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Voices of Exile: Reimagining a Polyvocal American South, focuses on the phenomenon of community formation and reformation, particularly the perpetual reimaginings of the South in Southern studies and literatures. This project argues that it is time for the South to be reimagined once more—to move away from traditional discussions of the South along a black/white divide and toward a more pluralistic understanding of this region. In my work, I create a genealogy of what J. Anthony Paredes calls a "New, New South" by recovering the neglected voices that have always been there, but that need to be (re)incorporated into the Southern dialectic. Through a cross-cultural reading of works by American Indian, African American, and Anglo-American writers, I explore a polyvocal South in which regional and ethnic identities are continually contested and reshaped. I pair literary texts that (re)imagine key historical moments of community formation with primary documents of the historical moment being addressed. Literary texts and authors explored in this project include: Diane Glancy's Pushing the Bear, William Melvin Kelley's A Different Drummer, LeAnne Howe's Shell Shaker, and William Faulkner's Wilderness stories and Go Down, Moses. My project's aim is to look at the South as a community or narrative of polyvocality, tearing down the idea of a master narrative or "bifurcated" South, and trading it in for a "non-traditional" South which is more representative of America--a multicultural, multivocal community.
INTRODUCTION

The Anglo voice of the American South has largely defined and continues to define the category of Southern literature. During the 1830s and 1840s, the conflict between North and South culminated in a sectional separation that spilled over into our very definition of American literature, and the idea of a "Southern" literature, a literature distinct from American literature as a whole, came into being (Rubin, *History of Southern Literature* 4). This move offered a way for the Southerner (who was often constructed as white male) to maintain an individuality and set himself apart from the rest of America--an America he found himself at odds with. As Louis D. Rubin, Jr. notes,

Subsequent developments--the heated-up slavery controversy, secession, military defeat, Reconstruction, widespread and enduring poverty, a colonial economic dependency upon the Northeast, pervasive segregation in almost every aspect of daily life, one-crop agriculture and a political and social order still dominated by its rural components--not only intensified the sense of the South as being set apart from and, for the white community, united against the rest of the nation, but gave to the literary imagination, and to those who studied it, a powerful sense of regional identity and sectional mission. (4)

This identity formation became the foundation upon which the master narrative of the South was imagined and created. The minds of Southern writers were immersed in this otherness and the loss that accompanied it. Ellen Glasgow "defined many of the elements we now associate with a larger pattern of Southern literature: a tragic sense of life, a deep-rooted pessimism, a recognition of human capacity for evil, and the decrees of history and place" (qtd. in Yaeger, *Dirt and Desire* ix). Regarding the categories that have boxed in and created a stagnation in Southern literatures, Patricia Yaeger asserts in her book *Dirt and Desire* that she's "tired of these categories" (ix). As we find ourselves
in the twenty-first century, facing not only trans-nationalism, but globalization in general, it is time that an epistemological shift occurs in our approach to categorizations of Southern literatures and regionalism in general.

Only recently has "the Southern narrative" been newly imagined to include the African American voice and experience, even though the region as a whole has been created by and largely indebted to African Americans almost from its inception. Louis D. Rubin's *History of Southern Literature* was one of the first works to begin anthologizing the voices of the "Southern literary imagination," black and white (6). Further, this need to expand the South's narrative and regional identity to include African American voices was brought to the forefront of Southern studies by Thadious M. Davis in her article, "Expanding the Limits: The Intersection of Race and Region." In her 1988 essay, she explains, "Whites in the South became simply 'Southerners' without a racial designation, but blacks in the South became simply 'blacks' without a regional designation" (4). She proposes that we must shift our thinking of region and race, and she insists that "race and region are inextricable in defining a Southern self, society or culture" (5). But even Davis--and many others--tend to exclude Native voices, using whiteness/blackness as the primary markers of racial difference. This bifurcated notion of the South, which has since become key to the reimagining of Southern studies and Southern literatures, is one that I seek to build upon and expand. In this project, I argue for a South that is not merely limited to the voices of blacks and whites, but rather a region that desperately needs to be reimagined once more to incorporate the pluralistic voices that comprise this geographical space. Moreover, the idea of "region" becomes complicated as I explore
writers working outside of what we label the "traditional South" and the ways in which their writing offers new ways of looking at the South.

In order to move beyond the master narrative of the South, a more nuanced understanding of competing Southern narratives and polyvocality is necessary. It is essential that we capitalize upon the "cultural pluralism" of the South and privilege all competing narratives at work. As Richard Gray points out in his forward to *South to a New Place: Region, Literature, Culture*, it has never been possible to "talk about the South in the singular; that would only be feasible for a culture frozen in time--and that the South decidedly never was. It has grown ever more impossible, as the pace of change has accelerated and cultural pluralism…has steadily grown. So the slippage of meaning in work in regional self-identification has become inescapable" (xv). Another interesting point Gray makes, that bears repeating, is that the defining relationship between the North and the South ("the South is what the North is not, just as the North is what the South is not") is problematized because "the difference with the Southern strategy is that it usually begins from a consciousness of its own marginality, its position on the edge of the narrative" (xvii). This position of marginality is one that I address at length in this project, not only the marginality of the South, but more importantly the marginality of the groups that comprise the South. My project necessarily complicates the concept of a Southern "master narrative," authored and claimed by only one group. I challenge the view of a South that is somehow preserved or maintained through the "master narrative" by looking at exemplary texts from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which necessarily complicate and dismantle this very concept.
The process of labeling and positioning certain cultural groups as "marginal" against a "center" is one of the greatest challenges in approaching multicultural literature. Critics continually argue that we move beyond a master narrative. However, even as the argument is made that the voice of the other be heard, even in this acknowledgement the othering is still present. In order to speak out for the "other," the other is still placed in this space defined against a mastered center. I am keenly aware of this problematic paradigm as I approach my work here. One of the main questions driving my project is how can we move beyond this type of categorization in Southern literatures, or on the macro level, in American literature? This is the question that prods further research for American literary scholars in the twenty-first century. The aim of this project is to disrupt the very "center" of Southern literature with a triangulated view of South--a South I hope to broaden even further to include all "Southern" voices in future research.

In the literatures I explore here, it is clear that the ability to imagine and construct reality is one of the essential markers of our humanness and our ideas of selfhood. Yet, if everything is imagined, then what is real? If nothing is real, and everything imagined, then doesn't that mean that the imagined is all that is real? And if this is the case, then we must privilege the ability to imagine and narrate experience. However, again the challenge arises: How do we label and construct "new" realities without reinscribing old ideals? We are in need of a new approach to multicultural studies. But how can we arrive at these new constructions without asking new sets of questions? How can we move beyond the model of writing "from" or "against" the center? While classifications are necessary in order to verbalize or put into language the imaginings of selfhood and
identity, it is also imperative that the same models are not continuously reimposed as we reconstruct our ideas of identity and nationalism. Or as Ralph Waldo Emerson so beautifully puts it, as we "become."

The literature of countless contemporary and twentieth-century American writers forces us to think about imagined spaces, whether textual, individual, geographical or national. Writers are resurrecting and returning to the history of the South, recalling a time when it was viewed as the "original frontier." Yet, even as these writers seek to construct a new way of seeing, the old way is reinforced in our minds. Because of the imagined space of the South in our national consciousness, it is all but impossible to imagine an area that is not fraught with racial tension and violence. In Eric Heyne's article, "The Lasting Frontier: Reinventing America," he posits that "the frontier becomes the place where Americans locate the violence and hand-to-hand combat they cannot allow at home, and the West remains a ritualized, mythical place that lives on in novels and advertisements" (6). While Heyne's argument revolves around the notions of "West" and the "Southwest," I would like to extend his argument to the way the South is perceived. The South, largely, is the place where Americans can locate their prejudice, racism, hatred and violence of the other. It becomes the space that holds the racial tension of the entire nation. Additionally, in Reed Way Dasenbrock's article, "Southwest of What?: Southwestern Literature as a Form of Frontier Literature," he explains, "Traditional regional literature is--or represents itself as--the discourse of the insider about his or her own region, a celebration of the local" (123). However, as my project will demonstrate, defining the Southern "insider" is as complicated as defining "the
Indeed, in Southern literary history, the Anglo voice has been the privileged voice; however, as Thadious Davis asserts regarding Alice Walker's *Color Purple*,

As a means of redressing the exclusionary practices that have resulted in a limited notion of Southern culture, Walker has insisted in her prose and poetry on writing blacks back into the regionality of the South. "No one," Walker has concluded, "could wish for a more advantageous heritage than that bequeathed to the black writer in the South… We must give voice to centuries not only of silent bitterness and hate but also of neighborly kindness and sustaining love." (Davis 8)

The African is as much the insider as the Anglo, they are just "insiders" to different experiences of the same place. And this project seeks to call attention to other insiders of this "Southern" literary tradition, too, namely American Indians. This work is a triangulation of the voices that inform our way of thinking about a southeastern landscape--voices that for the most part have been exiled from the Southern canon.

Though limited in scope to these three cultural groups, I do not mean to detract attention from other cultural groups that are also informing our imaginings of this area. Rather, my hope is that this project will provide a series of new questions and new ways of thinking about the southern United States. I look forward to new and continued explorations of the literatures of other cultural groups that inhabit the southeastern seaboard, and interior areas.

In this project, I explore the literatures of American Indians, African Americans, and Anglo-Americans from or writing about the South who find themselves in a position of marginalization and thus need to reinvent or reimagine "their" Southern community to (re)claim it, thereby making their experience part of a *shared* narrative that could be imagined as a "New, New South."¹ The writers I have chosen to address are actively
engaged in re-storying the past, and (re)creating and shaping it using their own authorial agency. For this project I pair literary texts that reimagine key historical moments and community constructions/ formations with primary historical and literary documents of the historical moment being addressed.

This project posits Native American literature as an essential part of a polyvocal South. Native American literature has not traditionally been seen as an integral part of Southern culture or a Southern literary tradition. Rather, it is more often understood in terms of a western American phenomenon. I seek to change this limited view of Southern studies and opt for a South that is not viewed as a monolithic anti-North, but rather as a site of contested meanings with multiple communities developing multiple strategies for empowerment. As Houston A. Baker, Jr. and Dana Nelson point out in their preface to a recent issue of American Literature entitled Violence, the Body and "The South": "the murder, displacement, and relocation of thousands of Native American bodies from the same geographies in which enslaved Africans in the United States worked the land is a critical area of investigation for a new Southern studies" (233). This much needed critique of Southern literary studies informs my research interest for this project, which seeks to recover Native cultures and traditions that existed in the southern region of the United States long before America was imagined into being. My goal is not to collapse Native American literature into Southern literature, but instead to break down the very paradigms that construct the Southern master narrative. It is imperative to rethink literary approaches and extend our thinking of Southern studies beyond the existing paradigms.
Further evidence of this need for a new approach to Southern studies can be found in *Anthropologists and Indians in the New South*, a collection of essays edited by J. Anthony Paredes that probes our retrospective as well as futuristic views of studies "in, of, and for the South" (1). In his introduction, Paredes addresses the need for a revisionist look at what he calls the "New, New South" proving that this newly revived interest and call for change in Southern studies is moving across fields and encompassing an interdisciplinary approach. Using a strategy which I employ here, Paredes links the civil rights movement with the "surge of interest in the Indians of the South" (3). Coupling the civil rights movement with what Kenneth Lincoln terms the "Native American Renaissance," attention to American Indian groups was sparked, and an interest in Native cultures spread throughout the United States as well as the South. And as Paredes asserts, "all this newfound Indianness among southerners surely contains deeper historical meaning for the South as an idealized cultural type" (5). My first chapter looks at the "Indianness" of the South and the imagined and reimagined communities that Native American writers have contributed and continue to contribute to the literatures of this geographical region. Or, perhaps, to say this better, the first chapter's focus is on the southern landscape of North America prior to the concept of "the Southerner," keeping in mind that Southerner, as Thadious Davis asserts, is defined as white male. The South was not merely an uninhabited landscape; rather, it was full of diverse Native peoples who had their own mythologies, social systems and traditions in place prior to the arrival of European groups.
The very idea of a community/nation revolves around the notion that there is an opposite—something that is different from or other than its self. In a world of Cartesian dualities there must be a differing substance, people, or concept to express the idea of identity. How can one define self or community without positioning it against something else? According to Baker and Nelson, the South "offered a regional geography against which the more abstract body of the 'new American' could be articulated" (233). They argue that "In order for there to exist a good union, there must be a recalcitrant secessionist 'splitter.' To have a nation of 'good,' liberal and innocent white Americans, there must be an outland where 'we' know they live: all the guilty, white yahoos who just don't like people of color" (235). In other words, the South was and is the "National Other" (239). While America began by defining itself against what was other (defined as British), this label of "other" was transferred to the South prior to and after the Civil War. Likewise, the "Southerners" quickly transferred this label of other to the Cherokee and other American Indian tribes as they became the common "enemy" and threat to an emerging American polity. The definition of community, therefore, becomes bound with this positioning of the other. Not only does a group create itself in opposition to those different, but likewise those that are "othered" create their own community and capitalize upon their uniqueness and ability to be separate. The problem of this othering arises when the other is not accepted, but rather is constructed to disappear. As Eric Cheyfitz points out in his article, "Savage Law": "Western imperialism…founds its program on the disappearance of the 'other.' This of course necessitates the construction of others as an absolutely oppositional, completely homogeneous, and ultimately superfluous figure,
rather than as figures in a possible dialogue of equals" (Cultures of United States
Imperialism 109). The majority of 19th century Anglo-Americans wanted the Native
peoples to disappear, and no where was this desire more prevalent than in the South,
particularly in Georgia. However, white Georgian desire to relocate the Cherokee
people, so that Georgians could possess their land and flourish economically (through
plantation style farming/slave labor), would be a task not easily accomplished nor a
decision easily decided or enforced. In my first chapter, I revisit these key moments in
our nation's history, which set up the initial relationships between American Indians and
Anglo-Americans of the South. In particular, I look at Cherokee literary texts that seek to
rewrite and reimagine these moments of contact and conflict in order to better understand
the dialectic (or lack thereof) between these dynamic cultural groups.

Crucial to my dissertation's thesis is the polyvocality of community, for which
Diane Glancy's novel Pushing the Bear (1996) offers a brilliant example. Drawing on
my background in American Indian Studies, my first chapter restores forgotten Native
voices to the Southern landscape. Focusing on Cherokee writer Diane Glancy, I begin
my project with an exploration of traditional Cherokee lifeways. With special attention
to tribal and historical contexts, I explore the decentralized political and social systems of
the Cherokee prior to contact, including kinship and gender roles. The Cherokee were
able to master the vocabulary of Americanness, but yet they were still forced from their
homelands to protect the newly formed American polity. I investigate the monumental
Cherokee cases of the early nineteenth century that led to the Cherokee Removal in 1838-
39, in order to show how these events function as historical memory in Glancy's *Pushing the Bear*.

This first chapter, "Conflicting Sovereignties and Southern Injustice: A Twentieth Century Interpretation of Cherokee Politics and History in Diane Glancy's *Pushing the Bear*," focuses on the reconfiguration of "Native" southern spaces and communities as presented in Glancy's novel. Here I investigate how the Anglo South "othered" the Native Americans, thereby making them a common enemy and a marker to bind the white Southern community together more tightly, and in addition, to gain a land base necessary to continue fueling their plantation style market economy. *Pushing the Bear* addresses the "conflicts" between the Natives and Anglos in the South and the rendered governmental "solution." My claim is that through interweaving historical information and documents to retell the history of the Trail of Tears, Glancy provides the necessary knowledge for the continuance of community, and also actively contributes to the continuance of community through her polyvocal style of history-telling. Her work is a testimony to continuance and cultural survival. Further, this chapter explores the Cherokee model of government and the historic cases that granted these people sovereignty, yet robbed them of their southern homelands. The importance of this chapter lies in viewing the injustice of the white South in the 19th century as a model for the rest of the nation--the South as a microcosm for the macrocosm that was/is America. However, even more importantly, this chapter reveals that Glancy is reinventing Southern/American history and calling attention to an alternative version through her own voice as she creates a narrative that becomes a living cultural artifact to the nature of
community and its survival. Importantly, she offers this reclaimed history through a Cherokee worldview. Her novel becomes a narrative different in kind in that it privileges polyvocality.

As segue to chapter two, "Narrating 'Voluntary' Migrations: William Melvin Kelley's Response to Southern Violence and African-American Agency in A Different Drummer," I present a poem from the Without Sanctuary exhibit on lynching in America, which was housed at Jackson State University during the summer of 2004. Through the imagery that this poem offers, I explore the violence that was visited upon Native American and African American bodies in the South. Further, I show ways these cultural groups use story to understand and order their "voluntary" removals. Like the stories that Glancy's characters provide of the Trail of Tears, I show that Kelley calls upon the oral and blues traditions of the African American experience to offer his characters autonomy and freedom as well.

My second chapter is an exploration of property, which becomes synonymous with selfhood and autonomy as depicted in William Melvin Kelley's A Different Drummer (1959). I look at the Great Migration not from the perspective of the urban North, but rather I examine what was left behind. I explore the role of community in the South for African Americans, particularly the violence and possibility of economic opportunity that fueled their migration to the North. I look at Kelley's novel as a different approach to reconfiguring an African American community both inside and outside of the South. One of my main focuses for this chapter is the notion of claiming property or obtaining property to assert personhood. The protagonist of Kelley's novel makes it clear
that there is a need to claim property rights to claim selfhood. Tucker Caliban (a name which evokes the history of colonialism and race relations embedded in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*) exclaims, "I want that land on the plantation because it's where the first Caliban worked, and now it's time we owned it ourselves…. We worked for you long enough, Mister Willson. You tried to free us once, but we didn’t go and now we got to free ourselves" (Kelley 183). From this short excerpt alone we see the convergence of personhood, property and freedom. I discuss these notions of autonomy and the role that the Southern community plays in creating an individual like Kelley's Caliban, who draws strength from the rituals he sees around him in the daily life of the African Americans, and how from this strength a sense of agency emerges. Essential to this analysis of Kelley's novel is understanding the history of race as property and the ways "whiteness" functions as property. Through an exploration of the Supreme Court case *Dred Scott v. John F. A. Sandford*, I show how African Americans were devalued and denied equal status in the American nation. Then, I turn to Cheryl Harris's article, "Whiteness as Property," to show the parallels between race as property for Native Americans, African Americans, and Anglo-Americans. Moreover, I show how the Anglo community in Kelley's novel is devalued when the "other" in the form of the African American disappears. Kelley dramatizes the breakdown of whiteness through his narrative gaps, showing that the narrative of the South depends upon the very narratives (of Blackness and Nativeness) it tries to erase/overwrite. Kelley's novel offers a space of true revolution in which a master is no longer acknowledged or valued.
The third chapter of this project, "Shaking Up Historical Correctness: Choctaw Tribal History in LeAnne Howe's Shell Shaker," explores Howe's concept of tribalography through an examination of her novel Shell Shaker. According to Howe, tribalography is a way of weaving and integrating shared histories. It is a way "to pull all the elements together of the storyteller's tribe, meaning the people, the land, and the multiple characters and all their manifestations and revelations, and connect these in past, present, and future milieus…" (Howe, "Story of America" 42). For Howe, tribalography is about "bringing things together, for making consensus, and for symbiotically connecting one thing to another" (42). In other words, integration becomes the key definition of tribalography. And this integration can take the form of oral stories, shared histories, and individual experiences that develop into narratives, thereby expanding "our identity" (46). Howe makes clear that tribalography can create "a future 'literary past' for American Indians, [and] the textual space, tribalography, [can] create a literary and literal past for non-Indians as well" (46). Tribalography is about inclusiveness and it offers us an interesting way to approach our reading of the histories held in the southern landscape. Howe's notion of tribalography offers us a way to develop new historiographies. We can develop new ways of creating experience and documenting it, not only in the Southeast, but throughout America.

