriotic, and therefore native, cavalier.

A more accurate description of the white southerner is depicted through Simms's character Teddy Macnamara. In a bloody scene in The Yemassee, Simms depicts a simple Irish settler as admirable and worthy of the title "Southron" in that he has courage and strength even though he suffers a torturous death. Simms describes him as the "true brave" and "fearless" in the face of death (Simms 259). Although this Irishman is obviously a non-native, he shares Simms's cavalier sense of "noble hardihood, fierce courage, [and] brave defiance," (Simms 262). Thus, white non-native southerners are included in Simms's Southern "nation" in that they hold the same values and character as Simms's ideal cavalier. However, the description of the Indians

in this scene is terribly savage and demonic. Simms describes them as torture hungry and flinging tomahawks, and all the while Macnamara is screaming, "ye red divils!" (Simms 260). Here, Simms reduces the image of the American Indian to even less than that of Jackson's image, but at the same time, their passion shows a fight for survival and for keeping their native lands. Both Macnamara and the American Indian share an allegiance to the land. The irony here is that Simms sympathetically portrays the non-native white southerner as having a right to the land that so blatantly belongs to the native "savage." This Southern "sentiment" of belonging to the land of that region is a major part of the symbolic "nation" that the South had created. This of course is severely undercut by the fact that their "nation" only included whites, none of which were native to the land and which at the time of Cherokee removal was a conscious, yet silently discarded fact.

This patriotism to the land and to cultural identity is what Gellner discusses as being a part of "nation" building, and what Simms's fiction shows is that both white Southerners and the American Indian share this attribute. Sanutee is portrayed as one of the most patriotic characters of the epic and he relates that the "true power of the nation rested in Sanutee." Also, he was a reminder to the others that they should not give up their lands "for a strange assortment of hatchets, knives, blankets, brads, beads, and other commodities of the character"(Simms 85). Indeed, Simms creates two protagonists in his epic, Craven and Sanutee. However, one can greatly perceive that the place of the American Indian is subordinate to the place of

the Southern Cavalier. While both are depicted as patriotic and honorable, Sanutee is presented as a character that played into his own doom. Despite Simms's idea of patriotism as a multicultural characteristic, Simms could not overcome his sense of a monocultural society. The end of The Yemassee depicts the fall of the tribe and with it the entire heritage and lands of the people are destroyed. Simms presents a complex view in that the "old patriot" as he refers to him, embodies what Simms would call a true "Southron" in that he would die rather than surrender his liberty and lands (Simms 86). However, this view also reveals that while white southerners may have considered the Cherokees and other southern tribes to be patriotic and noble, they still considered them as inferiors that must either move or be destroyed at the expense of land ownership.

What can be gathered from Simms's Yemassee is that while white southerners may have created a "romantic frontier" in their symbolic "nation," they could not "extinguish the Indian title" from fiction or history. In order to write the great Southern "epic," Simms had to include the American Indian as a part of his story. The patriotic cavalier depends on the American Indian for his image and his symbolic "nation" that he created. In his introduction to his collection of essays of William Gilmore Simms and the American Frontier, Guilds states that

> In 1816, ten years after Simms's birth and just after the War of 1812, the South existed as a distinct area on no maps except campaign theater maps from the Revolutionary War. It had no government and

> no formal institutions…Yet within twenty years, *the South* was a highly charged and widely used location designation and allegiance, and Southern had become an adjective with emotional as well as descriptive force far beyond its early functions as a political device"

Simms helped create the emotional adjective "Southern" through his fiction by examining the distinct convictions and philosophies of white southerners, but what his Yemassee reveals is that "Southern" depended on its multicultural people and region to function as a distinctly symbolic "nation." Although Simms presents a sympathetic attitude toward the Indians in The Yemassee, it undeniably reveals the uglier actuality behind whites advocating a Cherokee removal, that is that white southerners relied on the Cherokee for the creation of their symbolic "nation," but they would never "recognize" the Cherokee as "belonging to the same nation" as their own.

ENDNOTES

[1]Ernest Gellner, Nations and Nationalism, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), p.7.

[2]Ibid, p.1.