Chapters three and four of this project are often dialogic. The fourth chapter of this project, "Rethinking the Southern Literati: Tribalography in William Faulkner's Wilderness stories and Go Down, Moses," provides new ways for thinking about Faulkner's work through the lens of tribalography. Returning to chapter three, I show
how Choctaw writer LeAnne Howe re-reads Faulkner's distinctive narrative of a "New South" through the lens of Native history. Her novel provides a means to understanding the impact of Choctaw removal, as well as the separation of the Choctaw peoples--those that removed to Oklahoma and those that chose to remain in Mississippi. Her depiction of the historical warrior Red Shoes offers a strikingly different interpretation of Native actions and history than Faulkner's caricature of a character by the same name in his *Wilderness* stories. In chapter three, I explore Howe's depiction of Red Shoes's history through her concept of tribalography, then in chapter four I explore Faulkner's created Indians. Not only do I look at the contributions Faulkner made to what we view as the "New South" in Southern literature, but I also problematize the work of this Southern "patriarch," by examining his representations of region and identity contestation in juxtaposition to Howe's fiction.

As noted above, chapter four of this study looks at the work of William Faulkner, an author who is largely conceptualized as the patriarch of Southern literature and who played an essential role in defining what has come to be known as the "New South." Through an exploration of his *Wilderness* stories and *Go Down, Moses*, my discussion of Faulkner brings together my readings of community for the American Indian, African American, and Anglo Southerner, since Faulkner's fiction moves from Ikkemotubbe through the Civil War and Reconstruction and leaves us longing for a "New, New South." No exploration of Southern literature is complete without acknowledging Faulkner; however, I trace a relatively underrecognized thread in his work--the relationship between multiple Southern communities, not just black and white. Not only do I explore
Faulkner's role in creating what we view as the "New South" in Southern literature, but I also discuss his limits in his portrayal of Native Americans. Particularly, I juxtapose his caricatures of Native peoples against those presented by LeAnne Howe in Shell Shaker.

I also explore Faulkner's characters, some of which are representative of linear time (like Jason Compson), while others are more representative of cyclical time (like Dilsey). Looking at Anglo characters, including Quentin Compson, I show that linearity is often aligned with whiteness, but the fact that this assertion is made from an Anglo-American author tears down the model that whiteness is strictly linear, because Faulkner's body of work as a whole seeks to tear down this very understanding of whiteness. In doing so, he aligns the Anglo-American with the other in notions of time. He hypervalues "the negro" in his work because of his/her endurance and relationship with time; however, even in constructing these narratives he is creating Anglo endurance in the texts that he leaves behind. He shows the interrelationships that humans have regardless of race, though largely informed by it.

This project ultimately culminates in a space of exile for the numerous peoples who have inhabited the southeastern United States. In the afterword to Voices of Exile: Reimagining a Polyvocal American South, I look at the possibilities that my study can offer for future scholarship. Noting the rich history of statehood for Oklahoma, I close this project in a geographical space that ultimately brings these displaced peoples together once again in contact and in a state of community. For example, literatures of African American women writing about this space, like Toni Morrison's Paradise (1997) and Jewell Parker Rhodes's Magic City (1997), show how Oklahoma is a contested site
where multi-ethnic Southern exiles converge in the hopes of inventing a new regional, and national, community. Oklahoma can offer a case study in Southern communities and literatures because Oklahoma offers a model that is very Southern in kind. As the literature of the South is in some sense a literature of exile, I ultimately locate my definition of the "New, New South" in a region that is itself not geographically in the South. The definition of "The South," in other words, is finally as fugitive as the peoples it describes.

The chronology of this project is an attempt to model the very argument I am making: to decenter our notions of time, history and the Southern master narrative. Just as the narrative of no one cultural group is being privileged, neither is one notion of time being privileged. Future and present constructs of time are not viewed as more important than the past. Though the past is typically seen as less important because it is the thing we can place away, the narratives I explore demand that this place "of past or past tense" will not hold the past. History is a state of "being" that is continually becoming, as these writers so brilliantly portray the ways we can continually reconstruct and reimagine history. To construct something new, the monovocal history of the South must be rewritten and inclusive of the multiple voices that represent this landscape. Essentially this project becomes a miscegenation of time and history, and because of this any chapter can be read in any order. It is simply imperative that these chapters appear as a dialogue, one speaking to the ones before and after it, each one informing the totality of the project.

I would also like to offer a brief note on my use of terms throughout this project. I will use the term "Southerner" as Thadious Davis has defined it in her essay "Expanding
the Limits: The Intersection of Race and Region." The "Southerner" becomes the label affixed to the Anglo-American male and it connotes region. Moreover, I will use the terms Anglo-American and white interchangeably in discussing the cultural groups that colonized America and imagined this nation into being. When using the terms "West" or "Western" I am referencing the geographical space in the United States. Any points of departure from this usage of "West/Western" will be noted. Likewise, I will use "South" or "southeastern" when referring to the southeast region of America. In addition, I use the terms African American and black interchangeably in referring to Americans of African descent. And finally, I use Native American and American Indian interchangeably because of the availability of these terms; however, I am mindful of the political implications of these labels. Studying with Native scholars, I have adopted the usage of the term American Indian, but as an Anglo-American scholar myself I often use Native American and Native to identify this cultural group, using tribal specificity whenever possible. My use of these cultural markers is largely determined by the language used by an author in a particular text. For example, in Diane Glancy's *Pushing the Bear* she refers to Anglo-Americans as whites, or often times white soldiers; therefore, when discussing her text I will honor her language. And I will continue this pattern for other writers and critics discussed here.
1. CONFLICTING SOVEREIGNTIES AND SOUTHERN INJUSTICE: A TWENTIETH CENTURY INTERPRETATION OF CHEROKEE POLITICS AND HISTORY IN DIANE GLANCY’S *PUSHING THE BEAR*

Native American literature has largely been conceptualized as a western American phenomenon. From nineteenth-century representations of Native Americans in photography and fiction to contemporary Native American studies programs primarily founded at western universities by Native American writers and scholars, the "Indian" has been categorically placed in the West. Turning South, the work of Cherokee writer Diane Glancy positions Native American history and culture as a trans-regional American history, one constituting not just the west but the east as well. Her fiction reminds us to see the Southeast as a region that was dispossessed of its original inhabitants, and as a landscape that is still thriving with the voices of her people--one marker of which we can easily see in the names of rivers, towns and key landmarks throughout the South.

Through her novel *Pushing the Bear: A Novel of the Trail of Tears*, Diane Glancy joins a host of other contemporary Native American writers, like Leslie Marmon Silko, Louise Erdrich, and N. Scott Momaday, in using the power of narrative to promote healing and cultural renewal. Glancy reclaims the Cherokee traditions and rewrites the South's history as she artfully blends the voices and narrators of her novel into a form that becomes lyrical and unified--a testimony of Cherokee historical memory.

The form of her novel alone suggests her manipulation and revision of Anglo-American history. From the fragmented maps we see in the novel's beginning to the
fragmented pieces of narrative we get from members walking the trail, we witness a tearing down of artificiality--artificial boundaries, artificial constructs, and artificial laws. The importance of Glancy's narrative is not simply the fact that it is a new narrative, but rather that it is a narrative different in kind from the received history of Indian affairs. In place of traditional "plots" and "protagonists," Glancy offers a series of perceptions, fragments of stories and histories. Moreover, the "polyvocality" of Glancy's fiction challenges the long tradition of the individual in literature.

This concept of "polyvocality" is commonly associated with theorist M.M. Bakhtin, whose "Discourse in the Novel" examines the function of language in narrative theory. While superficial similarities exist between Bakhtin and Glancy, Glancy's ultimate sense of the novel is quite different. Bakhtin often uses the terms "polyglossia" (from which the term "polyvocality" is derived) and "heteroglossia" together. Heteroglossia is defined as

> the base condition governing the operation of meaning in an utterance. It is that which insures the primacy of context over text. At any given time, in any given place, there will be a set of conditions--social, historical, meteorological, physiological--that will insure that a word uttered in that place and at that time will have a meaning different than it would have under any other conditions. (Bakhtin 428)

For Bakhtin, the novel is never unified; rather, it is a heteroglot of "compositional-stylistic unities" (262). Bakhtin opposes a monologic (or authoritative) language for a polyphonic nature of language, or multiplicity of languages and dialects that operate within a culture. He defines the novel as "a diversity of social speech types (sometimes even diversity of languages) and a diversity of individual voices, artistically organized" (262). Glancy's novel follows a similar model to the one Bakhtin proposes, because she
infuses her novel with multiple narrators as well as languages (i.e. Cherokee and
English). But whereas Bakhtin argues that narrative unity cannot be found in a novel due
to the multiplicity of voices that are constantly undermining the idea of a monologue or
master narrative, I propose that Glancy produces cultural unity through a heterogeneous
narrative. Because the harmony of her novel evokes a traditional Cherokee worldview,
unity can in fact be constructed by the heterogeneous voices walking the trail.

For example, Pushing may offer a "heroine" in Maritole, but this story is not hers
alone--it is a story she is a part of, but not a story that she holds in individual possession.
Rather, it's one she shares with the Cherokee community, those walking the trail with her
and those involved in creating the narrative with her that will become the Trail of Tears.
Through this shared history Glancy revives the power of these multiple forgotten voices
as her text unfolds. With her decentered narrative, Glancy both models a form of history-
telling and provides us with the necessary knowledge for the continuance of community.
She offers a redefinition of the Cherokee community by rejecting the imposed Anglo-
American definition of the Cherokee Nation as a "domestic dependent nation," as defined
by the Supreme Court in Cherokee Nation v. Georgia, and offers up instead a literary
author-ity or sovereignty radically different from Anglo authority.

Glancy defines "storying" as "the making of story" or "act of imaging [through
which] you create a reality" (Glancy, West Pole 1-2). For Glancy, "storying" generates
cultural renewal and what critic Gerald Vizenor calls "survivance," "a new tribal presence
in the very ruins of the representations of invented Indians" (Vizenor 4). The healing
power of narrative that Glancy employs to claim this survivance is achieved by
integrating the discordant multiple voices into a single narrative. In other words, it's a way of reimagining fragmentation as communal truth, and moving from this communal truth to regeneration. Through an act of integrating traditional Cherokee myths with the stories of those walking the trail as well as Anglo-American histories and laws, Glancy indeed "creates a reality" in which the Cherokee are "storying" and continuing to create their own experience.

Communal Truth--Recalling a Decentralized Government through Polyvocality

Glancy turns to the early social and political organization of the Cherokee and draws directly from Cherokee history and traditional structures to create her polyvocal novel. Mirroring the early political structure of the Cherokee's decentralized government, Glancy creates a text that incorporates multiple narrators--all of which are equal and rightful agents of authorship. Prior to European contact the Cherokee tribe was one of communities and villages that revolved around a need-based economy. As Duane Champagne points out in Social Order and Political Change: Constitutional Governments Among the Cherokee, the Choctaw, the Chickasaw, and the Creek, "None of the south eastern nations had acquisitive attitudes toward the accumulation of wealth. Before the introduction of slave trade and fur trade by the Europeans, members of these nations lived in a subsistence or need economy…. Wealth had little meaning in terms of social and political relations" (34). Land was not viewed as a commodity or a means to economic growth; rather, it was used merely for sustenance. Champagne explains, "Personal valor, wisdom, and generosity were more highly regarded as virtues than the
hoarding of material wealth. Indeed, the southeasterners were openly disdainful of personal wealth and accumulation and scorned those who were stingy and greedy" (34).

An important characteristic of the Cherokee society was its lack of a central authority. A multiplicity of voices equaled a decentralized government. Villages were the key political units for the Cherokee. There were approximately sixty different villages, and each one was considered a sovereign unit capable of claiming peace or going to war independent of the other Cherokee villages. However, "the Cherokee polity was more than a loose confederation of towns" (Champagne 25). Since the Cherokee were an egalitarian society, decisions of both the national and local village councils had to be negotiated and a consensus reached. Moreover, avoiding conflict and maintaining harmony were highly valued in this society. If a decision could not be reached, the dissenting group or village would often withdraw to preserve the consensus; as a result, very few laws were nationally binding.

In the absence of "coercive institutions of political control," one might assume that enforcing social control would be problematic. However, for the Cherokee, "community sanctions and the threat of spiritual retribution for breaking sacred law" maintained order (Champagne 29). Their world revolved around maintaining order for the good of the community. Emphasis was placed on purification rituals and avoiding community disruption, which in their worldview was ultimately caused "not by the will of the Great Spirit but by the failure of the people to adhere to ritual, sacred law, or moral order" (Champagne 16). Glancy evokes this traditional community-centered system. With each turn of the page of her novel, we are given a different storyteller and
perspective. We receive the narrative with the inclusion of all points of view: Cherokee, Anglo-American soldiers, and missionaries, in addition to references to court cases, laws and treaties, and consensus reports. No one's voice is excluded because for Glancy each voice is a primary historian of the trail. In seeking to reorder the disrupted Cherokee Nation, Glancy's novel does so by rejecting Anglo historiography and imposed Western American ideals. Glancy rewrites the story of the trail by de-victimizing the Cherokee Nation and offering them up as agents directing their own course--all of them responsible for the well being of the community at large.

**Kinship and Ani-Yun Wiya (The Real People)**

Cherokee social structures emerge from a cosmogony predicated on balance and order. The growth of the American polity thus posed both a social and a spiritual disruption, manifested in factionalism along the Trail of Tears in Glancy's novel. She attempts to restore the traditional Cherokee worldview by ordering her novel according to the model of balance traditionally found in everyday Cherokee life.

For Cherokees, their entire world was ordered and they were at the center of this world; therefore, any intrusion from outsiders was viewed as an imbalance that needed reordering. Contact with Anglo-Americans forced the Cherokee into a state of accommodation, a reordering of their society to incorporate these new peoples. And to live among the Anglo-Americans and participate in their market system, the Cherokee had "to adopt new orientations toward specialized economic roles" and new attitudes "toward the accumulation of wealth and the production of surplus value" (Champagne 35), which inherently meant a change in the way they perceived the world around them.
However, this accommodation should not be viewed as a weakness, nor position the Cherokee as victims of the Anglo-American intrusion. Instead, we will see how through the assertion of kinship terms and the act of naming things and people in their world, the Cherokee constantly reorder their world while never losing sight of their position as "The Real People." Through the act of labeling "others" or forming a category for outsiders, the Cherokee are in fact asserting their own autonomy.

For the Cherokee, who "called themselves Ani-Yun Wiya, the Real People," the "bonds that held them together were obscure" (Perdue, Cherokee Women 41). They lived in scattered villages throughout the Southeast, "but no clear boundaries demarcated their territory and no political-authority delineated citizenship" (41). While the Cherokees boundaries regarding territory may have been obscure, their entire worldview was established upon categorization and boundaries, including their kinship system, which ordered every facet of their world. As Perdue asserts, "In aboriginal Cherokee society, matters of kinship affected social interaction, demography, internal order, and foreign policy" (42). Being a matrilineal society, kinship and clan membership was determined by the mother, and the only way to be a Cherokee was to have a Cherokee mother (either biologically or through adoption).

Kinship terms pervaded the Cherokee worldview and they extended beyond immediate family members to include all of the members of one's clan. As a result, relationships were determined by what they called one another--the way they verbalized or named their relationship into being. "Similarly, the clans of other people determined a person's behavior toward them: father's clan had to be respected, whereas sexual
familiarity was permissible with grandfather's clan" (Perdue, *Cherokee Women* 47). Kinship terms were not limited; they were also applied to non-kin relationships, including relationships of the Cherokee "with other tribes and with European powers as well" (Perdue 48). Moreover, "the absence of kinship ties was a distinct liability in Cherokee society. First of all, people were unsure how to behave toward someone who had no place in the kinship system.... The Cherokees could only interact peacefully with their old enemies only if they incorporated the outsiders into their kinship system" (48). However, rather than being absorbed into the already categorized and systematic Cherokee way of life, early colonists began inventing and imposing their own categories on the Cherokee. Here we can imagine the struggle for autonomy reaching a pinnacle as the Cherokee worldview becomes threatened by Anglo-American law. And we can clearly see the problem that early traders had with the Cherokee because they had no place in the Cherokee kinship system. Without kinship ties, the "Cherokee may have regarded an individual... as something less than a person. Hostility to early traders probably stemmed from the Europeans' lack of relatives and place in the social structure" (49). Once the English became more integrated in the Cherokee lifestyle, kinship terms were applied to them. For example, "the Cherokees applied the term 'brother' to the English, perhaps because their relationship was often competitive, but when they sought assistance in war, the Cherokees called the English 'eldest brother' because this person was responsible for the safety and well-being of his younger siblings. They usually referred to the king or governor as 'father' in order to indicate respect" (48). These kinship terms are not to be confused with just "quaint figures of speech." Rather, "they
were…descriptive of a particular relationship and prescriptive of behavior toward another party" (48). Through this acculturation the Cherokee were still asserting tribal autonomy by naming the Anglos accordingly to the Cherokee social structure. The major conflict erupts when White law brings its own set of categories and attempts to impose its own notion of categories on things already highly categorized within the Cherokee society.