[3] In William Gilmore Simms and the American Frontier, (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1997), p.7, John C. Guilds claims that "in the thirty years after the Revolution, writers from the future South joined in the exploration of state histories and in writing of a new genre, American history," but the South was too much of a separate culture from that of the North and thus these two "began looking for alternative pasts."

[4]For an analysis of textbooks and histories see Arlene B. Hirscgfelder, American Indian Stereotypes in the World of Children, (Metuchen, N.J, and London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1982).

[5]William Gilmore Simms, The Yemassee: A Romance of Carolina, (Fayetteville, Arkansas: The University of Arkansas Press, 1994), p.402. All other references to The Yemassee refer to this edition and will be given parenthetically within the text.

[6] John Caldwell Guilds, "Introduction," in William Gilmore Simms, The Yemassee: A Romance of Carolina, (Fayetteville, The University of Arkansas Press, 1994), p.xxix.

[7]See John Caldwell Guilds, "Historical Background," in William Gilmore Simms, The Yemassee: A Romance of Carolina, (Fayetteville, The University of Arkansas Press, 1994), p. 439-441.

[8]The Letters of William Gilmore Simms, eds. Mary C. Simms Oliphant, Alfred Taylor Odell, T.C. Duncan Eaves (Columbia, The University of South Carolina Press, 1952-1956), vol. I, p. 263.

[9]For a collection of essays Simms and his neglect in criticism, see John Caldwell Guilds, ed. "The Long Years of Neglect," (Fayetteville, The University of Arkansas Press, 1988).

[10]The Letters of William Gilmore Simms, eds. Mary C. Simms Oliphant, Alfred Taylor Odell, T.C. Duncan Eaves (Columbia, The University of South Carolina Press, 1952-1956), vol. III, p. 421.

[11]Louis D. Rubin p.131

[12]For an intensive study on the origins and ethnic backgrounds of white southerners see Grady McWhiney, Cracker Culture: Celtic Ways in the Old South, (Tuscaloosa, The University of Alabama Press, 1988), p.1-22.

[13]John B. Boles, "Foreward," in Plain Folk of the South Revistied, ed. Samuel C. Hyde, Jr., (Baton Rouge, The Louisiana State University Press, 1997), p.x.

[14]Grady McWhiney, "Crackers and Cavaliers: Shared Courage," in Plain Folk of the South Revisited, ed. Samuel C. Hyde, Jr., (Baton Rouge, The Louisiana State University Press, 1997), p.191.

CHAPTER 4

THE CYCLE OF CONCEALMENT

> …it must be a source of highest gratification to every friend to justice and humanity to learn that notwithstanding the obstructions from time to time thrown in its way and the difficulties which have arisen from the peculiar and impracticable nature of the Indian character, the wise, the humane, and undeviating policy of the Government in this most difficult of all our relations, foreign or domestic, has at length been justified to the world in its near approach to a happy and certain consummation.[1]
>
> --Martin Van Buren, *Address to Congress*, 1838

Van Buren's speech to Congress, given after the fatal Trail of Tears, symbolizes the total denial of the Cherokee Indian Nation and its existence within the South. While he claimed that "justice and humanity" had been served with the removal of the Cherokee, four thousand deaths remain as a reminder that its "certain consummation" was anything but "wise" or "humane." In his book Shame, the Underside of Narcissism, Andrew P. Morrison argues that shame, narcissism, and concealment result from one another and manifest itself as a cycle. He goes on to say that "shame and narcissism are closely related and can easily be transformed from one to the other." Furthermore, he states that "narcissism functions as a defense against

self-hatred and shame."[2] Van Buren's speech demonstrates both narcissism and a cycle of concealment that would continue for more than a century.[3] The United States literally tore the Cherokee people from their homes, locked them in stockades, and against their will, sent them on a death march of over one thousand miles during the coldest months of winter. Van Buren's concealment of the true nature of the Cherokee's removal as a "happy consummation" is only protecting the narcissistic and self-adulating reputation of the United States. His concealment of the "uglier actuality" of the "land of the free" hides America's shame, a shame that its government, which is supposed to be "the wise" and "the humane," has in actuality, utterly failed at being a "friend to justice." Jackson, Van Buren, and Simms's "fiction" are all a part of the cycle of concealment, but what Boudinot's writings illustrate is why the southern "nation" desperately needed to literally push away the Cherokee and figuratively push away their shame.

Boudinot's main goals in his writings were to instill a sense of progress into the Cherokee people and to prove to the whites that the Cherokee Nation could become useful, advanced allies of the United States. He wanted to "overleap the boundaries" of what seemed the "defined and certain," and shed a new light on the whites' perspective of the Cherokees. He wanted to preserve the Cherokee Nation and its independence, while shaping the Cherokee ideology through promoting progress in his writings. He wrote:

> I can view my native country rising…and taking her seat with the nations of the earth. I can behold her sons bursting fetters of ignorance and unshackling her from the vices of heathenism. She is at this instant, risen like the first morning sun, which grows brighter and brighter, until it reaches its fullness of glory.[4]

Boudinot argues for equal status as a nation, not as a dependent. He was a progressionist, like many whites, in that he saw his country "rising" to the level of the United States and other nations. His message ultimately reveals that the Cherokees were not the "impracticable Indian" that was unwilling to compromise, and his progressive attitude subverts Jackson's "romantic" portrayal of the Indian as an ignorant savage. Because he saw his people growing "brighter and brighter," the white South forced them farther away in order to maintain their monocultural vision.

Because Boudinot believed that the Cherokee must adopt progress and "remove ignorance" in order to survive as the Cherokee Nation, he displayed an image of civilization that whites were forced to conceal in order to keep their "romantic frontier" in tact (Boudinot 76). Boudinot's belief in Cherokee independence is complicated by the fact that, at the same time, he advocated for assimilation into white European culture. Boudinot stood for progress by means of upholding both Cherokee traditions and southern white institutions. Although born and reared a Cherokee Indian, he "received a white education, converted to Christianity, married a white woman," and even owned slaves.[5] His philosophy of assimilation is expressed when he says, "There are two

alternatives…become civilized and happy, or…become extinct" (Boudinot 78). Boudinot takes on the belief that a blending of his culture with that of the whites is the only alternative for survival. He associates "advancing the improvement" of the Cherokee with the assimilation into European culture, but still regards the Cherokee people as independent (Boudinot 94). Thus, Boudinot literally expresses a blending of multicultures in order to survive and exist in the South, but the problem was that the South could only conceive of a monocultural society.

Although he promoted acculturation of white civilization, he did not want to rid the Cherokee of their sense of unity. Perdue claims that "Boudinot maintained that the preservation of his people depended solely upon the "abandonment of their own traditions, cultures, and history," yet he still believed that civilization would not "eliminate them as a distinct people" (Perdue 3,10). However, while Boudinot did advocate assimilation, his assimilation did not call for the "abandonment" of their "traditions, cultures, and history" as a people. Instead his assimilation called for advancement and progress by learning European standards, not by abandoning their history. Civilization would require the Cherokee to extinguish old customs such as hunting and traditional Indian clothing, but it would not make the Cherokee Nation any less unique or any less "Cherokee."[6] Boudinot instilled the idea that civilization and progress would come to the Cherokee if they maintained themselves as a cohesive group. For instance, the invention of the Cherokee syllabary advanced the Cherokees as a literate people, but was created as a

distinct and separate written language from that of any other nation. In his "Address to the Whites," Boudinot calls for the "shrill sound of the Savage yell" to "die away," but to replace it with their own civilized institutions (Boudinot 74). Thus, Boudinot shapes a complicated Cherokee ideology that calls for a separate and unique "nation" from that of the United States, yet still "recognizes" and embraces a multicultural society within the South.

Boudinot's idea of patriotism is one that carried little allegiance to the land, but a great amount to his people, which underscores his idea that the Cherokee should assimilate, yet remain a cohesive group. He felt that the patriotic duty in 1835 was signing the removal treaty at New Echota. He knew that removal would insure the Cherokees' survival, and that was what was most important. His dream was that the Cherokee Nation be left in tact and independent of the United States government. He realized that by signing the treaty he would be despised by many of his fellow tribesmen, but he felt that it was his patriotic duty to "act legitimately on the behalf of the 'ignorant' masses" (Perdue 29). On the day that he signed the Treaty of New Echota, Boudinot addressed the public saying

> I know I take my life in my own hand, as our fathers have also done…we can die, but the great Cherokee Nation will be saved. They will not be annihilated; they can live. Oh, what is a man worth who will not dare to die for his people? Who is there here that will not perish, if this great Nation may be saved?
>
> (Perdue 27).