**Imposition of White Law**

One of the most significant narratives that Glancy writes against and undermines is the master narrative of the law of the United States. The 1823 Supreme Court ruling of *Johnson and Graham's Lessee v. M'Intosh*, which became the bedrock of federal Indian law, basically resuscitated the "doctrine of discovery." This case dealt with competing claims to land ownership: Johnson's claim was granted by Native Americans while McIntosh's was granted by the United States government. The ruling, in favor of McIntosh, determined that as the "original inhabitants," Native Americans were allowed to occupy their lands, but their rights to title and ultimately sovereignty were diminished. They were given "a legal as well as just claim to retain possession of [their land], and to use it according to their own discretion; but… their power to dispose of the soil at their own will, to whomsoever they pleased, was denied by the original fundamental principle, that discovery gave exclusive title to those who made it" (Cheyfitz 111). This decision sought to erase Native American natural rights to their soil. Basically, the court's decision translated Indian notions of native peoples' relation to their lands into the language of Anglo-American property law--that language where "title" is the supreme term--not so that Indians could be empowered in that language, but so that ultimate power over their lands, the historical
inalienability of which constituted their cultures, could be "legally" transferred to the federal government. (Cheyfitz 110)

In other words, by asserting Anglo-American notions toward property (in the language of title) and imposing them on Native Americans, the decision sought to disempower Native American peoples and their sovereignty. It makes ownable that which for Native Americans cannot be owned. Recalling the Cherokee's own notions toward autonomy, we can see how the power struggle will erupt between the white Southerners and the Cherokee as the Anglo-Americans attempt to impose their own set of categories and terms on the Cherokee polity. Tim Garrison asserts in *The Legal Ideology of Removal* that

Marshall's decision to reinvest the doctrine [of discovery] with legal dignity gave southern politicians a powerful intellectual weapon that they could use to beat back the moral opposition of Indians, northern philanthropists, and congressional opponents of removal. When the time came for the southern courts to decide the fate of the native tribes in their midst, *Johnson v. McIntosh* was the case that they chose to cite as precedent. (101)

This agenda was further advanced by the famous Cherokee cases of 1831 and 1832: *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* and *Worcester v. Georgia*. *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* was brought about by a string of events and legislative acts by the Georgia General Assembly which sought to destroy Cherokee sovereignty. In 1826 and 1827, "resolutions of the Georgia General Assembly…asserted that by virtue of its colonial charter, Georgia held complete sovereign dominion over all the land and people within its borders, including the Cherokee" (Perdue, *Cherokee Removal* 61). Moreover, recalling language from the *Johnson v. McIntosh* case, the Georgia assembly of 1827 resolved "'that the Indians are tenants at [Georgia's] will, and [Georgia] may at any time she
pleases, determine that tenancy by taking possession of the premises" (qtd. in Perdue, Cherokee Removal 61). One year later Georgia enacted legislation that would place the Cherokee people and their lands under state jurisdiction by dividing the Cherokee Nation between five Georgia counties. Further, in 1830 the Georgia legislature made it illegal for the Cherokee Nation to meet and act as a government. In an effort to resist the encroachment of Georgia on their sovereignty and lands, the Cherokee proposed their case to the Supreme Court. The court determined that the Cherokee Nation was not in fact a foreign nation; therefore, the court had no jurisdiction. Although there was no ruling in this case, it is still a fundamental case in federal Indian law because the language used by Chief Justice John Marshall established the Cherokee Nation as a "domestic dependent nation."

The competition for sovereignty between the Georgians and Cherokees remained unresolved until the 1832 case of Worcester v. Georgia. The plaintiff in this case, Samuel Austin Worcester, filed suit after he was arrested for refusing to "take the oath of allegiance Georgia required of whites living among the Cherokees" (Perdue, Cherokee Removal 69). Worcester asserted that while abiding in the Cherokee Nation he was subject only to Cherokee laws. The court ruled in favor of Worcester and determined that "Georgia law was not valid within the Cherokee Nation" (69). While this case recognized the sovereignty of the Cherokee, Georgia refused to follow the order of the court to release other missionaries who were jailed for the same reason as Worcester. The court ruling was a victory for Native sovereignty, but Andrew Jackson's choice not to enforce it ultimately led to the Cherokee's Removal from their Native homelands.
The problems of these landmark cases arise over concepts that were alien to the Cherokee before contact, those of title and property. Eric Cheyfitz points out in his essay "Savage Law" that

In traditional Native American cultures there are persons, but no "individuals." For in these cultures identity is conceived of as exclusively mutual, rather than, as in the West, mutually exclusive. Thus, traditionally, by which I mean prior or in resistance to the Anglo-American imposition of governmental forms, Indian governance is consensual not representative. (112)

Cheyfitz goes on to explain how "traditional kinship-based cultures," like the Cherokee, would have problems with the imposition of Anglo-American language toward property: "So in traditional kinship-based cultures, it is only the whole that can act in the name of the whole. And because there is no notion of individuality in these cultures (a notion we should not confuse with autonomy), there, traditionally is no notion of property." In other words, the Western notions of property and individualism (which cannot be separated) were forced on "Native American cultures in the forms of the treaty and the law, which demanded that these cultures accept the terms of property/individualism/representation or die fighting for another set of terms" (112).

This forced notion, more specifically the Anglo attitudes toward "property, individualism, and representation," are the very things that the Cherokee are pushing against in Diane Glancy's novel Pushing the Bear. The consequences of the imposed Western notion of property and individualism for the Cherokee, as represented by Glancy's novel, are alienation. Alienation from the land leads to alienation from self and ultimately from the Cherokee community at large as well. Maritole, one of the main voices in Pushing, says of the trail that, "I felt separate. On my own. Individual. I'd
heard that word. Now I knew what it meant. At one time we were one. I was one of everyone…. Now everyone had gone away from inside my head" (Glancy, Pushing 201). Glancy's novel seeks to heal this separation by recreating culture from the fragments of both Cherokee and Anglo-American history.

**Glancy's "Storying"**

*Pushing the Bear* begins in part of the original southeastern homelands of the Cherokee Nation--North Carolina. The main character, Maritole, is working in the corn fields as her husband, Knobowtee, arrives and tells her of soldiers gathering Cherokees in stockades to prepare for their removal. The novel then becomes their story of detachment; they are taken from their homes by force, separated from other family members and held in stockades until there is a large enough group to begin the trek West. When they begin the trail, Maritole is reunited with other family members, but the disintegration of the familial unit as they walk, particularly Maritole and Knobowtee's relationship, becomes a microcosm for the division among the Cherokee Nation as a whole. The trail threatens Cherokee survival and identity, a process Maritole understands through the metaphor of a bear. As she walks the trail, Maritole feels as if she is pushing against a bear, some force that has more strength than she does. At first, the bear is merely a metaphor she uses to describe the thing she is pushing against. However, as the novel progresses Maritole and others on the trail think that she is possessed by the bear's spirit. *Pushing* is divided into geographical sections--each section titled for the state the Cherokee are passing through to reach Indian Territory: North Carolina, The Stockade, Tennessee, Kentucky, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, and finally Indian Territory. As we
move through the map of removal in novel form, we are given the history leading up to
the Trail of Tears from the stories of differing people on the trail, and we also hear the
stories that are produced along the trail. From discussions of property, legal actions,
conflicts between Georgia and Tennessee Cherokee, fighting and murder, to survival,
traditional lifeways, stories and basketry, and ultimately reunion in the new territory, as
signaled by Maritole and Knobowtee relationship at the novel's end and the inclusion of
the Cherokee Act of Union, July 12, 1839, Glancy provides us with a novel that
reimagines a key moment in Southern/Cherokee history--one of conflicting sovereignties
and Southern injustice.

The form of Glancy's novel is central to the discussion of its polyvocality. As
mentioned above, the novel is broken into sections like a map. We move through the
novel in much the same way we would follow a map from North Carolina to Oklahoma.
Just as the form is made up of multiple mapped spaces, so, too, is the novel made up of
countless narrators. With each turn of the page a new narrator takes up the role of
"storying." Before we are given the character's narration the name of the narrator
precedes his or her section; however, even within this structure we easily lose sight of
who is telling the story. The plurality of voices begin to merge in the text creating the
narrative of the Trail of Tears. Cherokee voices integrate with the voices of white
soldiers, and traditional voices and stories merge with new voices along the trail,
including missionaries, conjurers, warriors, and storytellers. The artistic blending of
voices becomes unified through the ultimate narrative of the text, one that recalls the
traditional stories and worldview of the Cherokee.
Disorder and Chaos: Factionalism on the Trail of Tears

Following a cyclical pattern, *Pushing* begins with the Cherokee functioning, at least provisionally, as a community. However, they fall into heated arguments, separation, death, distress, and lifelessness as they walk the trail. When the novel begins, Knobowtee looks at the "long line of walking people" behind him and they appear "like kernels on a cob of corn." Knobowtee explains that "for a moment, I could almost believe we were walking a holy walk. As a unit. A people. One kernel following another. Our voices united. If we could be one in our walking, we would make it to the new territory. All of us had a part" (Glancy, *Pushing* 62). In this passage, Glancy makes clear that the cohesiveness of her people is part of their survivance mechanism. This moment mirrors the balance of the Cherokee worldview, where everything is ordered and in its place. This sense of unity that Knobowtee experiences in the beginning will be the very thing that allows the Cherokee to survive the walk and begin anew in the new territory. However, Knobowtee's idyllic view is quickly disposed of because as the trail continues the chaos becomes evident and division spreads throughout those walking the trail. This division is brought by the Cherokee's sense of alienation from both each other and their land. In addition, the Removal itself lacks any type of order. The Cherokee are rounded up like animals in stockades and then forced to begin the detachment West without enough wagons or ships, food or medical supplies. Instead of the Cherokee ordering their own march, the American soldiers impose their own system of "order," which results in death for thousands of Cherokee on the trail. Knobowtee describes the chaos of the march: "And so we would march. A mix of diverse peoples. Agreeing on
little…. It felt brutal to be marched in a haphazard way, not by seven clans…but in several groups, here and there, some led by Christian ministers, some by local chiefs…feeling broken and apart" (47). Terms set forth in the Treaty of New Echota provided that the Cherokee were to organize their own removal; yet Knobowtee's description of the haphazardness of the walk signals the lack of order that the Cherokee were allowed. Unable to order their walk, the Cherokee find an Anglo authority directing their course.

The breakdown of Maritole and Knobowtee's marriage is a reflection of the factionalism among the Cherokee. Early on Knobowtee defies the matrilineal structure of the Cherokee by returning to his family rather than remaining with his wife and her family. Even prior to the Removal Act, Knobowtee explains, "I could sit with Maritole's family while her father led them in morning prayer at dawn, but I wasn't a part of them" (Glancy, Pushing 60). This passage alone suggests that this sense of division was in place prior to the Removal, and in fact the Removal is simply an intensification of the already present disorder. During the Removal Knobowtee says, "I wanted to be with my brother, my mother, and my sister in their circle. I didn't feel separate from them" (61). While Knobowtee does not feel separate from his birth family, his decision to walk with them rather than Maritole shows Knobowtee's break with tradition. In the matriarchal society of the Cherokee, Knobowtee is to be integrated into Maritole's family unit; however, he defies this system and chooses not to uphold his commitment. Just as the Georgia and Tennessee Cherokee are separated, so are Knobowtee and Maritole. Maritole's brother, Tanner, sees Knobowtee's problems stemming from Knobowtee's
embrace of white values toward property, law and individualism: "You're always looking
at the groups of men talking…. You got an eye for what's in it for you. I think
sometimes you don't see Maritole but for the fields and cabin she offered you" (61).
Rather than a resurgence in the familial unit, we instead see that any structure that could
offer balance, such as the family, is being broken down. Everyone is experiencing
alienation. Maritole even claims that "Knobowtee made it harder to walk…. He didn't
say anything to heal…. I wasn't anything he wanted to see. His eyes went far away. He
didn't see me as his wife. I was something different from him" (74). Separation becomes
key. Furthering this notion of alienation, Knobowtee describes those walking the trail
and his description makes clear the heterogeneous group that moves toward Indian
Territory:

> Our seven clans divided between three white peace clans and three red war
clans, with the neutral Long Hair clan to break up disagreements. Small
Whites who'd intermarried. Conjurers. Christians. Some had been
spokesman in Washington. Then there were soldiers. Government
teamsters. (47)

The separateness here may signify the factionalism of the Cherokee, but like other tropes
in Glancy's fiction this alienation has a double meaning. As the novel progresses, this
separateness actually becomes a unifying force among the Cherokee--something that
everyone on the trail is pushing against and attempting to overcome. This emotion is one
that they all experience, including the American soldiers on the trail. It becomes the
unifying agent of these heterogeneous peoples.

The form of Glancy's novel stands in opposition to the multiple Anglo and
Cherokee voices that cannot create unity. Bird Doublehead vividly articulates the
multiple voices speaking in discord: "The ministers say we go. They say their different ways. Presbyterian. Moravian. Methodist. Baptist. How many gods does the white man have? They can't agree on anything. But wasn't He three, a many-voiced God? All voices tell the same story though, one man says. No they don't. He-three's a god with many mouths to say because there's many ways to say" (Glancy, Pushing 22). Here we witness the confusion of the conflicting worldviews as well as a problem that is threatening the Cherokee in Glancy's portrayal of the trail. Dissention results from the many voices, many mouths, and many stories that are conflicting. Interestingly, the passage that follows Bird Doublehead's narration is Chief John Ross's. Ross's narration shows that the dissonance is inherent in not only the White voices but the Cherokee too. He says, "there were white men in Washington arguing for the Cherokee to stay on their land. There were Cherokee cooperating with the government to remove the Indians. None of the boundaries were clear. There were fractures and inconsistencies everywhere I turned" (22). In this passage, Glancy makes it clear that no boundaries are certain--even those between whites and Cherokees. A transcendence of these boundaries can only occur as the Cherokee traverse the landscape, moving through the narrative and through the artificial borders that will take them into "Indian Territory."

Traditional stories are the healing force that will ultimately bring unity to the division threatening the Cherokee worldview. Maritole explains this division to Sergeant Williams as a split in our ways of thinking… The Cherokee lived in agreement with the earth. But the white man told us God's curse separated us from the earth. What was wrong with our relationship to the land?… The Cherokee believed that after this earth, there would be another. One
without the white man. The conjurers only wanted to get back the agreement of man and earth. (Glancy, *Pushing* 149)

Here we witness the imposition of Western thought on the Cherokee worldview that Cheyfitz describes. The introduction of Western ideals and beliefs does not cohere with the Cherokee system and this causes a fissure and a need to reorder the chaos brought by the white man. The stories become the one thing that can bring redemption because as Maritole's father explains, the stories held our fear and hurt and resentment and anger. They gave us a place to order our disorder, a direction for our directionlessness. They gave us a place to argue with ourselves. Men felt a need to fight sometimes. Even women. Not because soldiers took our land, but because they took the order that couldn't be seen. They opened us up to the old disorder, and we would have to build the world again. (158)

This building of the world again comes through the telling of stories—a telling which necessitates multiple storytellers.

Glancy advocates a return to tradition as a way of reordering the world, and she models the incorporation of the traditional in her novel with the inclusion of Cherokee myths and stories. This building of the world again is set in motion in the Illinois section of the novel when the factionalism shifts—a shift that is set in motion by the remembrance of stories. Throughout the novel the multiple narrators have been unified in their discordance, but here we see that they are becoming unified around a means of connection—a shared tradition. The Basket Maker says, "the idea for baskets came from our stories. The baskets hold fish and corn and beans. Just like our stories hold meaning" (Glancy, *Pushing* 153). Recognizing the fluidity of stories, The Basket Maker explains, "We need new ways…. The trail needs stories" (153). Someone responds that
they would rather the stories of the trail be left "unspoken," but The Basket Maker declares that she will continue her basketry in the new territory and "rim her baskets with the hills in the new territory" (154). When Maritole asks, "What if there are no hills there?" The Basket Maker responds, "Then the rims will be clouds so my baskets will have new stories to tell" (154). Their exchange shows the perceptiveness of The Basket Maker in relation to stories. She recognizes that stories are living culture, not static, because indeed if they were static the Cherokee people would be too. For a people to flourish their stories must also flourish. The Basket Maker claims the power of story and the ability of the Cherokee to continue reinventing themselves, while holding onto their traditions in the new territory.

Following The Basket Maker's narrative is Knobowtee's remembrance of the power of story:

I remembered my father rowing. I remembered our words. Our voices and the meaning of our stories. The feeling of wholeness that held back the cold. To heat me. To be my fire. To be my means to survive the night. Voices interacting. The sound with the thought behind them, just like Maritole's father said. Connecting with others. That was the spark that made the fire. (Glancy, Pushing 155)

At a moment of utter darkness and bleakness, Knobowtee remembers the wholeness that the stories provide and the power they have to transcend the trail, and this is exactly what they do. Traditional stories are interspersed throughout the text along with other stories. Through numerous narrators, including Quaty Lewis, Anna Sco-so-tah, Luthy, Knobowtee, Maritole's father, Chief John Ross, Bird Doublehead, Tanner, and even James Mooney, we are told the tale of nation building (both that of the United States and the Cherokee Nation) and Removal. We are also told stories of the Cherokee division
between the Treaty Party (led by Chief John Ridge which supported Removal), and the majority of Cherokees that opposed the Removal (a group led by Chief John Ross). American soldiers on the trail also tell their stories in support of, or against, the Cherokee. And finally, Reverend Bushyhead's tales of acculturation and change overlap with those of the traditional Cherokee narrator called War Club. Importantly, the moment the traditional stories are recalled the narrators begin ordering the text, and the varying historical moments become integrated within their traditional myths--they become a way to rebuild the world with the Cherokee worldview and the "Real People" at the center of this new narrative.

**Cherokee Cosmogony**

In the Missouri section of the novel, Maritole realizes that the land sounded different…. There was one leaf hitting the sapling, clicking. I listened. It sounded like a soldier's bayonet hitting his saddle as we walked. It sounded like the women weaving their river cane baskets. I closed my eyes with the memory…. The white traders had bought as many baskets sometimes as they did deerskins. The leaf kept clicking in the cold wind. I watched it again. It was telling the story of our march. I would have the tongue of a leaf. I would tell our story, I thought. (Glancy, *Pushing* 173)

Again we see the merging of the different stories in Maritole's memory as well as her present moment on the trail. Maritole, like the sapling, holds the future of the Cherokees in her, just as the others on the trail do. In her urge to tell the story, she joins the others on the trail in becoming part of a harmonious order.

When we reach Arkansas, Maritole remembers the traditional stories and she becomes a storyteller. As her father dies, Maritole is telling a version of the Cherokee cosmogonic myth, and it is clear that she will take on the role that her father once held.
Maritole recounts a version of the cosmogonic myth, which closely resembles the myth collected by nineteenth-century anthropologist James Mooney called *How the World was Made*. This myth essentially describes the creation of the Cherokee and their worldview. According to the myth, in the beginning "the earth is a great island floating in a sea of water, and suspended at each of the four cardinal points by a cord hanging down from the sky vault, which is of solid rock" (Mooney 239). When everything was water all of the animals lived in the Upper World and because of this it was becoming crowded and they longed for more room. Wondering what was below the water, "'Beaver's Grandchild,' the little Water-beetle, offered to go and see if it could learn. It darted in every direction over the surface of the water, but could find no firm place to rest. Then it dived to the bottom and came up with soft mud, which began to grow and spread on every side until it became the island which we call the earth. It was afterward fastened to the sky with four cords, but no one remembers this" (239). Initially, the earth was "flat and very soft and wet" (239). Different birds were sent down to earth to see if they could find a place to light and determine if the land was dry because all of them were "anxious to get down." The Great Buzzard "flew all over the earth, low down near the ground, and it was still soft. When he reached the Cherokee country, he was very tired, and his wings began to flap and strike the ground, and wherever he struck the earth there was a valley, and where they turned up again there was a mountain" (239). Another world exists under this one too, called the Under World. "It is like ours in everything--animals, plants, and people--save that the seasons are different…. We know that the seasons in the underworld are different from ours, because the water in the springs is always warmer in winter and
cooler in summer than the outer air" (240). As the myth continues, animals and plants are made even though they don't know who made them. And finally "men came after the animals and plants. At first there were only a brother and sister until he struck her with a fish and told her to multiply, and so it was. In seven days a child was born to her, and thereafter every seven days another, and they increased very fast until there was danger that the world could not keep them. Then it was made that a woman should have only one child in a year, and it has been so ever since" (240).

This story, along with the other stories that Maritore's father has told her, will live on in Maritore. While her father may pass into another world, the stories he has relayed to her, including those of the Cherokee's beginnings, will continue through her telling. Regarding the stories, Maritore says, "Sometimes stories didn't seem to make any difference, but now I wanted to ask my father for a story again…. Suddenly I felt the magic of the stories again. They could keep life with me when I would let it go" (Glancy, Pushing 210). When she goes to her father he is so overcome with grief that Maritore asks him to tell a story and when he does not she becomes his voice: "If he couldn't tell me, then I would tell him" (211). Thus she begins a version of the Cherokee's cosmogonic myth: "'At one time all things were in the sky…. All living things spoke the same language, so they understood each other. But we misused this privilege and were stricken deaf to the talk of animals and birds'" (211). When she reaches the part of the story where the animals are growing so large in numbers that they're being pushed from the sky vault, she sees her father clutch his chest and die. Rather than bear his death, she looks away and continues the story. In her conviction that the story be told, she affirms
the continuity of her people even in this moment of death. As she ends the story, Maritole says, "We're like the animals in the sky pushed off to find a new place'" (212). Here the traditional story is infused with new meaning. Elements of the old story remain; yet woven into the elements of this story are the Removal and the Cherokee detachment to a new place.

Ordering the World: (Re)memory and (Re)turning to Tradition

The image of the bear plays a central role in the reordering as well. As the title of the novel suggests, the story of the bear becomes an integral part of the novel and the Cherokees healing and reunification. The bear has a double meaning, for not only is it something that the Cherokee are pushing against in their struggle to survive and make it to the new land, but it also becomes a unifying agent in that the energy and anger the bear provides causes those that walk the trail to push forward--through anger, through desperation, or through the sheer will to live. The bear is resisting them and in their struggle against his resistance they find the power to continue--the ability to become whole again.

To understand the significance of the bear and the multiple meanings that the novel attributes to this animal, we must once again turn to Cherokee cosmography and the classification of the bear. As noted earlier, Cherokee society was traditionally developed around strict adherence to social boundaries. Everything was ordered and placed within a particular social category within their mythology. Anxiety arose when boundaries were crossed and the Cherokee believed that imbalance would give way to chaos, so their role was to continually reorder any imbalance. As Charles Hudson
explains in *The Southeastern Indians*, "The Southeastern cosmos consisted of three worlds: in addition to This World, an Upper World existed above the sky vault, and an Under World existed beneath the earth and the waters. This World was believed to have seven levels [hence the number of clans among the Cherokee]" (123). Initially only two worlds existed, that of the Upper World, which signified "order and expectableness," and the Under World which "epitomized disorder and change" (124-125). Mirroring the Cherokee's adherence to balance, This World "stood somewhere between perfect order and complete chaos" (125). Just as there were divisions between This World and the Upper and Under Worlds, divisions and categories were incorporated into every facet of Cherokee society, including their kinship system as described earlier, and plants and animals as well.

Three major categories existed for animals: "The main subcategories were the four-footed animals--the creatures of the surface of the earth; birds, creatures of the air, and hence the animals who were closest to the realm of spirit; and vermin, including snakes and fish, creatures of the watery under world" (Hudson, *Elements of Southeastern Indian Religion* 13). However, occasionally animals were anomalies--they defied neat categorization. Among the Cherokee "beings which conform to more than one major category are anomalous and are treated or regarded in a special way. Anomalous creatures were those which did not fit neatly into a single category, but which fell into two or more" (14). Interestingly, the bear is one of the few animals that falls into "both the human category and the four-footed animal category… [because] it often walks
upright on two legs, and it frequently eats the same kinds of food men eat" (Hudson, *The Southeastern Indians* 139). Regarding the importance of the bear, Hudson explains that above all other animals, the bear represents the nature of the division between people and animals. According to Cherokee oral tradition, bears are descended from a Cherokee clan who decided that they would prefer to live in the company of animals where they would never go hungry rather than face the toil and uncertainties of human existence. In Southeastern Indian thought, part of being human was eating human food. Thus in their oral traditions men who went to live and eat with animals or spiritual beings generally died after returning and eating human food for several days. (161)

Akin to the traditional stories of the bear, Maritole experiences an in-between-ness along the trail. She is constantly threatened by being consumed either partially or wholly by the bear, which is in essence a metaphor for the trail. At first she merely likens her experiences on the trail to the act of "pushing a bear," but as the novel continues Maritole actually feels like the bear is with her, even if only in her imaginings. During one moment in the novel, she feels that her body is being taken over by a bear, but she is brought back to This World by the shaman who calls her back from the bear spirit. Following this ceremony, Maritole finds within herself an incredible strength to move forward. She even befriends the trail, an act that is shown through her symbolic action of walking with the bear rather than fighting it.

There are several myths about the bear, including those collected by James Mooney as well as the stories Glancy interweaves in her text that offer differing interpretations. All of these versions offer an entry into the complexity surrounding this animal. In Cherokee mythology, the "Origin of the bear" story as collected by Mooney is very similar to the above version in which a young boy repeatedly goes into the woods to
play and live among the bears. And as he digests their foods and rejects the food of his parents' home, he finds himself exhibiting physical characteristics of the bear. Eventually the boy convinces his parents and those of his settlement to join him and they all live among the bears and become the bears. Mooney explains,

A continuous adherence to the diet commonly used by a bear will finally give to the eater the bear nature, if not also the bear form and appearance. A certain term of "white man's food" will give the Indian the white man's nature, so that neither the remedies nor the spells of the Indian doctor will have any effect upon him. (472)

Glancy's work recalls this myth as she presents the Cherokee's reaction to Western food--the white paste that becomes bread--on the trail. Again and again people become sick from the food offered them; Maritole cannot even digest the food or swallow it at times. The symbolic action here is that through ingesting the Western food, the Cherokee are turning into "bears" or whites by partaking of the food. Through assimilation and acculturation they are losing their tribal identity. Maritole's vile reaction to the food encapsulates her reaction to what is happening to her people and their traditions along the trail. The people are forgetting what binds them together. They need to remember how to (re)create the world by (re)turning to their traditional stories. Remembrance of the bear story shows the Cherokee what will happen if they choose to give up rather than face the toil confronting them.

The image of the bear initially represents grief, resistance, immobility and darkness. However, as Glancy's novel progresses we see her rewriting the traditional bear story by adding elements of strength and unity to the bear--elements that become attributed to the bear by members of the Cherokee along the trail. Just as there are
multiple voices in this polyvocal tale, there are multiple images and meanings attributed to the bear. The novel begins with Maritole likening her emotions to the image of a bear: "It was as if a bear sat on my chest all the way to camp. I felt air would not come into my lungs. It was a heavy grief I couldn't push away" (Glancy, *Pushing* 15). In other moments Maritole describes a "dark presence" that resembles a bear. Here, the bear functions as a metaphor for the trail: she says, "The bear we pushed would not move away. Each day I felt his ragged fur. Sometimes I could smell his breath" (80). As her journey continues, she will metaphorically be taken over by the bear, rescued from and by the power of the bear, and ultimately learn to truly push the bear in an act of survivance by the novel's end.

Maritole's moment of complete passivity comes in the middle of the novel. And in this moment she is completely consumed by the bear, yet in her becoming the bear she ultimately finds the strength to assert agency. During their trek through Tennessee, Maritole says to Luthy,

"The bear's at my feet…. My toes feel like the bear's eating them! He's eating my legs!"…. The bear kept eating my body. He ate my stomach. My chest. There was nothing anyone could do. The bear kept eating until I was inside him. There was nothing left of me in the wagon. I could feel the bear's warmth. My whole body was stinging. I saw nothing but the dark. (Glancy, *Pushing* 114)

Here Maritole's action of becoming the bear serves as an act of surrender--she is powerless to continue on the trail and powerless to assert any form of agency. Theda Perdue explains in *Cherokee Women* that "The bear…was unable to kill humans even to avenge the loss of its own kind. Consequently, 'the hunter does not even ask the Bear's pardon when he kills one.' The bear had a place in the world, but it had little power"
This total passivity that is attributed to the bear is transferred to Maritole in this moment. However, Maritole's passivity quickly gives way to fight as she is aided by those around her to survive. Her attempts to fight the bear become her way of not going passively into the new lands, not accepting the fate, but rather striving for survivance of her tribe. Moments after her consumption by the bear, Maritole feels herself being sucked out of the bear. She says, "I had been warm. Now I felt cold again. I heard the shaman talking to the bear…. I tried to kick him away with my feet but someone held my legs" (Glancy, *Pushing* 114). Later when Maritole awakes she declares with firm affirmation, "I wanted to walk again. I wasn't going to ride to the new territory with the old ones. I wasn't dead. I would get out of the wagon and walk if that's the way it had to be" (114). Clearly, Maritole has gained strength because of the bear. While she may have had moments of passivity or defeat, she is revived with a new affirmation to continue the walk. Kakowih even says of Maritole, "Maritole growl like a bear when she sleep. She got eat by bear. She have bear strength. Always keep marching" (131).

This brings to mind Glancy's telling of The Story of the Bear in *Pushing*, a story that mimics the factionalism of the Cherokee on the trail, but that also affirms that moments of loss are always transformed into moments of power. Cycles continue, just as the Cherokee continue, and in the ebb and flow of disorder there is the counter which is balance. Here is Glancy's account of the Bear story:

>A long time ago the Cherokee forgot we were a tribe. We thought only of ourselves apart from the others. Without any connections. Our hair grew long on our bodies. We crawled on our hands and knees. We forgot we had a language. We forgot how to speak. That's how the bear was formed. From a part of ourselves when we were in trouble. All we had was fur and meat to give. (*Pushing* 176)
The Story of the Bear follows Maritole's narrative in which she explains, "We had entered a huge land. It had entered us. Along with the cornfields we left. I was full of trees. Full of corn. Full of walking.... The bear licking my face.... My ears heard the ancestors singing their song.... The trees in Alotohee took root in me" (176). Here strength is returning to Maritole. When she says she is full of trees, she inherently means she is full of stories--full of the power to reorder the Cherokee world. It is imperative that the Story of the Bear follows Maritole's epiphany, because the placement of this story proves that the Cherokee have survived divisions before. The story calls to mind other moments when the Cherokee "forgot" they "were a tribe." And in these moments a story was used to order the split. The bear had entered the Cherokee before, and the Cherokee had authored the story that tore them apart. They can do so again.

In the bear metaphor for the trail, Glancy is taking the power away from Anglo authority and asserting the autonomy of the Cherokee. She honestly grapples with this history and looks beyond boundaries between Anglo-Americans and Cherokees. In fact, in the afterward of her novel, she explains, "I knew this wasn't going to be a good Indian/bad white man story. You know there has to be both sides in each" (Glancy, Pushing 237). Understanding Glancy's position of interconnectedness enables us to extract the importance from The Story of the Bear. Glancy examines the role of the Cherokee and claims it so that her people are not victims, but rather agents that will survive despite the injustices put upon them. These people will author their existence; these people will continue ordering their world regardless of impositions that others try to place upon them. This moment of chaos, when the Cherokee "thought only of
[themselves] apart from others," will be followed by renewal. Balance will return. In offering up the weakness of the Cherokee in her story of the bear, Glancy is also aware of the ambiguity of this animal. She takes this important animal and imbues him with another power--strength and unity. It is in the Cherokee pushing against the bear that they become unified again. In fighting against their common enemy or "other" they are maintaining the unified front of community. The bear takes on dual meaning and importance, offering more than a simple monovocal tale.

Glancy's *Pushing the Bear* follows a cyclic pattern that is reflective of Cherokee history and traditional stories. Through historical memory, Glancy reclaims this history by authoritatively redefining the Cherokee community. She takes the imposed Anglo-American laws and notions and weaves them into her novel and back into a framework where the Cherokee are authoring their own existence and history--authoring it in their traditional style--multiple voices--all equal and singing a song of survival and continuity.
2. NARRATING "VOLUNTARY" MIGRATIONS:
WILLIAM MELVIN KELLEY'S RESPONSE TO SOUTHERN VIOLENCE AND
AFRICAN-AMERICAN AGENCY IN A DIFFERENT DRUMMER

This is the only branch of the Dogwood tree;
    An emblem of WHITE SUPREMACY.
A lesson once taught in the Pioneer's school,
    That this is a land of WHITE MAN'S RULE.
The Red Man once in an early day,
    Was told by the Whites to mend his way.
The negro, now, by eternal grace,
    Must learn to stay in the negro's place.
In the sunny South the land of the free,
    Let the WHITE SUPREME forever be.
Let this a warning to all negroes be,
    Or they'll suffer the fate of the DOGWOOD TREE.

The above poem, titled "The Dogwood Tree," was part of the Without Sanctuary exhibit, which was housed at Jackson State University in Mississippi during the summer of 2004. As part of the Unsettling Memories conference, the exhibit included letters, photographs, memorabilia, newspaper articles, and written testimonials of lynchings in the American South. Upon entering the exhibit I could hear a sorrowful voice singing an
old negro spiritual, and this singing voice haunted the entire exhibit as I traversed from room to room viewing the numerous disturbing and horrific images. Along with lighted candles, in memory of those African American bodies depicted in the photographs, tears were streaming down the faces of those viewing these bodies that have become testimony to the horrifying history of racial relations in America, particularly the American South.

The exhibition of this history becomes very tangible in that temporal moment of walking through these artifacts—in the space of the *Without Sanctuary* exhibit. Unlike typical traveling exhibits, there was little to no chatter among individuals, nor were others looking and smiling at people as they passed one another. Rather, eyes were averted or gripped by the terrifying images that brought the violence of Night Riders of the South into the present. At once this exhibit reminded me of the reality that Toni Morrison's novel *Beloved* brought to slavery. It made this "institution" that is sometimes discussed in a very desensitized fashion, suddenly very gripping and raw. *Without Sanctuary* had the same impact. Suddenly, lynchings and the images of this act were not just a product of the past—a history stored away or written in words that one could close up in the confines of a book. Instead there were bodies, charred limbs, faces, mutilations, smiles, cries, looks of wonder, looks of hatred, fear, delight, and showmanship. All of these things came to life in the images of the lynchings and the white bodies that inflicted the terror on these black subjects.

The poem, given in its entirety above, offers a narrative text to a postcard in the exhibit. This postcard could easily have gone unnoticed because it was in a glass case with probably thirty other similar photographic images and "souvenirs" of lynching
parties. However, the title alone is striking and somewhat odd for a photograph of this nature, and it set this particular postcard apart. Dogwood trees are extremely beautiful and statuesque; however, they could probably not support the weight of a human body. Therefore, the pairing of the dogwood tree as a lynchng tree seems odd, but compelling because of this odd pairing. The visual text of the postcard is an image of four to five black men that have been lynched. As the text of the poem puts forth, these men have supposedly been hung from a dogwood tree. Clearly, they have been lynched in a Texas town. Under the photo is the following caption: "Scene in Sabine County, TX, 6/15/08." The narrative of this postcard, both textually and visually, offers the threat of violence that has been and will be visited upon the bodies of the South that do not adhere to white supremacy in the early twentieth century, namely Native American and African American bodies. In "The Dogwood Tree," Native Americans have been written out of the Southern landscape as well as the threat of these bodies to white supremacy. However, it is important to note that the Natives are not simply "written out" or erased, but rather they are "written in" to the Southern master narrative as peoples who were then erased and removed by the Anglo Southerner. They are acknowledged in the Southern narrative so that the Southerner can narrate his "superiority" over these peoples. Interactions between whites and Natives, as well as the image of the lynched Black bodies, serve as an example to those who threaten the whiteness of the South. While the Natives are both textually and visually written out of the Southern narrative of the postcard, the Black body becomes the "new" site of racial injustice and extreme violence.
Throughout the first chapter of this project, I show the ways in which Native American writers, particularly Diane Glancy, are recalling a southern landscape that is full of the voices of their peoples. While the poem above attempts to write the Native out of the southern landscape, Glancy and writers like LeAnne Howe, whom I will discuss at length in chapter three of this project, offer a counter-narrative to that of erasure. With the Removal of Native Americans, specifically the Cherokee Trail of Tears in 1838-1839, Natives found themselves in a new landscape. As Glancy points out through her protagonist, Maritole, this new landscape, including the trail that the Cherokee take to this new landscape, is in need of narration—a story to counter the ill effects of the Removal, a story to heal the devastation visited upon these peoples walking the trail, and a story to unify the fissures the Cherokee face internally in a metaphoric sense, and more explicitly in a literal sense as they are extracted from their homelands, present-day North Carolina and Georgia. In Glancy's text, the image of story or narrative becomes likened to the natural world in the image of a tree. At one point in the text, Maritole espouses that she is "full of trees" and she inherently means that she is full of stories. Throughout her experience walking the Trail of Tears she has internalized so many stories, along with new stories of the trail. Her experiences of integration allow her to cling to the past and her traditional values, customs, and homeland, while also embracing the change the Removal has visited upon her people. Likewise, this metaphor of tree and story are witnessed throughout Glancy's other writings, both essays and poems alike. The tree becomes a carrier of the oral tradition; and in addition, the tree provides us with the
resource of paper—a place the written word is recorded, furthering the link between tree and story.

However, the tree imagery presented in "The Dogwood Tree" offers a supposedly alternative narrative. Not a narrative of hope, but one of violence, hatred, and racial supremacy in a white southern landscape. The tree for the African American becomes a literal space to fear. Lynchings were so prevalent in the South that according to the "Tuskegee Institute figures, between the years 1882 and 1951, 4,730 people were lynched in the United States" (Red Summers). And these are conservative figures, because often lynchings were not public or reported, but many of them took place in remote, rural communities; therefore, obtaining a definite number of those that suffered from this terror is an impossibility.