Boudinot equates the Cherokee Nation with the people, not the land. He says, "they," the Cherokee Nation, "can live" by relinquishing the land and eventually whites could learn to co-exist within the same borders. Boudinot's patriotism lies in his "love of the people," and the act of signing the treaty could be considered as honorable in that Boudinot gives up his own reputation so that the rest of the Cherokees could still maintain their pride (Boudinot 172). He signed the removal treaty because he wanted to see his people "rise like the Phoenix" (Boudinot 78). This metaphor of the Phoenix suggests that he wanted immortality for his people by surviving and leaving a mark in history. The only way this dream could be achieved was if he signed the treaty, which was his patriotic duty to fulfill.

> In order to maintain their narcissistic southern "nation," white southerners had to conceal the fact that Boudinot, and at least some Cherokees, were willing to advance, assimilate, and progress just as they would. Theda Perdue says in her preface to Cherokee Editor, that he was "willing to part with the land," but "he could not part with the dream." The fact was that Boudinot's "dream" was well on its way in that the Cherokee had "built a network of schools, and churches, developed an alphabet, published a bilingual newspaper, organized libraries as well literary, temperance, and benevolent societies, and instituted written laws and a constitutional republican government" (Perdue ix). Boudinot treated the Cherokee newspaper, as more than a source for information, it was tool for propaganda. With the newspaper, he could show white readers that the

Cherokees were accomplishing civilization and progress, that they were leaving behind their old customs and learning the practices of white southerners. While most Cherokees did not exhibit a progressive attitude as extreme as Boudinot's, they were quite "Americanized," and this was why white southerners desperately needed to remove the Cherokee westward. Besides the fact that they dwelled in log homes, had a circulating newspaper, and dressed in English-style fashion, they adopted a written Constitution that was extremely similar that of the United States. Thus, in order to maintain their monocultural society, whites had to conceal the "advances" of the Cherokee, push them westward, and ultimately deny them of any chance of revealing the "glorious confusion" of an equal and multicultural South.

This concealment and inability to "recognize" that the Cherokee people were indeed a Nation that was surrounded by and intermingling with the symbolic "nation" of the South directly stems from narcissism. The non-recognition of the Cherokee Nation eliminates its people, not only from their own lands, but as influential characters in a multicultural region and in the formation of the United States. Besides the fact that the white South concealed the advances of the Cherokee, they also concealed that the properties of the United States government were in part based on the Cherokees own form of natural law. Historian, Donald A. Grinde, Jr., argues that "Throughout the revolutionary war and into the early years of the United States, relations with the major native nations that bordered the colonies (later the United States) were a primary focus of the nation's statecraft."[7] Jefferson

even wrote in one letter that "the only condition on earth to be compared with [our government]…is that of the Indians, where they still have less law than we."[8] The argument that the Cherokee could have politically influenced the United States undermines the narcissistic attitude of an original democracy. If Gellner's theory holds true that "political principle" is a factor in nation building, then what this shows is that the American government derived its "Nation" from that of the Cherokee's. This idea completely dismantles the fragile and narcissistic society that the United States has romantically depicted as monocultural. To "recognize" the Cherokee as an integral part of their own nation building would have been to accept the fact of a multicultural society, but for the white South, this was impossible to conceive.