Not only does the above poem bring together the violence enacted upon Native Americans and African Americans, but the symbology presented in the dogwood tree itself brings the religious element to the forefront of this Southern narrative. Dogwood trees are abundant throughout the South and they bloom every year during the Easter season. This tree only blooms for a very short period of time, and afterward it does not produce flowers until the next Easter season. During the autumn months the tree produces small red berries; otherwise, the tree produces green foliage, but no flowers. In Christian ideology, the dogwood has become a symbol of the resurrected Christ. Christians throughout the South esteem the dogwood tree with a special reverence because of its ability to bloom only during this sacred holiday season. Therefore, the fact that these black bodies are lynched from this particular type of tree offers a two-fold
importance. First, the tree becomes the space in which the violence is enacted. But secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the violence enacted upon these black bodies is a violence that can be equated with the violence enacted upon Christ's body (as represented by the dogwood), and the resurrection of this body as we understand it in the story of the Passion. Certainly the creators of this postcard were not equating the African American body with the body of Christ, nor were they expecting a resurrection of these African American bodies; however, the irony of the chosen tree is that this is exactly what the narrativizing of this event can offer. The "fate of the DOGWOOD TREE" is rebirth and regeneration, resurrection if you will. And this counter-narrative, one of resurrection and renaissance, is present in the Great Migration narratives that arise in American literatures during the turn of the twentieth century, which ultimately give way to the Harlem Renaissance.

The threat of violence and lynching, coupled with the opportunity for economic and personal advancement, caused a flood of Black migrants to leave the Southern "homeland" and head for an urban landscape during the turn of the twentieth century. This movement has come to be known as the Great Migration. Jean Toomer's Cane is one of the first Great Migration texts to narrativize the experience of migration for the African American. His poem, "Song of the Son," is directly linked with the interpretation given here of "The Dogwood Tree" because the lynching tree ultimately becomes a "singing tree" bearing fruit that will give way to voices and Black bodies of the Harlem Renaissance.
Along with this imagery of tree, it is impossible not to be reminded of Billie Holiday's performance of "Strange Fruit," which narrativizes the violence of lynching in the South in song. In the lyrics of this song, written by a white Jewish schoolteacher, Abel Meeropol (also known as Lewis Allan), "Southern trees bear a strange fruit,/ Blood on the leaves and blood at the root,/ Black body swinging in the Southern breeze,/ Strange fruit hanging from the poplar trees" (Margolick). The plums of Toomer's tree in "Song of the Sun" and the "strange and bitter crop" produced in "Strange Fruit" show the twisted "pastoral scene of the gallant South" (Margolick). By July 1939, Holiday's rendition of this song was "widely publicized." David Margolick notes that "The New Masses called it 'the first successful attempt of white men to write blues'…. But surely the most extravagant praise came from Samuel Grafton, a columnist for the New York Post. 'If the anger of the exploited ever mounts high enough in the South, it now has its Marseillaise,' he wrote" (Margolick). In many ways "Strange Fruit" could offer a "Marseillaise" for William Melvin Kelley's African Americans in A Different Drummer. Kelley even sets his novel in an imagined New Marsails, which used to be called "New Marseilles…after the French city" (Kelley, Drummer 10). The new anthem for a 1950s South is one of revolution and protest. Regarding "Strange Fruit," "the late jazz writer Leonard Feather once called [it] 'the first significant protest in words and music, the first unmuted cry against racism'" (Margolick). And the lyrical protest of "Strange Fruit" lives on in Kelley's text as he presents a changing South, an anti-pastoral devoid of any black bodies to create another "strange and bitter crop." The imagery of the tree may offer different experiences for Native Americans and African Americans alike, but ultimately
this image is imbued with power for both. It becomes equated with the power to create narrative, to create a healing space, and to be born again. The saplings of the twentieth century become the narratives of agency written by Native and African American writers in their own words and by their own pens.

A Different Migration Story: A Different Drummer

William Melvin Kelley's *A Different Drummer* published in 1962 follows some of the typical patterns of migration novels. The story begins with the unnamed African landing on the shores of New Marsails. Like William Faulkner's Yoknapatwpha County, William Melvin Kelley's novel is set in an unspecified, unnamed "State" which is located in the Deep South. While the State, like the African, is never named, Kelley does provide the following information about its geographical positioning: "An East South Central state in the Deep South, it is bounded on the north by Tennessee; east by Alabama; south by the Gulf of Mexico; west by Mississippi" (Kelley, *Drummer* 3). This positioning draws attention to boundaries and clearly Kelley is showing how easily these demarcations can shift. He has pushed the boundaries of the southeastern states outwards to make room for his version of a created Southern state. This imagined shift in boundaries that Kelley creates for his state becomes a critique of the boundaries that hold Southern identity. In fact, it recalls Benedict Anderson's thesis in *Imagined Communities*. Anderson defines nation as "an imagined political community--and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" (6). Moreover, Anderson explains that "the nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie
other nations" (Anderson 7). This elasticity of boundaries within a nation (in this case America) is exactly what Kelley is toying with. In *A Different Drummer*, Kelley creates a sovereign state that is inhabited by blacks and whites alike, only to reimagine it as a space of only whiteness—a state that is isolated because its imagined boundaries will not be crossed by African Americans.

As Anderson discusses sovereignty and the imagined nation, he tells us that this concept of

sovereign...was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm. Coming to maturity at a stage of human history when even the most devout adherents of any universal religion were inescapably confronted with the living pluralism of such religions, and the allomorphism between each faith's ontological claims and territorial stretch, nations dream of being free, and, if under God, directly so. The gage and emblem of this freedom is the sovereign state. (7)

Here I would like to call attention to the idea of sovereignty being equated with freedom. The poem that begins this chapter brings up the South as the land of the free. Here, nation is defined as "dream[ing] of being free." However, the crucial part that's missing from this pairing is the "other" who is not free—the one who takes on the violence of the state in order for one group to be free. The first page of Kelley's novel calls attention to this concept of sovereignty in the title of his first section, "The State." Before Kelley begins the story of the African and his offspring, he provides us with historical information about the state: "CAPITAL: Willson City. AREA: 50,163 square miles. POPULATION: (1960 Census, preliminary) 1,802,268. MOTTO: With Honor and Arms We Dare Defend Our Rights. ADMITTED TO UNION: 1818" (Kelley, *Drummer* 3). Then, Kelley provides the early history of the state, followed by recent history. In
this recent history (1957), "all the state's Negro inhabitants departed. Today, it is unique in being the only state in the Union that cannot count even one member of the Negro race among its citizens" (4). Here, it is evident that the state has been reimagined. It is now the sole state in the Union (the sovereign nation) that has no "Negro inhabitants." It has become a state that has boundaries separating it from other states that have Negro inhabitants. Kelley, in fact, imagines a state that is devalued for its very lack of Negro inhabitants. As the history of Kelley's imagined state unfolds, the importance of Blackness, and Whiteness' reliance on Blackness, becomes apparent.

An interesting question that Kelley's text puts forth is if America is little more than a construct, an imagined space, then how different is the real imagined state of any Southern state different from the fictional imagined state that Kelley is proposing? Likewise, how is an imagined nation different from its imagined history? And if there is little difference, then what separates history from fiction? How separate is history from story, if it is story?

A Different Drummer begins with the men of the porch--the white storytellers of Kelley's novel who congregate each morning at Thomason Grocery Company. Showing the communal aspect of storytelling, the story of the African is framed as a story within a story. The legend of the African comes to life as Mister Harper, the white patriarch of the porch that spends his time in a wheelchair because nothing important enough has happened to warrant him standing, tells the story of the African's arrival to the State's shores. As the story goes, Dewitt Willson is waiting at the docks in New Marsails for his new grandfather clock. Willson is in the process of building a new home for which he
orders a clock from Europe, and the "slaver" is the quickest way for the clock to be shipped. While the folks of New Marsails along with Dewitt Willson congregate, they discover that the captain of the ship has had incredible mishaps throughout his journey due to the actions of one African man. The entire crew is afraid of him. The narrator tells us that "folks held their breath like youngsters at a circus waiting for a high-wire fellow to make it to his nest, because even if an old deaf-blind lady had-a been standing on that dock, she would-a know there was something down in the hold that was getting ready to make an appearance" (Kelley, *Drummer* 13). Through the imagery presented here, it is clear what a spectacle the slaver and auctioneer create with the unloading of slaves for public auction. Likewise, this passage calls attention to the "underworld" where the African is held, alluding to the underworld that is the narrative space for Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man*. And like a figure out of myth or legend, the African cannot be held down in this place of invisibility. As he emerges from the ship, his description is larger than life:

To begin with, they seen his head coming up out of the gangway, and then his shoulders, so broad he had to climb those stairs sideways; then his body began, and long after it should-a stopped it was still coming…. His head was as large as one of them kettles you see in a cannibal movie and looked as heavy. There was so many chains hung on him he looked like a fully trimmed Christmas tree. But it was his eyes they kept looking at; sunk deep in his head they was, making it look like a gigantic black skull. (Kelley, *Drummer* 14)

The auctioneer faces the astonished crowd and begins his rap to sell the African, explaining to the crowd that he is an African chief of "extraordinary muscular development, the regal bearing" (15). When the auctioneer says to Willson, "'What say, Mister Willson, you figure he's worth that much?'" Dewitt Willson didn't answer, didn't
say nothing, just reached into his pocket and pulled out one thousand cash" (16).

However, Willson never gets the opportunity to take his "slave" back to his new home. Instead, the African escapes his captors, running with chains swinging all about--much like we would imagine Paul Bunyan chopping down trees left and right, we see the African beheading the auctioneer with his chains, fleeing to freedom and safety, while creating mob hysteria.

Even as Willson purchases the African chief, the African becomes the body that will not be enslaved. He refuses to become the property of another. In his interactions with Willson we see the actions of two masters, rather than the Hegelian model of the master/slave dialectic, which I will discuss at length later in this section. The African begins a game of cat and mouse with Willson, who declares that he must own the African: "He'll work for me. I'll break him. I have to break him" (Kelley, Drummer 14). Willson goes all but mad attempting to find and enslave the African. Moreover, the African frees all of Dewitt Willson's slaves, further calling attention to his inability to be enslaved, and his role as a master himself. Willson explains, "I heared this noise outside down by the slave cabins. God damn, when I rushed to the window if I didn't see all my niggers heading into the woods behind a man who was as big anyways as a black horse on its hind legs. And there was another one too, … never more than a few steps behind the big one, waving his arms and telling MY niggers what to do and where to go" (20). Willson's obsession with catching the African becomes so strong that he almost loses his mind. "His wife told folks he kept right on talking to himself and when he did wake up, he came up screaming: 'But I am. I'm worth a thousand too! I am!'" (19). Willson's
nightmarish dreams confirm that he doubts his own worth. He sees the African as incredibly valuable, and in his declaration that "I'm worth a thousand too!," it is evident that Willson's need to argue this point is his need to believe this himself.

The African only allows Willson to get as close to him as possible. He outwits Willson at every stage. Willson is unable to capture the African, and even when Willson does discover him, it is through the Judas-like betrayal of the African by the Auctioneer's servant. Willson's obsession with the African is fueled by his own need to be recognized. He wonders if he is worth as much as the African, too. His attempts to enslave or break the African are in effect an act to make Willson feel more worthy--worth the same, if not more, monetary value as the African. His whole notion of self-worth is bound in his ability to enslave the one that cannot be enslaved. Already, in the early pages of the novel, Kelley is pointing towards the ways that whiteness as property holds value in relation to the African subject. This point of property and the racialization of property and value becomes the key theme of Kelley's novel, a point I will continuously address in this chapter.

Throughout the African's escape and even until the end of his life, he holds under his arm a black baby boy. Willson finally happens upon the African and determines to kill him. He shoots the African, but even as the African sinks to the ground he remembers that something is left undone. And in his final act, the African tries to kill his offspring so that none of his lineage will experience slavery or become the property of the Willson family. Similar to Sethe's decisive moment in *Beloved* to claim her personhood through any act possible, including sacrificing her children so that they will
not become commodities, the African refuses the lot he has been given. However, he is unsuccessful in his sacrificial attempt. He is unable to kill the baby boy, and generation upon generation of Calibans become slaves, servants, chauffeurs, and house-keepers for the Willson family.

In this opening scene of the novel, we already witness the agency of a black body who refuses to be owned--who sees his personhood in his own hands--his life to give or take. Refusing to become property, the African cannot be bound by American property laws, or by the plantation slave system. Moreover, we witness a perverted version of Hegel's Master/Slave dialectic as Willson and the African come face to face, staring each other down outside of language:

Keeping his back to the rock, where the baby was sleeping, [the African] made a full, slow circle, eyeing them all, eyeing the auctioneer's Negro too, who was standing next to Dewitt, but not stopping at him, or showing any anger or bitterness, stopping only when he came to Dewitt Willson and staring at him. They stared at each other, not like they was trying to stare each other down, more like they was discussing something without using words. And finally it seemed like they came to an agreement because the African bowed slightly like a fighter bows at the beginning of a match, and Dewitt Willson raised his rifle, sighted the African's upturned face, and shot him cleanly just above the bridge of his wide nose. (Kelley, Drummer 24)

This passage sets up a pattern that recurs throughout the novel--the notion of absence. Absence in the form of language, narrative, dialogue, or body becomes a prevalent theme in the novel. Regarding this passage, the moment of absence becomes key because it is a moment of acknowledgement. Although the African loses his life, he makes clear through his nonverbal look at Dewitt Willson that Willson will never own him. He can take his life, but he will not take his humanity. The "agreement" that takes place in this
This non-verbal exchange between Willson and the African is interestingly read within Hegel's concept of lordship and bondage that he proposes in *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Hegel's model is useful because Kelley takes this paradigm and complicates it, offering a "slave" that will not recognize himself in this status to the "master." The lines between master and slave become so blurry that the use of these terms are almost irrelevant. These terms become mere labels that don't necessarily define the subjects. In the Hegelian model, it is imperative that "recognition" occurs between two individuals--one becomes recognized as master, while the other as slave. To reach this moment of recognition, the master and slave become engaged in a "fight to the death," and only in the moment before death can this recognition occur and the master and slave recognize their respective positions. The master/slave dialectic thus becomes a relationship of dependence. However, while the master may appear to have the power in this paradigm, in fact, the master becomes static. He/She can no longer see his worth outside of the slave. But for the slave, his or her self-awareness continues to grow. Through the fruits of his/her labor, the slave becomes aware of his/her agency and this self-recognition can result in rebellion, whereby the slave overturns his/her status.

Willson's and the African's interactions largely follow this template of the master/slave dialectic; however, the final confrontation between these two shows that the purchased "slave" clearly does not fit in this framework. Instead, the African proves his role as a chief. He is a master himself, too; therefore, the master of himself. Even in his
act of freeing Willson's slaves, he shows Willson how helpless Willson is in his "fight" with the African. According to Alexandre Kojeve's lectures on Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*, "all human, anthropogenetic Desire--the Desire that generates Self-Consciousness, the human reality--is, finally, a function of the desire for 'recognition'… Therefore, to speak of the 'origin' of Self-Consciousness is necessarily to speak of a fight to the death for 'recognition'" (Kojeve 7). In addition, Kojeve states that "in order that the human reality come into being as 'recognized' reality, both adversaries must remain alive after the fight" (8). And in order for both of these adversaries to "remain alive" they must necessarily take up different positions, one acknowledging the other as master, while the other is acknowledged as slave. Where Kelley's characters diverge from this model is in the final act by Willson, when he kills the African. The Hegelian model posits that "the relation of the two Self-Consciousnesses…is determined in such a way that they come to light--each for itself and one for the other--through the fight for life and death…. And it is only through the risk of life that freedom comes to light…. In other words, only by the risk of life does it come to light that Self-Consciousness is nothing but pure Being-for-itself. The human-individual that has not dared-to-risk his life can, to be sure, be recognized as a *human-person*; but he has not attained the truth of this fact of being recognized as an autonomous Self-Consciousness" (12-13). Willson and the African engage in a "fight for life and death," but Willson's life is never risked. He has never "dared-to-risk his life." As a result, he is unable to "attain the truth of this fact of being recognized." In addition, in the act of killing the African the "truth" of his humanity is destroyed, because "proving of oneself by death does away with the truth…that was
supposed to come from it" (13). Perhaps to say it better "if one of the adversaries remains alive but kills the other, he can no longer be recognized by the other; the man who has been defeated and killed does not recognize the victory of the conqueror. Therefore, the victor's certainty of his being and of his value remains subjective, and thus has no 'truth'" (14). Willson's value is bound in the African, so as he destroys the African he also destroys his own worth. He devalues his own sense of self, loses his humanity and truth, as he pulls the trigger and kills the African. This opening story of Kelley's novel is its synecdoche. It is the part that represents the whole. And it holds the significance of the entire novel. As a symbol for whiteness, Willson destroys Blackness (in the form of the African); thereby destroying the value of whiteness. The African's lineage will take up where he leaves off and further devalue the property of whiteness in the state. The story of Tucker Caliban, which Kelley's novel primarily focuses on, is a story of rebellion, migration, and destruction. For the remainder of this chapter, I will address the ways in which Tucker Caliban rebels against the system that has continued since the time of Dewitt Willson and the African's initial confrontation. I will discuss at length the ways whiteness has become a source of property that is dependent upon the "other" (in this case African Americans) for its value. And, as a result, when the presence of Blackness is absent from the white community, the community, just like Dewitt Willson, finds itself at a loss for ways to construct its value.

The narrative that the African begins becomes the narrative that his lineage continues. Following the African's story, Kelley offers the story of Tucker Caliban. Once more the story is narrated through an Anglo voice. Rather than Mister Harper
narrating this section, Harry Leland is given the role. Whites are narrating their own journey into Whiteness and Blackness. In their journey, they come to realize that their property as Whites becomes devalued as the African Americans in Kelley's fictional State leave in mass numbers, until ultimately there is not a single person of African descent in the county or state. Like the opening scene of this novel in which Dewitt Willson sees his worth bound in his ability to enslave the African, here an entire community of whites are left to determine their own worth when the African Americans of the community leave in droves, following Tucker Caliban to the unnamed Promised Land.

Tucker Caliban's story mirrors the African's. His actions pick up where the African's leave off. While the African tried to kill the black child under his arm, he was unable to do so. Thereby he was unable to free his line from the fate of slavery. However, Tucker Caliban through symbolic action—as those on the porch explain he got through the blood—destroys the land, the landscape, particularly the tree that holds the memory of the African's story. And, like Quentin Compson in William Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*, Caliban destroys the Willson family's old grandfather clock (the sole reason that Willson met the slave ship to begin with). Like Quentin, Tucker tries to destroy time/past through destroying the grandfather clock. Whereas Quentin wants to stop time and go back to a more child-like innocence, Caliban wants to return to the freedom his people once enjoyed. Caliban destroys these historical markers to lay claim to his person as property—to free himself, those before him, and those that will follow. By destroying the clock, he attempts to destroy the time of enslavement and markers of that time. In essence, he destroys time itself, or at least the construct of it as embodied in
the grandfather clock. Yet, since we never get Tucker's narration we never know his story completely. We only get his story though the Anglo voices. We must infer what we know from the text, much like we approach historiography. However, through Caliban's actions, he does create another legend for the citizens of the state: "in June 1957, for reasons yet to be determined, all the state's Negro inhabitants departed. Today, it is unique in being the only state in the Union that cannot count even one member of the Negro race among its citizens" (Kelley, *Drummer* 4).

In his article "The Ivy League Negro" which appeared in *Esquire* in 1963, Kelley writes, "To be a Negro is to be a man waking up in a hospital bed with amnesia. He asks the doctor who he is, what is his name. The doctor tells him, but the name means nothing to the man. He will take the name anyway, simply because it is better to have a name, even one which holds no meaning, than to have no name at all" (*Esquire* 55). Naming is an act, but a meaningless act in the context of this quote. Likewise, in Kelley's novel he shows the unimportance of naming. More importantly, he calls attention to the act of not naming constructs, whether constructed space, identity, or race. Even the careless way in which the main character of Kelley's novel is named shows the haphazardness masters applied to naming their slaves. For example, Caliban is named by the Willson slaveowner because he was reading Shakespeare at the time. Kelley's use of the name Caliban shows his link with his character and Shakespeare's character by the same name, but the name is important only in that it tells another story. It draws attention to another narrative, like the naming of New Marsails connects to a French narrative and one of colonialism. However, seeking to undo or rewrite that narrative of colonization, Kelley
refuses to name the created state in which he sets his novel. It's like even in the
collection of the state he's reducing its importance by disallowing it a name. As we
discover by the novel's end, the state is reduced in importance because no African
Americans live there, nor will they cross the borders to settle there. This further proves
the argument that whiteness and the state go hand in hand. As property, the state is
bound with properties of ethnicity. The inferiority of the state is shown through its lack
of black citizens. Whiteness is devalued there, and; as a result, the state's status is also.
Therefore, black bodies are actually the body that increases the property value of race and
land. Numerous intersections between notions of nationalism, statehood, and property
occur in the interplay of blackness and whiteness.

As Kelley breaks down the value of whiteness in his novel, he essentially breaks
down the power of ownership as well. Since ownership and the act of naming go hand in
hand, Kelley devalues both. When the emigration of African Americans out of the state
occurs, the name of the "Promised Land" that is their destination is not given. The
African, the state, and the promised land all remain unnamed. Since naming implies
ownership, ownership is never transferred because what could be "ownable" outside of
Kelley's text is never named. The state cannot be owned, the promised land cannot be
owned, rather they are entities in and of themselves, valuable without any need to be
labeled or constructed through the act of naming. And applying this same logic to race, it
cannot be constructed without naming and labels either. Kelley completely devalues the
act of naming and constructing ownership. Thereby, Kelley takes away the power of
naming, the very act of naming and shows the importance of the place rests in and of
itself, not in the way that it is constructed or created to be through the act of naming.

Even in constructing a narrative himself, Kelley is writing a novel that shows a different way of thinking—a way of moving beyond these constructions. In the way that Anglo writers are writing Natives and African Americans out of the South in the poem that began this chapter, Kelley is writing them back in.

Caliban's act of destroying the land makes it unownable. When the men of the porch arrive at Caliban's farm, they witness "a tiny man at work in a field that with every wave of his arm took on the white color of an autumn frost" (Kelley, Drummer 39). As he salts the earth, he also whitens it, destroying the blackness of the soil. In this action Caliban takes away the value of the land. He makes it worthless. Witnessing the scene of Caliban salting the earth, Harry Leland thinks to himself:

*Just like he's planting seed. Just like it's spring planting time and he started early and don't have to worry none about missing the first good days. Just like all of us every spring, getting up early and eating and then going out into the field and tossing in seed. Only he ain't planting nothing; he's surely killing the land and don't even look like he hates it. It ain't at all like he got up one morning and said to hiself, "I ain't busting my backbone another day. I'm getting that land before it gets me." Not running out like a mad dog and putting down the salt like it WAS salt, but putting it down like it was cotton or corn, like come fall, it'd be a paying crop. (Kelley, Drummer 40)*

In this passage, it is interesting that Harry witnesses this act, but does not think Caliban is destroying the land because of hatred for it. The act, as described by Harry, is one of sowing seed and producing life from life. Yet, in Caliban's action he is proving that the only way to preserve life is to destroy it. Like Sethe in Toni Morrison's *Beloved*, or the African in the introductory story to Kelley's novel, the act of destroying is also an act of freeing—a preservation of life. Moreover, this scene further shows that whiteness is not
always best. Through the color imagery offered, the white salt covers the black soil entirely. The whiteness causes the blackness of the soil to be completely worthless.

Caliban acquires land so that he can destroy/preserve it, but this is not an act of defeat. In fact, this scene calls to mind another scene in American literatures when Fleur Pillager of Louise Erdrich's *Tracks* cuts down the trees of her homeland. She destroys the land prior to the arrival of the foresters. It's not an act of defeat, but rather one of empowerment—showing that the natural world, be it land or human beings is unownable, and therefore unnamable. Owning property is not natural. It is a construct, just as race is a construct. Caliban makes what was ownable unownable and resultantly devalued in white ideology. He purchases the land to free it. By salting the earth it will not be tilled nor forced to produce. Then he abandons the land, proving again the unnaturalness of ownership. He buys the land to set it free, just as he frees himself and his progeny. Here again Hegel's master/slave narrative is revised and the former enslaved enacts wrath upon the white community. He then departs with his family for an unnamed place; thereby setting in motion the largest migration New Marsails has ever seen.

Salt as a substance also has a history that is tied to numerous Biblical references as well as the Trans-Atlantic slave trade. Salt can be something that "literally gives us life, and reminds us of the origins of all life in the primordial sea" (Kemper). However, salt as an economic substance shows the other usage of salt, one that caused enslavement and took "life" away. The Salt Institute points out, "Salt was of crucial importance economically. A far-flung trade in ancient Greece involving exchange of salt for slaves gave rise to the expression, 'not worth his salt.' … Special salt rations given early Roman
soldiers were known as 'salarium argentum,' the forerunner of the English word 'salary' " (History). Operating as part of an exchange system, salt was esteemed as most valuable, as valuable as human life even. Caliban's use of salt to destroy the land shows how each substance becomes devalued. The salt is the substance that is cast away on the earth, and even in throwing it onto the earth he is destroying the land, and he is showing the worthlessness of preserving salt for exchange. Caliban sees salt as worth only in its ability to destroy. Once again proving the thesis here that the act of destroying is also equal to preservation, which ironically is one of the most fundamental uses of salt. The mixing/blending of salt and soil becomes a ritualistic act to reject both the substance that caused enslavement (salt) and the substance that created a need-based labor pool of slaves (soil).

**America's History of Devaluing Blackness**

The issues of property, personhood, and race that Kelley addresses in his novel have a long history in America's court system. The Supreme Court case *Dred Scott v. John F. A. Sandford* (December 1856) became one of the pinnacle decisions that rejected the personhood/humanity of African American slaves. The determination of this case was that the plaintiff, Dred Scott, was in fact not a citizen of the United States, and, as a result, Dred Scott filed his complaint in error because he did not have the protection of the court. Since he was the property of another, he had no rights in the judicial system. The rhetoric of this case makes explicit how internalized racism was for white America. The question brought to the court was

Can a negro whose ancestors were imported into this country, and sold as slaves, become a member of the political community formed and brought
into existence by the Constitution of the United States, and as such become entitled to all the rights and privileges and immunities guaranteed to the citizen? One of which rights is the privilege of suing in a court of the United States in the cases specified in the Constitution. (*Dred Scott*)

And the determination in this case was that no, Dred Scott could not claim citizenship nor be entitled to the rights of the Constitution as set out by America's founding fathers.

This case also strictly defined boundaries between African Americans and Native Americans. In explicit terms, the Court allowed personhood for the Natives; however, rejected it for the African Americans. The following excerpt from the transcript of the case illuminates the plight of the African American in comparison to that of the Native. I am choosing to quote at length here because of the important rhetorical shifts that become apparent throughout the explication of the Dred Scott decision:

> The situation of this population [slaves of African descent] was altogether unlike that of the Indian race. The latter, it is true, formed no part of the colonial communities, and never amalgamated with them in social connections or in government. But although they were uncivilized they were yet a free and independent people, associated together in nations or tribes, and governed by their own laws…. Indian Governments were regarded and treated as foreign Governments, as much so as if an ocean had separated the red man from the white; and their freedom has constantly been acknowledged, from the time of the first emigration to the English colonies to the present day, by the different Governments which succeeded each other. Treaties have been negotiated with them, and their alliance sought for in war and the people who compose these Indian political communities have always been treated as foreigners not living under our Government. It is true that the course of events has brought the Indian tribes within the limits of the United States under subjection to the white race; and it has been found necessary, for their sake as well as our own, to regard them as in a state of pupilage, and to legislate to a certain extent over them and the territory they occupy. But they may, without doubt, like the subjects of any other foreign Government, be naturalized by the authority of Congress, and become citizens of a State, and of the United States; and if an individual should leave his nation or tribe, and take up his abode among the white population, he would be entitled to all
the rights and privileges which would belong to an emigrant from any other foreign people.  *(Dred Scott)*

The argument posed here is twofold: to establish a chain of hierarchy while also undermining the civility of the Native population. Here Native Americans are entitled to sovereignty over those of African descent because they had established governments and helped the colonials during war times. However, even in the allowances given to the Indians, in the next breath their ability to be "equal" sovereign nations within America is taken away. They are determined to be a nation under "pupilage;" therefore, needing the assistance of the United States government to succeed or progress. A definite order is established here. On the ladder of social importance and rights, Anglo-Americans are the top priority and afforded/guaranteed all rights espoused in the Constitution, but Indians and slaves have a different place in this new government. Natives are given a marginal space, while slaves are even further marginalized and devoid of any rights because they are property--property available for purchase by Anglo-Americans and Indians alike.

**Constructing "Whiteness as Property"**

In Cheryl I. Harris's article "Whiteness as Property," she discusses at length the ways that race has been constructed and how whiteness itself has become a form of property. In her article she examines "the emergence of whiteness as property and trace[s] the evolution of whiteness from color to race to status as property as a progression historically rooted in white supremacy⁶ and economic hegemony over Black and Native American peoples" (1714). Echoing back to the language in the *Dred Scott* case, Harris discusses the linkage between African Americans and Native Americans in a nation that has historically hypervalue whiteness:
Slavery linked the privilege of whites to the subordination of Blacks through a legal regime that attempted the conversion of Blacks into objects of property. Similarly, the settlement and seizure of Native American land supported white privilege through a system of property rights in land in which the "race" of the Native Americans rendered their first possession rights invisible and justified conquest. This racist formulation embedded the fact of white privilege into the very definition of property, marking another stage in the evolution of the property interest in whiteness. Possession--the act necessary to lay the basis for rights in property--was defined to include only the cultural practices of whites. This definition laid the foundation for the idea of whiteness--that which whites alone possess--is valuable and is property. (Harris 1721)

She also argues "that whiteness shares the critical characteristics of property even as the meaning of property has changed over time. In particular, whiteness and property share a common premise--a conceptual nucleus--of a right to exclude" (1714). This right to exclude is one that is witnessed throughout history as well as American literature. Yet, in Kelley's novel, he reverses the power structure and whites become excluded. They are excluded from the black migration narrative, the location of the "promised land" to which the African Americans are migrating, and they are excluded from any association with Blackness. Even though they narrate Caliban's experience along with the massive movement of African Americans that follow him out of the State, they can only offer fragments because they are not privileged to the "whole" story. They can only speculate on the full details of Caliban's narrative. Whites are unable to create a "master" narrative because there is no "slave," nor any group to enslave.

Harris further argues in her article that "The concept of whiteness was carefully protected because so much was contingent upon it. Whiteness conferred on its owners aspects of citizenship that were all the more valued because they were denied to others" (Harris 1744). This denial of others is exactly what Kelley is addressing. "'White' was
defined and constructed in ways that increased its value by reinforcing its exclusivity. Indeed, just as whiteness as property embraced the right to exclude, whiteness as a theoretical construct evolved for the very purpose of racial exclusion. Thus, the concept of whiteness is built on both exclusion and racial subjugation” (Harris 1737). For Kelley, he counters this pattern. Instead, whiteness becomes devalued because it is excluded. Whiteness becomes excluded from the narrative of the promised land, and more importantly from Blackness all together. With the removal of black bodies from New Marsails and the entire state, they (the black community) become the ones that exclude the whites. With their departure they prove they will not be enslaved any longer, either literally or by a de facto system. In this regard, the concept of master (equated with Whiteness) is null and void because there is no "slave" or "other" there to recognize the status of the White, nor another group there for the Whites to exclude. "The effect of protecting whiteness at law was to devalue those who were not white by coercing them to deny their identity in order to survive" (Harris 1744). Caliban rejects this ideology for its very reversal: the need to claim his identity in order to survive. Devaluing of property occurs in Kelley's text with the departure of blacks from the South, and the property of whiteness loses value with the absence of a black community.

**Orality, the Blues, and William Melvin Kelley's Unsung Lyrics**

In her book "Who set you flowin'" The African-American Migration Narrative, Farah Jasmine Griffin explains that "most often, migration narratives portray the movement of a major character or the text itself from a provincial (not necessarily rural)
Southern or Midwestern site (home of the ancestor) to a more cosmopolitan, metropolitan area" (3). She poses "four pivotal moments" that define the migration narrative:

(1) an event that propels the action northward, (2) a detailed representation of the initial confrontation with the urban landscape, (3) an illustration of the migrant's attempt to negotiate that landscape and his or her resistance to the negative effects of urbanization, and (4) a vision of the possibilities or limitations of the Northern, Western, or Midwestern city and the South. (Griffin 3)

Recalling the poem that began this chapter and the very real threat of lynching throughout the South, Griffin notes the terror and threat of violence was a very real fear that provoked numerous African Americans to turn North. Jean Toomer's Cane, Paul Laurence Dunbar's The Sport of the Gods, and numerous other migration narratives follow this template. And in many ways, Tucker Caliban fits nicely into most of the model offered above. For instance, there is an "event that propels the action." However, we are never given the exact location of Tucker's journey--we only know where he's leaving, what he's leaving behind, and even here there is ambiguity because we never know the name of the state--only small townships that are a part of it. Parts that are missing from the narration of Tucker's migration are his encounters with the "urban landscape," and we don't witness his ability or inability to negotiate this new urban space. Here again, this calls attention to the importance of what is absent from the text. Clearly, Caliban sees a "vision of possibilities" in another landscape, yet as readers we are not privileged to this information. Since Tucker Caliban's story is being told through the Anglo voice, we never know his story, rather we only know the points that the white audience witnessing his departure extrapolate as important. As a result, we are given the counter-narrative to the Great Migration--the story of those that are left behind.
Mirroring the stories that create reality and that narrate the experience of the Trail of Tears in Glancy's text, Griffin calls attention to how the Blues is the oral tradition that narrativizes the move from the rural South to the urban North. And as noted in the beginning of this chapter through the voice of Billie Holiday, song can offer protest, narrate the torture and violence visited upon a particular person, community, or cultural group. According to Griffin,

> While [blues] lyrics offer significant evidence of this primary confrontation with the Northern landscape, the change in form, performance, and the influence of recording, distribution, and consumption of the blues profoundly illustrates the immediate consequence of migration…. (54)

Referencing Charles Keil, she "explains that songs become more standardized, defined; there is less improvisation, fewer deviations. The blues narrative becomes less fragmented, more condensed and consumable. Keil notes that in the North, there is an increasing emphasis on lyrics that tell a story as opposed to the country practice of stringing together phrases linked only to a very general theme or emotional state" (54). Here again we witness the importance of story to shape reality, to make the reality bearable. Like the Trail of Tears that demand stories for the people to continue, here, too, the African American migration requires stories that move beyond emotions, but rather stories of action--success stories of those who have made it to the "promised land" of the North. "In a social situation that is itself fragmented, the blues begins to provide some narrative coherence and order. The blues performance fills a void in the migrants' urban existence. While lyrics may reflect a sense of fragmentation, performance provides order, stability, 'acclimatization' to the North. It serves as a transitional space, making the
transformation from migrant to urban dweller a little less harsh. It does this by providing the stability of 'home,' as well as offering a means to negotiate the 'here.' " (Griffin 54).

As shown in the previous chapter, Maritole in *Pushing the Bear* is able to withstand the harshness of the trail, and she is able to claim Indian Territory as her new homeland because she brings the stories of her old homeland with her. She uses narrative as a way to integrate the fissures and the dual homelands. Likewise, the African American finds solace and a sense of "home" space in the blues. As Griffin points out, "In the South, where a sense of community exists, the bluesman can serve as the wandering stranger, but in the North, where the context in itself is the 'stranger,' the bluesman convenes the community and sets the atmosphere to invoke tradition. The blues performance therefore exists as a safe space where migrants are healed, informed, ministered, and entertained" (Griffin 55). Story (in the form of the blues) functions as a healing element, ways to counter the ill-effects that the migrations have created. These fragmental stories offer ways to construct home in a foreign landscape, a landscape that is doubly foreign for the African Americans who have experienced a series of dislocations, both from Africa and then the Southern landscape that has become the "new" home. The blues is a form of the oral tradition that mirrors the cultural function of story in Diane Glancy's text. It offers a way to reconnect, a way to establish/create, and reestablish and recreate identity. Blues is the oral tradition, both in its narrative and its performative aspect. Also, important to note is the communal aspect of this form. The blues offer "success" stories or survival stories that inform an entire community's way of seeing the impending change that the North offers. These songs mark the Great Migration and narrativize the multiple
experiences of African Americans like Glancy's stories of Removal do for her Native characters.

In his preface to *The Land Where the Blues Began*, Alan Lomax calls attention to the presentness of the blues. He explains that the blues is a "state of being." "The blues has always been a state of being as well as a way of singing" (Lomax ix). Calling attention to the presentness of narrative. As it is being sung, the story is being re-enacted. It is not compartmentally in the past, but always present.7

The blues becomes a testimony to the survivability of African culture even in the new world of America that began enslaving Africans and attempting to erase their culture and traditions. As Lomax points out, he "gradually, … began to see Delta culture as the product of the reaction of a powerful African tradition to a new and often harsher social environment" (Lomax xiii). The narrative of the blues offered a way to shape the experience so that it was manageable, survivable, and ultimately possible to overcome. Moreover, regarding the performative aspect of these traditions, Lomax posits that

Careful comparison showed that black African nonverbal performance traditions had survived virtually intact in African America, and had shaped all its distinctive rhythmic arts, during both the colonial and the postcolonial periods. It was this unwritten but rich African tradition that empowered the creativity we had encountered in the lower depths of the Mississippi Delta. The error in African-American studies had been to look to print and to language for evidence of African survivals. For instance, musicologists discovered that American blacks performed many European-like melodies, but failed to notice that the whole performance context--voicing, rhythmic organization, orchestration--remained essentially African. (Lomax xiii)

This passage is particularly urgent because it calls attention to the importance of performance in the oral tradition. Privileging the written text over the oral tradition and
performative aspects of story and song is problematic. For example, through his novel Kelley provides a narrative about Tucker Caliban and his migration, along with the entire African American community, to a new location. But the written text does not hold Caliban's narrative. This story that is as important, if not more important than the story provided, must be held by the African Americans that leave the state in record numbers. They know a different story--an equally important story that propels their action to relocate. One cultural group witnessing the performance of another does not mean that their interpretation or attempt to box another culture is accurate. As with Kelley's novel, we are unsure what is actually true. We do know that Caliban bought the land from Willson, destroyed symbols of his family's enslavement, and then left for parts unknown. But Caliban's march to freedom is a story that he carries alone. The whites on the porch of Thomason's grocery store only have parts, fragments of Caliban's story. The whites in the novel and the reader's of the novel find themselves in a place of displacement, alienated from the "master" narrative of freedom as understood through the Black experience.