Boudinot's writings before the Trail of Tears upset the narcissistic ideology of a monocultural south by undercutting the one-dimensional image of the "savage" Indian. In his *Cherokee Phoenix*, he demonstrates an unwavering will to assimilate and be equals. For instance, even though the Cherokees developed their own written language, both English and Cherokee characters were used in his newspaper side by side. He says in his "Prospectus" that in addition to "the laws and public documents of the Nation…miscellaneous articles, calculated to promote Literature, Civilization, and Religion" will be included in his newspaper (Boudinot 90). Boudinot's hope was that the Cherokee people would learn both languages in order to better acculturate themselves with the whites, and in his words, the newspaper would "add great force to the charitable means employed by the public for

their melioration" (Boudinot 91-92). As a whole, his newspaper displayed not only a civilized and intelligent image of the Cherokee, but it showed a multicultural view of the South. His paper circulated in the South, was read by both Cherokees and whites, and its language was innately Southern. His paper shows that a monocultural South simply did not exist, and ultimately, it is narcissistic of the United States to pretend that it did. This is why removal "functioned as a defense against self-hatred and shame." To "recognize" the existence of a multicultural South would have been to "recognize" the southern "nation" as a part of what they has already deemed and "inferior race." The white South was simply ashamed to be identified as inferiors themselves, since in reality, they were indeed inferior to the land that they claimed as their own.

Boudinot's newspaper, with its first issue on February 21, 1828, undermined the image of the "savage" Indian, and in order to protect their monocultural society and their "romantic frontier," the United States was forced to remove the Cherokee. The Trail of Tears marked the ultimate shame of the United States, and Van Buren's speech represents a climatic point in the perpetual cycle of concealment behind the "true nature" of the Cherokee's condition. Cherokees were torn from their homes by the enforced deadline of removal and the desperate need to conceal and protect a monocultural ideology. However, what cannot be concealed is the utter shame and guilt felt by all whom were involved in the atrocity of removal. Private John Burnett, a soldier during this horrible time reflected afterwards that he "wish[ed] that he

could forget it all, but the memory of six hundred and forty-five wagons lumbering over the frozen ground with their Cargo of suffering humanity still linger[ed] in [his] memory."[9] It seemed like a nightmare to everyone concerned, but with Van Buren's depiction of a "happy" consummation, the image of the removal becoming a fleeting one, and indeed a nightmare that was judiciously concealed by generations following. This soldier's testament to the nature of the removal shows that the shame of "suffering humanity" of the Cherokee can be concealed by a "romantic frontier," but it can never be forgotten. Likewise, Boudinot's writings are a timeless reminder that the Trail of Tears did indeed exist, and that the shame still "lingers" in the United States' "memory."

While Jackson and Van Buren reshaped the face of southern history through their romantic language, purposefully leaving a vacancy in southern identity, Simms and Boudinot bring the missing piece of the heritage of the South back to its original form. The romantic language that state and federal government officials used conflicts drastically with the reality of the Cherokee's past situation. In an effort to "forget it all" Van Buren left an everlasting marker that erased the inhumane and unjustified treatment of the removal. This paradox is the "fascinating mess" of the "historical frontier" of the South. Van Buren "promoted the welfare" of the Cherokee Indians to his public by blatantly ignoring the atrocity and instilling the "romantic frontier" of the south. By doing so, he only concealed the shame and guilt of the American people. Boudinot, however, offers recognition of the shame,

concealment, and narcissism of the Southern "nation" and the United States, and what both Simms and Elias Boudinot do for Southern identity is bring the Cherokee people alive to the present day reader. Although Simms only perpetuates the cycle of concealment in that he does not "recognize" the American Indian as a part of his southern "nation," his fiction is based around the American Indian's influence and presence. While Simms's The Yemassee reveals the historical complexity of a southern "nation," Boudinot's writings reveal the missing heritage of a multicultural south. Thus, a reading of Boudinot's writings today breaks Jackson, Van Buren, and Simms's "romantic" ideology of a monocultural south. What this "romantic" ideology ultimately displays is narcissism in that fails to "recognize" any culture other than European culture as having origins in its foundation and establishment. If this narcissism can be overcome, then what is found is that the Cherokees not only intermingled with the southern "nation," they were the southern "nation."

ENDNOTES

[1]Martin Van Buren, "Address to Congress" in "A Compilation of the Messages an Papers of the Presidents, (New York: Bureau of National literature, Inc., 19??) vol. iv, p.1717.

[2]Andrew P. Morrison, Shame, the Underside of Narcissism, (Hillsdale, N.J.: Analytic Press, 1989) p.52.