While the story of relocation and the music/lyrics of the blues are absent from Kelley's text, I propose that it is in this very absence that they are particularly present. When discussions of the African Americans leaving occur, the imagery of blue often comes before it. For example, when Mister Harper wheels up in his wheelchair to talk to the bus driver about the destination of the state's blacks, the bus driver is witnessed dropping "his cigarette and twist[ing] his toe on it. It became a small spot of paper, ash and tobacco, but Mister Leland could still see the printing in fine blue letters" (Kelley,
Drummer 59). Here the cigarette is symbolic of both ash and blue, or lynchings and the blues. Moreover, when the group of Anglo men approach the depot, they cannot get close enough to it because it "was cut off by state troopers in cowboy hats and steel-blue puttees, and New Marsails policemen in light blue" (130). Then the passage that follows this one also points to color--skin color: "Beyond the roadblock, crushing toward the depot, were the Negroes, all kinds, light, dark, short, fat, thousands of them. A few sang hymns and spirituals, but most stood quietly, inching forward, thoughtful, triumphant, knowing they couldn't be stopped" (130). As precursors to the blues, hymns and old negro spirituals were the original text onto which the blues were written. At this moment in Kelley's text, the characters represent this early stage of blue, the version that will be transformed and metamorphosed into a newer form of blues during the journey and then ultimately the arrival. Like Maritole's stories change throughout the Trail of Tears, the African Americans' story will also change, showing the fluidity of culture and the ability to adapt to new experiences and collapse them into their older experiences, thereby constantly creating narrative, meaning, and reality. This process, like the blues, is always present because it is always on-going. It is in a constant state of "being" and becoming that possesses elements of the "past" and "future" in its perpetual (re)creating.

Tucker Caliban's story is ongoing as well, and continually being created in the text. His departure from the State could be labeled an "escape;" however, this way of viewing his narrative seems false. Caliban's narrative is not an escape, but rather a flat denial of a cultural group that has imprisoned him. He denies them the right to his narrative, even as he destroys their symbols of possession in front of them--a
performative act that becomes story for the white community. He performs his refusal to be enslaved--his refusal of being denied humanity. His act of freedom is the one act that summons Mister Harper to his feet--the man who has not left his chair for twenty years because there was nothing worth seeing, at least until Tucker Caliban took up an ax to destroy the Willson clock. Discontinuing the Willson hold on his family. He also shoots his animals--they become symbolic of the sacrificial child that the African was unable to kill in the beginning, but in this revised version of that story Caliban is able to kill them and free them from more servitude. He will pick up where the African left off and deny the power of whiteness over himself and his family. The story that the African began is now being re-enacted, and through the re-enactment the story is righted.

**Absence: The Power of Silence in Caliban's Narrative**

Regarding the template set forth by Griffin for migration narratives, it is interesting the ways that Kelley adheres to this template, while also radically departing from it. Kelley's narrative does follow this pattern, but what is striking about the narrative is that it is told through the White voice. Eric Sundquist discusses the importance of this in his essay "Promised Lands: A Different Drummer." He points out that Kelley's novel begs the question, "Without blacks, what is left of white thought, white culture itself?" (270). Regarding the promised land of Kelley's characters, Sundquist argues,

By writing without reference to a future land of milk and honey--that is, by initiating an Exodus but identifying no sought-for homeland--Kelley exaggerated the pain of the continuing black diaspora. Severed economically, psychologically, and culturally from a homeland, *A Different Drummer* suggests, African Americans are left in a condition of perpetual wandering. Conceivably, the novel is silent on the subject of the
Promised Land because Kelley found or anticipated it to be a bankrupt illusion…. (275)

Throughout his article, Sundquist provides an important historical trajectory in American history and literatures that would support this reading of the text. However, in light of the argument I have been making regarding race value and property, I would like to expand this reading of the novel. I do not view Caliban's lack of speech or the lack of a black narrator as a source of defeat, nor is his exodus a perpetual wandering to an unknown promised land that will forever be unattainable. Rather, I see Caliban's departure and lack of narrativizing it as a reversal, a move by the trickster to have his story told in his own terms. Using his silence as a power move. Once again absence becomes the forceful agent of power.

Even in the absence of Caliban's narrative to a new place, clearly, there is a story. Numerous accounts of runaway slaves inform us of the power of narrative to bring about freedom. Frederick Douglass's autobiography is a narrative about story, but also about absence. At the end of his _Narrative of a Life_, Douglass shares that parts of the story are missing. These essential pieces are the fragments that would complete his story of freedom--which would offer the details of his escape. In _Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass_, Douglass begins the final chapter of his autobiography with the following disclaimer:

I now come to that part of my life during which I planned, and finally succeeded in making, my escape from slavery. But before narrating any of the peculiar circumstances, I deem it proper to make known my intention not to state all the facts connected with the transaction. My reasons for pursuing this course may be understood from the following: First, were I to give a minute statement of all the facts, it is not only possible, but quite probable, that others would thereby be involved in the
Douglass is writing at a moment in history in which disclosing all of the "facts" could pose even more problems for his fellow "brothers" in slavery. This pivotal moment in history calls for an absentia of a very key part of his autobiography. Likewise, in Kelley's novel there is an absent story, a fragmented narrative that is constructed from the various Anglo narrators. Like numerous slave narratives, particularly Frederick Douglass's omission of his narrative to freedom as noted above, perhaps an alternative way to read Kelley's text is that his deletion of the key city is because it is privileged information for Caliban and the African Americans alone. Set in a moment of continued and mounting tensions in the South, Caliban's unspoken promised land may very well be withheld because during the violence of the late 1950s through the Civil Rights movement African Americans once again found themselves in a historical moment that needed their voice. A moment that their voices needed to be heard, but also at times needed to be silent because of the powerfulness of their actions. During this tumultuous time, African Americans needed to narrate their own experience, and they asserted their bodies as claim to their "American property." Through sit-ins, marches, and peaceful
demonstrations the African American population along with their supporters insisted upon equality and overcoming the decades of violence and oppression that had been acted upon them.

Likewise, the power of Caliban's story is not in his words, but his actions. The narrative of Caliban's migration is an ellipses in Kelley's novel, yet this ellipses calls attention to the importance of absence and what is left unsaid. Moreover, the power of the entire African American community is in their actions, rather than their words. As hundreds of blacks await their transportation out of the oppressive state, they are largely silent. Their lack of communication is powerful in that the whites that try to communicate with them are unable to. It's not that the blacks are powerless to communicate, but rather that they choose not to communicate with the rest of the community. Kelley writes that they were "waiting, they said nothing to each other, rather stood patiently, self-engrossed, as if the white men did not exist" (Kelley, Drummer 57). Like Caliban, they are silent. The narrative of their journey North is not given, nor are their blues heard, which would narrate their departure and Great Migration. Instead we are left with white narrators who are unable to weave a whole, true story due to their lack of perspective. Fragments are what we receive of Caliban's story. We get pieces of his story from his interactions with the young child, Mister Leland. After Caliban burns down his farm and begins his departure the small boy runs after him and asks him if he is crazy. He looks at Tucker and asks, "why'd you do all them evil, crazy things?" (50). Caliban, a man of few words, responds, "You young, ain't you, Mister Leland…. And you ain't lost nothing, has you…. Go on back" (50-51). In this short exchange, we get
the actual words of Tucker Caliban, and it is clear from his response to Mister Leland that Caliban has lost something. However, for the most part Caliban's story becomes fragments of dialogue, which we receive from those on the porch. Caliban does not author his experience. Therefore, Kelley's text is told entirely through a white voice--like most history, particularly early American history. Still, Kelly as trickster is showing the value of blackness even in his inability to give his characters voice or more visibility. Their story becomes the more important story--the one the reader wants to know. The text must be approached much like primary, fragmented documents that define history. The reader must peruse the text to make meaning of the "unheard" voice and the "other's" story. Just as we have to look for the "real" Native and African in historical documents of early explorers and colonials, we have to tear apart Kelley's text to look for the fragments that can lead to the "truth" of Caliban's narrative.

Kelley is often compared to Faulkner, and rightly so. In chapter four of this project, I discuss the ways that Faulkner writes about differing cultural groups, writing their voice and their experience. Yet for the purposes of this chapter it is enough to point out how Kelley turns a typical norm in American literature--that of the white writing about the African American experience--on its head. Instead he writes of the African American experience through the eyes of the other--through the Anglo voice. Voicing their perceptions of events and giving narrative to their understanding or misunderstanding of it. Instead of the Anglo writing about the Black experience, the Black author is writing about the White experience and how they perceive (or misperceive) the actions of the African and Tucker Caliban. As readers, we are left with
many of the apprehensions we have about Faulkner's characters, feeling that they are ambiguous, that there's more to the story that is left untold. And in this search, we discover the importance of multiplicity and numerous perspectives. We desire more than one, definitely wanting the voices of other characters to be heard.

The novel ends as it begins with violence being enacted upon a black, male body. The persistence of violence continues with the sole black body of New Marsails having violence visited upon it in the form of lynching. The story of the Reverend Bradshaw is one of countermigration in the novel. He arrives in the South to do investigative work regarding Caliban's story. He also attempts to learn about the black Southern movement out of the state. As the men on the porch begin discussing the exodus of "their" black community, one of them says, "God Damn! If we ain't a stupid bunch of bastards! …We could-a done something, YESTERDAY, instead of just sitting there and looking, and then we wouldn't be crying now because they's all gone. We could-a DONE something!" (Kelley, Drummer 191). As the men are discussing the cause of Caliban's departure, they begin blaming the Reverend, even after one of them responds that the Reverend didn't arrive until after Caliban began to act. The men refuse to believe that their actions have anything to do with driving the blacks away. At that moment, the Rev. Bradshaw drives by and one of the porchmen, Bobby-Joe, hollers after the car for them to stop. The porchmen then begin berating the Reverend and they blame him for the loss of "their negroes." While the hysteria grows, the mob eventually erupts into a lynching mob. They force the Reverend to perform for them. One man replies, "You fellows know this is our last nigger? Just think on that. Our last nigger, ever, there won't be no
more after this, and no more singing and dancing and laughing…. I been thinking that while we still got one, we ought to get him to do one of the old songs for us" (Kelley, *Drummer* 199). The Reverend is asked if he knows "Curly-Headed Pickaninny Boy," and he somberly nods. This is the connection that the Reverend has with African culture. As the narrator reveals, "Of course he knew, everybody knew it; it was a song liberal-minded third-grade music teachers in New York, Chicago, Des Moines, San Francisco, and all the towns in between had their pupils sing to acquaint them with Negro culture…. And Dewey realized that Bradshaw's nod had signified a knowledge of something else; he knew now and could understand why the Negroes had left without waiting or needing any organizations or leadership" (200-201). Being raised in the North, Bradshaw had never experienced such hatred and violence. In his countermigration, he understands why an entire community can be called to action. As he faces the lynch mob, he becomes their site of violence, and Bradshaw's body becomes the space "without sanctuary."

Lynching the last black body (the fantasy of the pure society, removing all traces of blackness) is like Willson killing the African. This looks like an act of power, but it isn't. The "master" destroys his own value by destroying the "slave;" and whiteness destroys its own value by destroying blackness. Finally, violence is a purging--both of blackness and ultimately whiteness and its value.

Kelley calls attention to absence, most importantly the absence and vanishing of black bodies from his imagined state. The landscape that was once a thriving space is absent of Caliban and his family, causes a decentering in the text's characters. So much so that even at the novel's end Mister Leland (the young child of Harry Leland) cannot
imagine this geographical space without Caliban's presence there. As the boy begins to 
fall asleep, he hears a scream that wakes him. Then he hears voices and singing coming 
from Caliban's place. It is impossible for him to imagine the grotesque horror that is 
taking place as the community lynches their last negro, the Reverend. Instead, the child 
imagines Caliban happy and content. He thinks to himself that when he wakes up the 
next morning

It would be Sunday and first they would eat and go to church, where his 
mother taught Sunday school, and then they would come home. He would 
take Walter by the hand and they would go back through the woods and 
come out on Tucker's field. Tucker would see them and wave and they 
would run across the soft, gray earth of the plowed and salted field toward 
him. He would say hello, and would be glad to see them…. Then Mister 
Leland would ask Tucker why he came back. Tucker would say he had 
found what he had lost, and he would smile and tell them he had 
something for them. He would bring out large bowls of the leftover candy 
and popcorn and cracker-jack and chocolate drops. And they would eat 
until they were full. And all the while, they would be laughing. (Kelley, 
*Drummer* 205)

Mister Leland doesn't know how to comprehend the absence of the figure that is 
surrounded with so much lore and power. Just as the porch men don't know how to 
comprehend a blackless community. Even in their desire for the blacks to stay, they don't 
try to stop them. And they impose violence on the one individual who is not a member of 
their community. The Reverend's body becomes the site of their self-hatred and feelings 
of helplessness. Without the presence of blackness they are unable to articulate their 
worth. What Kelley does with the narrative space is removes the presence of a black 
narrator, yet it is in the absence that there is an overwhelming presence. Even when 
Caliban speaks very briefly to Mister Leland it is in the abstract--again calling attention 
to a lostness, an absence that Mister Leland cannot understand, and that it appears
Caliban cannot comprehend because it is so vast and all encompassing, crossing generational and historical lines-- continuing the pattern of lostness until his moment of action creates a rupture. Though not a voice, an action creates a stir and a continuation of an old narrative, though now layered with the new--that of Caliban. The blood of the African, in the blood of nerdy, small stature Caliban is given larger than life qualities. Elevated by those on the porch as something they cannot comprehend. In its inexplicability, and in Caliban's insistence not to tell the story to Mister Leland, the story grows and becomes larger and larger. Like the Whites on the porch, we as readers are outsiders to the knowledge that Caliban has. This in itself imbues it with more power because it is something we, like those on the porch, cannot tap into. Kelley does not offer us the answers, nor the map to the Promised Land. But he does declare that one man--his Black Jesus--does have the answers.

In the final pages of his article, Sundquist states that "Although Exodus logically implies the exchange of one state for another, A Different Drummer has nothing to say about the imagined future of its black characters…. For all the historical depth of the novel, Kelley wrote paradoxically in a prophetic mode but without prophecy" (281). While A Different Drummer doesn't name a Promised Land, the implication in the novel is that there indeed is one. In fact, it is in Kelley's lack to prophesy that he prophesies the most. By providing a fragmented story, without all of the details, as readers we are left with imaginary spaces. While the novel may end with a child's imaginings that all is right with the world and racial equality is achieved, as readers we learn that the final lynching is occurring of the last black man in the state's borders. However, in this child-
like space of imagining the possibilities become limitless for the feat of African Americans, for the success of the Civil Rights movement, and for the changing face of the American South. The final pages of the novel finally offer hope. Even as the Reverend's body is being lynched, Tucker Caliban and an entire state of Blacks are on their way to a Promised Land. As Sundquist says, "Tucker Caliban's act, though its practical outcome remains unimagined in the novel, is thus a true 'revolution.' To the extent possible, it turns full circle, through the amnesia of history, back to the moment at which the African family lost its own name and accepted the name of Caliban" (281). The "unimagined" space is a space Kelley leaves open for the reader to reflect upon. It is a space that history and time will layer and narrate, creating new narratives of the African American experience that interweave the narratives that precede Kelley, that include him, and that ultimately build on the space, both imagined and unimagined, which he offers America.
3. SHAKING UP HISTORICAL CORRECTNESS:

CHOCTAW TRIBAL HISTORY IN LEANNE HOWE'S SHELL SHAKER

Native American writers are causing us to turn our attention southward in our exploration of American Indian literature and by default Southern literatures as well. The work of writers such as Louis Owens (Choctaw/Cherokee), Linda Hogan (Chickasaw), and Joy Harjo (Muskogee), all descendants of the "Five Civilized Tribes," often places us in the landscape of the southeast. Whether it is Owens's protagonist in *Dark River*, who cannot escape the words of his Choctaw grandmother; Harjo's poem "New Orleans" that takes us to the Mississippi River and the site of De Soto's murderous rage on her people; or Linda Hogan's exploration of the Everglades in *Power*, again and again their work recalls a southeastern landscape that is testimony to the cultural traditions and origin stories of their people.

The southeastern landscape itself bears witness to Choctaw origins by such areas as the Mound at Nanih Waiya in Noxubee, Mississippi, a geographical space that marks the cradle of their civilization. It is a location of power, full of Choctawan beginnings and their continued stories. However, the southern landscape also holds other Native stories, those of pain and colonization. It was a contested space of interaction between Natives and early conquistadors, explorers, and colonists; a host for diseases carried from Europe; a complex area of trade routes; violence and warfare; and ultimately, removal for a vast number of southeastern Indian peoples to a landscape that is now known as Oklahoma.
Choctaw writer LeAnne Howe's debut novel *Shell Shaker* is an announcement that she, too, has joined the work of other Native writers in exploring the southeastern landscape and history of the United States. Her novel joins the growing body of writers whose work is instrumental in providing us with a new way of understanding the region and the southeast's original inhabitants. Not only does this growing body of work help us better understand the southeast's history, but it also projects a hopeful future for cross-cultural relationships and a space for healing the effects of internalized colonization throughout America.