[3]Satz states that "No presidential administration in the 1830s or '40s refuted Jackson's logic or Indian policy…During the 1830s and especially in the 1840s, schoolbook authors and writers in leading literary magazines and political journals argued that Providence or Progress demanded the removal of the Indians who were 'disagreeable neighbors,' blocking their vision of 'cities, lifting their spires and turrets' over the country. Researchers in the nascent field of ethnology declared the Indians to be an 'inferior race,' thus providing additional justification for removal."p.55

[4]Elias Boudinot, Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot, ed. Theda Perdue, (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1996), p.77. All references refer to this edition and will be given parenthetically within the text.

[5]Theda Perdue, "Introduction," to Elias Boudinot, Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot, ed. Theda Perdue, (Athens: The

University of Georgia Press, 1996), p.3. All references to Perdue will be given parenthetically within the text.

[6]In Tony Mack McClure, Cherokee Proud: A Guide for Tracing and Honoring Your Cherokee Ancestors, (Somerville, TN: Chunannee Books, 1996), p.ix-x, He illustrates this idea being "Cherokee." He quotes Principal chief Jim Pell as saying, "there is no such thing as 'part-Cherokee.' Either you're Cherokee or you're not. It isn't the quantity of Cherokee blood in your veins that is important, but the quality of it…your pride in it. I have seen full-bloods who have virtually no idea of the great legacy entrusted to their care. Yet, I have seen people with as little as 1/500th blood quantum who inspire the spirits of their ancestors because they make being a Cherokee a proud part of their everyday life." In other words, being "Cherokee" is a state of mind rather than an adherence to old customs.

[7]Donald A. Grinde, Jr. and Bruce E. Johansen, Exemplar of Liberty: Native America and the Evolution of Democracy, (Los Angeles, CA: American Indian Studies Center University of California, 1991), p.161.

[8]Thomas Jefferson to John Rutledge, Paris, 6, August 1787, in Boyd, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 11:701.

[9]John Ehle, Trail of Tears: The Rise and Fall of the Cherokee Nation, (New York: Doubleday, 1988), p.37.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

"Our tale becomes history. The web of fiction is woven—the romance is nigh over. The old wizard may not trench upon the territories of truth. He stops short at her approach with a becoming reverence. It is for all things, even for the upsoaring fancy, to worship and to keep the truth.

(Simms 402)

In an effort to forget the "speedy removal" of the Cherokees, southerners have consciously concealed a huge part of their heritage. Anthropologists, J.A. Barnes and Jack Goody, discuss in their 1947 and 1968 studies how preliterate societies must inevitably forget some events in history as time passes since their only recollection of history comes from memory and oral story telling.[1] They call this theory "structural amnesia" in that it is an unconscious exclusion of events due to their little relevance on the society. Hudson, in Red, White and Black, says that the problem with the South's "structural amnesia" is that it embarrassingly does not represent an accurate picture of the "complex social entity composed of three races—red, white, and black, leaving aside for the moment various mixtures."[2] The "structural amnesia" of the Old South also disregards the intertwining and cross-connections between these divisions of race, culture, and economic status, and

while Hudson points to the role of history writing and its "amnesia," the role of "fiction" and its "romance" should equally be considered. The "structural amnesia," or rather the "romance," of both history writing and fiction has created a one-dimensional and monocultural image of the South's history with the clear "lines and lessons" that were needed to relieve white southerners from their Indian burden. The cycle of narcissism, concealment, and shame, as discussed in the previous chapter, shows that this "structural amnesia" is in reality a cognizant amnesia. What this study of Jackson, Van Buren, Simms and Boudinot reveals is that their "fiction" read in dialogue actually reverses the cycle and "recognizes" a silently concealed heritage. Thus, this "tale" now "becomes history" in that it undeniably reveals "the web" of multicultural complexity that was desperately concealed.

What Simms and Boudinot do for Southern History today is show that "the web of fiction" has become a "web" of multiculturalism. There is no longer only the black/white racial anxiety that the south must contend with, but rather an acknowledgment of its native past and present as well. Thus far it has been revealed that Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren, as well as other presidents and political figures, concealed the true reasons behind removing the Cherokees by using propagandized language that shaped a false rationale called the "romantic frontier." Jackson "bend[t]" reality to push the concept that removal would preserve the Cherokees, and that it was the morally correct measure to take. It has also been shown that Simms's The Yemassee represented southern, white ideology during the early 1800s that

did not hide the uglier reality behind Jackson's narcissistic Removal Policy. One might look at Simms as a spokesman for white Southern Americans in that he "helped frame and direct [the South as a social and cultural region and Southerners as a distinct subspecies of Americans]."[3] Because Simms does not shy away from the "innate racism" behind the Removal, he depicts a more accurate picture of white ideology. Likewise, the writings of Elias Boudinot uncovered the fact that he represented a Cherokee perspective on Indian Removal that dramatically destabilized the narcissistic Jacksonian Policy.

Whereas Jackson, Monroe, Van Buren, and the United States government as a whole pushed aside the controversy and concealed the true nature of the conflict, Simms's The Yemassee and Boudinot's writings reveal the uglier reality of the situation. By placing these two writers side by side, one can see that their views and opinions were very similar and touched on many of the same values and principles. Both advocated for removal, patriotism, progress, civilization, and independence. Both severely undercut the government's "clearly drawn lines and lessons." Simms presents a picture of white southern ideology that depicts a sympathetic view of removal while unconsciously revealing the utter racism behind it. As John Guilds points out in the introduction of The Yemassee, Simms's fiction, "while disturbing to the modern reader because of the innate racism, nevertheless represents effectively the thinking of [his] day"[4] Boudinot's speeches and editorials depict a Cherokee ideology that completely defies savagism, ignorance, and other Jacksonian stereotypes. Because these writers reveal an "uglier

actuality" in the face of Jackson's "romantic frontier," they together paint a more accurate picture of Southern culture and the rationale behind removal.

So the question remains: What does it mean to the present day reader to join together Jackson and Van Buren's addresses, Simms's The Yemassee, and Boudinot's writings? The answer to this is entails analyzing a "web" of complex history and romance, but eventually brings forth a new concept behind Southern Identity as it stands today. Consider the Jackson-Van Buren-Simms-Boudinot relationship as a small part of the "web of fiction" that reveals a glimpse into a Southern Identity that has been quietly tucked away in the cycle of concealment since 1828 .

Jackson's corner of Southern identity represents the shame and concealment of the fact that whites could not conceive of a multicultural society. Southern shame lies in the fact that Jacksonians masked the "innate racism" that was such a driving force in the removal of Indians. While southerners quietly watched as the Indians were pushed westward, they quietly pushed their consciences westward as well. Jackson's Removal Policy allowed the white South to conceal the historical accuracy behind the "romantic frontier." What the Jackson-Simms-Boudinot relationship, of Southern Identity does is bring forth this concealment and shame. This means that ultimately, Jackson cannot "trench upon the territories of truth" any longer. By joining this cross-connection of history and fiction, the Southern Identity can no longer conceal its shame from forcing the Cherokee to leave their land. This means that the southern identity of the past, the one of honor,

pride, southern belles, and gentry, is subverted by the recognition of shame. While Jackson and Van Buren's speeches aimed to "forget" the atrocity of a forced removal, Simms and Boudinot's writings ultimately reveal the shame of not "forget[ting],"

This analysis of both "history" and "fiction" unravels this cycle of concealment and strives to undo this cognizant amnesia. Simms and Boudinot together create an undeniably multicultural picture of the South. Simms may not have included the American Indian into his Southern ideology but he inevitably includes them into the South's history. What this shows is that his southern "nation" would not be distinctly "Southron" if it were not for the American Indian. What gives the southern "nation" its identity is its patriotism to the land, its adherence to its traditions, and its southern institutions. Boudinot's writings prove that the Cherokee were a part, if not the core, of the southern "nation." Simms's and Boudinot's "fiction" together give an historically accurate picture of the South because they reveal the overlap in the "territories of truth." This means that while their "territories" literally overlapped, their cultures overlapped as well. Thus, the monocultural vision of the South is subverted by its literal overlapping of multicultures.

As much as it is pretended that the Cherokee are a lost and extinct race, they are very much all around society as images and as peoples, and what this collective reading reveals today is that the Cherokee were and still are a part of Southern culture and tradition. At the Atlanta Braves baseball game, their image, although blatantly stereotypical and naïve, plays a central

role in the team's characterization. The bald eagle, a part of many American Indian tribes' religion, is not only depicted on the seal of the United States, but also in its talons is drawn a bundle of arrows, which was purposfully depicted to include the natives as a symbol of America. Tony Mack McClure, author of Cherokee Proud, explores the myth that "virtually everyone who wears shoes has been told at one time or another that their great-grandparents were Cherokee" or that their grandmother was " a Cherokee *princess*."[5] Ironically, while the Cherokee themselves have been pushed to the outskirts of southern society, their symbols and myths have "linger[ed]" in the "memory" of the United States. In other words, the American Indian is part of American and Southern identity, whether we "recognize" them or not. Cherokee Indians still live in the Smoky Mountains of North Carolina and Tennessee. However, southerners do not consider the Cherokee Indians as a part of southern identity or include them in their society because of the shameful acts committed against them while in the South and as they were being removed. Essentially, southerners and Americans have taken the image, the nice, clear and romantic image of the "savage," as their own, and what is left is the dehumanization of the Cherokees themselves.

The process of dehumanizing the Cherokee and the American Indian has made them a static figure in both "fiction" and "history" and the point of this thesis is to reverse that process by bringing them alive to the present day reader. The American Indian is timelessly pictured as the "savage" red man wearing a feather headdress and running around war-whooping. The United

States concealed its multicultural South long before the Trail of Tears ever happened by perpetuating the image of the Cherokee as "savages," rather than as humans. Sociologist Michael A. Dorris says that the American Indian "is a motif embedded in Americana, not a part of the American present,"[6] However, the American Indian is not included in the past either. The United States' government and public have perpetuated this motif since their arrival in order to conceal the fact that the Cherokee were indeed a people of progress and "civilization." In his *Cherokee Phoenix*, Boudinot wrote that "before the writer can establish his positions, he must prove that the *Cherokee* are not *Indians*" (Boudinot 92). In other words, the Cherokee people were no longer war-hooping savages, dressed in feathers, or the lost children of the forest. Here, Boudinot shows that he understands that the image of the Indian and the emotions and "descriptive force" that the word Indian carries with it is no longer appropriate. What he understood in the 1820s that most people of the South today do not understand is that the Indian people are not "The Indian."

Boudinot's "Address to the Whites" proves that Southern Identity did include multicultural view of itself despite its desire for a monocultural society, but goes a step even further to show that the image of the American Indian is actually a false reality to both the past and present. The fact that Boudinot believed in the ideas of white southern society shows that whites were not alone in opinions and ideas in the "Old South," as they might have one think. Cherokee Indians were also part of the South, its birth of identity, its history, and its ideology. What the white South did not realize then, that

can be seen now, is that it was a multicultural society despite its monocultural vision. Boudinot's perspective proves that Cherokees were influenced by progress, esteemed patriotism, and in general valued many of the principles that whites southerners valued as well. Boudinot's connection to the "web of fiction" shows that what white southerners valued as distinctly "Southron" was actually indigenous to Cherokee civilization. Thus, the fixed savage image of the Cherokee Indian is made human again, and ultimately is subverted into an "image" that reveals its complexity through the idea that they too are "Southrons".

Ultimately, a new Southern Identity has formed by the connection of historical and fictional texts. Narcissism, shame, concealment, as well as courage, patriotism, duty, and multiculturalism are all a part of the "web" that constitutes being a "Southron." By undoing the cognizant amnesia of the Old South, Simms's "old wizard" cannot "trench upon the territories of truth" in that the multicultural complexity is apparent despite its concealment. By joining together these historical and fictional texts, the narcissism of the South's monocultural society is completely broken into "glorious confusion," yet a humble and historically honest multicultural "nation."

ENDNOTES

[1]In Red, White, and Black, Symposium on Indians in the Old South, Charles M. Hudson, ed. (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1971), p.1

[2]Ibid, p.2

[3]Moltke-Hanson, p. 4.

[4]Guilds, p. xix.

[5]McClure, p. 1.

[6]Michael A. Dorris quoted in Arlene B. Hirscgfelder, American Indian Stereotypes in the World of Children, (Metuchen, N.J, and London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1982), p. xiii.