Winner of the 2002 American Book Award, Howe's novel provides a counter-narrative to the received history of Choctaw, Chickasaw, French, and English relations in the region that has come to be labeled the American South. She seeks to counter the erasure of her people and their histories from the conventional story of the South. Like Cherokee writer Diane Glancy, Howe's work recreates a "usable past" for southeastern Native Americans. She writes fiction, poetry, essays and plays. Earlier in her career she worked as a journalist and Wall Street trader. Given that she researched her novel for over ten years, one can easily add Choctaw historian to the list of appellations that describe Howe's professional experience, too. Her professional experiences as well as her cultural experiences join together in this tour de force novel that expresses a Choctaw way of seeing. *Shell Shaker* addresses tough issues in Indian Country, including alcoholism, diabetes, internalized colonization, the history of Indian boarding schools, Wild West shows, and stereotypes of Native peoples. Yet throughout her novel of sacrifice and pain, there is a greater story of love that is told with sensitivity and humor.
The humorous thread that runs throughout reminds us of Native characters like Louise Erdrich's Nanapush, characters who are at once dealing with extreme situations, yet finding that laughter and creation through story is often the most productive and essential ingredient to promoting healing.9

**Understanding Tribalography**

Howe reclaims the Choctaw tradition and revises the South's history as she artfully blends the voices and narrators of her novel into a form that becomes lyrical and balanced--a testimony to Choctaw historical memory. The form of her novel alone suggests her manipulation and revision of Anglo-American history. Oscillating between the 1730's and 1990's, Howe's *Shell Shaker* is a novel of epic proportions--dividing these two historical periods by chapter divisions, while simultaneously bringing them together in a narrative framework. As the novel interweaves events of the eighteenth and twentieth centuries, we see a folding of historical moments upon one another, while witnessing the cyclical nature of history and the repetition of Choctaw traditional stories. This weaving of history becomes an integration of shared histories, or, as Howe terms it, a tribalography. In her essay, "The Story of America: A Tribalography," Howe explains: "Native stories, no matter what form they take (novel, poem, drama, memoir, film, history), seem to pull all the elements together of the storyteller's tribe, meaning the people, the land, and the multiple characters and all their manifestations and revelations, and connect these in past, present, and future milieus…” (42). For Howe, tribalography is about "bringing things together, for making consensus, and for symbiotically connecting one thing to another" (42). In other words, integration becomes the key
definition of tribalography. And this integration can take form in oral traditions, shared histories and individual experiences that develop into narratives, thereby expanding "our identity" (46). Howe makes clear that "Not only are Choctaws and other American Indians creating a future 'literary past' for American Indians, but the textual space, tribalography, creates a literary and literal past for non-Indians as well" (46). The notion of tribalography is about inclusiveness, not divisiveness. Whereas Anglo-American historiography largely focuses on isolated events, the Choctaw model that Howe offers provides non-Natives with a way to think of constructing history and developing new historiographies. We can develop new ways of creating and acknowledging not only the Southeast's history, but America's as well.

Howe's *Shell Shaker* exemplifies her concept of tribalography. It is a multigenerational novel that manipulates time and history to create a "literary and literal past" for Choctaws and Anglos alike--a past that we come to realize is a current state of being and inseparable from the present moment. Through narrative and the temporal organization of her novel, Howe brings the past into "being," making it real and having a life force of its own.

Howe's novel follows a thematic pattern, merging past and present. When asked in a 2003 interview with Harlan McKosato of *Native America Calling* if this method of blending the past with the present has become too cliché, Howe answers no without hesitation. Rather than viewing this blending as cliché, she views it as an essential part of her Choctaw worldview--something that is largely second nature to her life and writing. She explains, "I don't believe that we separate the past from the present… I grew up
with all of these [elders] who were telling stories and they told them in the present tense…. The past was ever present. It was looming around us … and there was no past…. So I grew up with that sensibility and it's second nature to me" (Howe, *Native America Calling*). In addition, she remembers a comical story of her childhood that shows her inability to divorce past from present due to the nature of Choctaw storytelling: "My grandmother used to…tell stories and I thought for a long time that Andrew Jackson…was still alive. I thought, 'I don't want to meet him. He is the devil!'" Because the past is inseparable from the present, the history of Removal and Jackson's role in it remains a vital part of Choctaw memory and its relationship to constructing a cultural worldview as shown in Howe's childlike response to stories of Removal. Relaying more of her worldview, Howe tells McKosato that "the stories are about the present and how they really connect to the past…. If you sit down with an elder, you know you need several pots of coffee, and pretty soon the conversation will come back to the present."

Howe grew up with a different understanding of the past than what most Western readers are accustomed to. And it is imperative that we understand her attitude toward time and how it works within her novel. Her work is representative of this different understanding of time--the merging of past and present because the present always includes the past. The past IS the present. Here, Howe is not speaking of Native peoples in some fixed past tense, nor does her work attempt to offer a static view of Native history. Rather, her work is a celebration of the present--a celebration that the Choctaw "people are ever living, ever dying, ever alive!" (Howe, *Shell Shaker 5*). And through being ever mindful that the past is always present, Choctaw and other Native people alike, can be invigorated
with the endurance and tenacity that they and their ancestors have possessed and continue
to possess.

**Southeastern Shell Shakers**

Several of the key themes in Howe's book are evident from the title alone. Her
title connotes ceremony, dance, prayer and tradition—all nouns Howe uses to describe the
act of shell shaking. Stomp dancing is a more common term used to describe the act of
shell shaking. Howe explains, "Some of [the stomp dances] are specific to just the
women…. They take place at night and they're prayers, they're dances, they're
community, they're meant also for friendship…. Women are silent and our jobs are to
shake shells as the men are the callers" (Howe, *Native America Calling*). Presently,
"women in the southeastern tribes shake shells and especially in Oklahoma…[they] shake
turtle shells, and, of course, then there was a period in the 1980s where women were
recycling evaporated milk cans or various cans and using those because turtles…came
under stress." Moreover, Howe tells us

It's an intertribal celebration or ceremony throughout the summer that
people would go from one chief's ground to another chief's ground in
Oklahoma and shake shells, especially beginning during Green Corn time and finishing up in the Fall…. In Oklahoma, we have
this…community feeling of getting together with our southeastern
neighbors and shaking shells…. It's very different from powwow and it's exclusive to the southeastern people. So I wanted to write about that. I didn't want to particularly write about the powwow circuit or something like that. I wanted to do something that was specific to Oklahoma and other southeastern tribes. (Howe, *Native America Calling*)

Here, Howe calls attention to the ritual and "ceremony" of shaking shells, a ritual that is
at the center of her novel. Moreover, she points out that she is writing "particularly"
about a ritual shared among southeastern peoples. By choosing to write about
southeastern tribes, the Choctaw specifically, Howe constructs a novel of decolonization. She reclaims the original geographical space of her people within a textual space, and she does this through language and ceremony. As an artist she is creating a reality, an alternative history through the power of narrative, which is ultimately the function of the oral tradition in novel form.

**Autumnal Equinox**

Howe's novel is set during the Autumnal Equinoxes of 1738 and 1991, respectively. In choosing to set her novel during this time, Howe acknowledges that her people recognize time according to the Earth. That is, Choctaw rituals and celebrations are held during the time of the equinox, "around these shifts in the Earth's time" (Howe, *Native America Calling*). As Howe was doing research for the novel, she observed that a number of important historical events were occurring around the Autumnal Equinoxes. She tells us that "the Choctaws are celebrating and meeting and holding off the French or the Spanish or the English, whoever it may be, at that particular time period." She sees the repetition of these important events in the past and the present (as represented by Choctaw Days), around this particular time, as a continuity of her people--further proving the fluidity of time. Even though her people have been moved around the North American landscape, including parts of "Mississippi, predominately Louisiana, parts of Alabama, [and] relocated to Oklahoma," she sees this wrinkle in time as a "continuity of things." Her novel becomes a way to acknowledge these patterns of history and shifts in time. She is ever mindful that the past is present, that Indian people are not confined to a static past, but rather the past is always a part of the present moment, the continuous
narrative that constantly shapes Choctaw life and identity. In addition, her work as a Choctaw historian and fiction writer provides us with a living history of Native peoples. In her historical fiction, the Choctaw are not victimized or seen as a "dying breed;" rather her work celebrates and calls attention to the tenacity, skill and ingenuity her peoples had dealing with the early colonists in both commerce and as allies in war. The protagonists of her novel are clearly agents charting their own course. Ken McCullough points out in his article "If You See the Buddha at the Stomp Dance, Kill Him!: The Bicarmeral World of LeAnne Howe's Shell Shaker," that the characters of Howe's novel "are far from usual; in fact, they are the antithesis of the characters in many Indian novels who are, in essence, Third World victims of the dominant culture" (60). McCullough continues by listing the intricacies of Howe's characters and their successes in the novel: "Auda has a Ph.D. in history and gave up an academic career to become assistant chief of the tribe; Adair is a successful stock broker; and Tema, a well-known actress. Their uncle Isaac is the publisher of a newspaper, and their aunties, the Love Sisters, used to be film stars. Redford McAlester himself graduated from Dartmouth and Harvard Law School" (60). These characters provide something in addition to a legacy of survival--they prove a mastering of the colonizers system, while maintaining a Choctawan center. These characters are the new generation of bicultural mediators that can succeed in a transnational twenty-first century economy and world.

**Howe's Lesson in Choctology**

Howe's commitment to explore the history and cultural geography of the Southeast is evident in the Choctaw histories and myths she uses to introduce her text--
the tale of Tuscalusa's encounter with de Soto and the evolution of the Shell Shaker.

Multiple layers of narrative are pieced together to present a novel that continues the oral tradition. The novel begins with Shakbatina telling the story of "our grandfather" Tuscalusa, the Black Warrior, and "our" grandmother. It is both their love story and a story of war. According to Shakbatina's tale, "There was once a road, an ancient route that began in the east. Like the wind gathering, receding, returning, it went through hundreds of towns until it reached the middle of the square grounds where Grandfather played stickball. Down this road came a terrible story" (Howe, Shell Shaker 1-2). The story that travels to the Choctaw is about an enemy that is approaching the shores of the southeastern seaboard. This enemy is Hernando de Soto, and the story prophesies that he and his men will bring weapons of fire and "devour" Tuscalusa's family. What is particularly interesting here is the way that the story comes to life. It's presented as a lifeforce, traveling down "an ancient route" to warn Tuscalusa and his family of what's to come. This is a perfect example of the function of oral tradition. As the novel opens, Shakbatina is a woman preparing to meet her death, and in this moment she chooses to tell a story that is life affirming. In her telling of the story, we see that the story moves, it creates, it is life. When more of the story unfolds, we are given the tale of the first Shell Shaker, Tuscalusa's wife. Upon hearing the story of the approaching Osano, Grandmother (Tuscalusa's wife) does something

"extraordinary…. She built a fire and she strapped the empty shells of turtles around each ankle…. She only moved her lips in silent prayers. For four days and nights she never stopped dancing around the fire, extolling the heroics of the man she loved. Amazingly, the fire did not go out. Miko Luak, fire's spirit, was so spellbound by her story that he would not leave for fear of missing important details of Tuscalusa's courage" (2).
She dances so much that the shells cut into her ankles and the path around the fire becomes red with her blood, yet she never stops dancing. After Grandmother dances for four nights, the fire spirit takes her prayers to "Itilauichi," the Autumnal Equinox, who listened with compassion. *Itilauichi* learned that Grandmother had begun her ceremony on his special day of the year" (2). So it gives her the following song to sing whenever she needs it: "*Itilauichi, Autumnal Equinox, on your day when I sing this song you will make things even*" (2). This tradition of shell shaking carries on across the generations, spanning the life of Howe's novel from the 1700s to contemporary time. The ceremony becomes a link between story (that of Tuscalusa), landscape (the Autumnal Equinox's spirit in the form of *Itilauichi*), and time (the recurrence of the Autumnal Equinox throughout the generations). All three elements are bound by the blood that Grandmother sheds from her ankles into the earth as she whispers her silent prayers.

Continuing Tuscalusa's story, he prepares for the battle that is to come, and in doing so he says goodbye to his wife. Before departing she gives him a feathered shawl along with a lock of her hair, and Tuscalusa gives her a small stone that "represents his spirit" that she is to swallow (Howe, *Shell Shaker* 3). Part of Tuscalusa's plan is to be captured by the enemy and lead them into a trap, so he allows himself to be captured by de Soto and his men. The group of *Hispanos*, along with Tuscalusa as captive, move toward Mabilia, and all along the way Tuscalusa's "group surrendered to the *Hispanos*" (3). However, the "Mabilians … were in on the plan to drive de Soto out of the region." So when they all arrived at Mabilia, Tuscalusa and his men rose up against the *Hispanos* with the Mabilians' help. But it was not enough to hold off the horrific acts of the
Hispanos, and the Choctaws were slaughtered by the Hispanos, who made trophies of the Choctaws' heads in a celebratory act of victory.

Through this short, four-page story that opens the novel, Howe gives us a microcosm of tribalography. And she continues this model throughout the text. Story, landscape and time merge through her story that incorporates elements of tribalism: ceremony, oral tradition, history, and the power of these things to narrate experience. Howe constructs her tale of Tuscalusa so that he is not a victim taken captive; rather, he is serving as a trickster hero himself. He offers himself as a captive to serve a much larger plan. Even though the Choctaws experience extreme brutality and death at the hands of the Hispanos, Howe shows that they meet their death by strategically fighting back. The novel that follows this opening story always comes back to these essential elements that she offers in the beginning pages.

Shakbatina's love story follows that of Tuscalusa and his wife, and her story is one of love for her husband, Koi Chitto, and her daughters. She, too, becomes the force that sets numerous events into action. As a descendant of the original Shell Shaker, Shakbatina's story becomes a continuation of her Grandmother's, and then her daughter's story continues this tradition that travels through the textual space without regard to time.

Following Shakbatina's telling of the story of Tuscalusa, we discover that she is preparing to offer herself as payment for a crime her daughter, Anoleta, allegedly committed. Red Fox Woman and Anoleta are both wives of the infamous Choctaw warrior Red Shoes, and when Red Fox Woman is found murdered, Anoleta is accused of the assault. Red Fox Woman was Chickasaw; therefore, since Anoleta is Choctaw, a
Choctaw life must be sacrificed for the Chickasaw life taken in order to avert war between the two tribes. Refusing to let her daughter die, Shakbatina offers herself as a stand-in for her daughter. She becomes the sacrifice for Red Fox Woman's death, and Anoleta's life is spared. The eighteenth century story of Shakbatina and Anoleta is mirrored in the contemporary story that Howe tells alongside it. In the twentieth century version, Redford McAlester (a modern-day version of Red Shoes) is the chief of the Oklahoma Choctaws. He is murdered and Auda (a contemporary Anoleta) is arrested for his murder. Auda's mother, Susan Billy, steps in for Auda, claiming that her daughter did not murder Redford McAlester, but rather that she herself did. Thus, Susan Billy follows the pattern of the other characters as she, too, is a descendant and modern version of the original Shell Shaker. The plot of the novel revolves around these two stories and their integration, which comes as the historical story is re-enacted in contemporary time.

Shakbatina's story begins during the Autumnal Equinox of 1738, which echoes the original Shell Shaker's decision to begin her ceremony for Tuscalusa on this important day. Shakbatina declares, "Today, I will tear myself from the arms of my family and stand in for my first daughter, Anoleta, who has been wrongly accused of the murder of a Chickasaw woman from the Red Fox village. I will sacrifice myself, knowing that peace will follow between our two tribes" (Howe, *Shell Shaker* 4). As Shakbatina readies herself for her death, she paints her face red and dresses in all white, a symbolic action that shows her separation from the traditional. At once she is portraying herself as a member of the peace party by wearing white, while simultaneously conveying to her tribe that her death must be avenged by painting her face the color of
the warrior--red. Even in sacrificing herself for peace, Shakbatina's symbolic action of painting her face red sets up her desire for revenge, showing her foreknowledge that new ways are needed to fight against the Europeans. Her people cannot sit back peacefully while they are being destroyed; instead, they must all work together to avenge crimes visited upon their people in the past, and crimes that continue into the twenty-first century. Her action offers a model of continuance. She offers an alternative to what has been visited upon her people, and in this alternative (an act of all of them working together to fight back) stasis is not an option.

As a child, Shakbatina had witnessed a warrior "making a ceremony to his enemy in the center of Yanabi Town." She had watched as he later returned with the "head of his victim" on a post. The warrior had painted his face red and begun a chant. Later in the day Shakbatina saw that the warrior was "covered head to toe in white chalk, signifying that he'd made peace with his adversary" (Howe, Shell Shaker 7). Mimicking what she saw, the young Shakbatina took red paint and painted her face. Her grandmother, Onatima, saw Shakbatina's face painted as if for war and she pulled Shakbatina from the path to town and scolded her. The small girl ran to the river to cleanse herself. To punish her, Onatima did not speak to her for one month. When Onatima finally spoke to her granddaughter she said, "Never steal from your family, we lose confidence in you and won't drink from your hands. Red is the color for warriors. What a terrible fate for a granddaughter of peacemakers" (8). Shakbatina learned the hard way the disgrace she'd brought upon herself and her grandmother, and she also
learned the valuable lesson to "never wear the vermillion unless you plan to kill or seek revenge" (8).

Shakbatina's childhood story is essential to understanding her actions as she prepares herself to meet her executioner. As an adult, Shakbatina is fully aware of the meaning of her actions, and she finally proclaims to the world that she has "split [herself] in two" (Howe, *Shell Shaker* 15). She says, "At last I understand why Onatima was so angry at me all those years ago. I was born into the peace clan, but in my heart I've always chosen a weapon. It is the reason I was attracted to the warrior Ilapintabi, and tried to imitate his war dance…. Why I now seek revenge. I decide that as a final gesture I will show the people my true self" (15). Proceeding to paint her face red, Shakbatina "hisses," "Grandmother, do you see me? I will make the peace for you, but in my heart I want a war! … Dressed in white with my face painted red, I have split myself in two. My message to my people is that we must fight to survive" (15).

I have gone into detail regarding Shakbatina's action because it is central to understanding the text. Not only does she symbolically divide herself, but she becomes a microcosm for the dualities at work in the text: the traditional divisions of moieties in Choctaw culture, the dual histories portrayed in the novel by the characters Red Shoes and Redford McAlester, the factionalism within the tribe itself, including the divided Choctaws as represented by the Choctaw Nation in Oklahoma and the Mississippi Band of Choctaws, and the conflicting stories that seek a proper ending/beginning. I plan to show how it is in fact these divisions, not only within Shakbatina, but the factionalism pervading the Choctaw tribe, that ultimately become ways of unifying the tribe. These
divisions are in fact not divisions at all when you erase the Western construct of time. Rather they are fluid actions that are integrated and layered upon one another through story and ceremony. Shakbatina's action is one that brings the people together. Her name itself means "Survivor." And the visual she presents with her painted face shows her plan of survivability--the integration of the two moieties dramatized by the capacity of her one body to contain both white and red. This integration spans time to bring the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and the Mississippi Band of Choctaws together in a unified front by the novel's end. It is the presentness of the past that integrates all elements of time in the textual space of the novel. The collapsing of time--the past upon the present--allows a unification process and a release from time. And this release from time and the "trappings of history" is essential for the freedom of Howe's characters. As a descendant of the original Shell Shaker, Shakbatina, and then her present day counterpart, Susan Billy, represent the spatial and temporal "divisions" that ultimately become a unification of histories and Choctawan peoples in Howe's tribalography.

**Nanih Waiya and Chahta Iksas**

Shakbatina embodies the integration of the two Choctaw moieties as she meets her death. At once she expresses the cultural organization of her tribe. Discussing the traditional organizational divisions of the Choctaw, Richard White explains in *The Roots of Dependency* that "All Choctaws belonged to one of two great moieties: the Inhulahta [known as the peace clan] and the Imoklasha [or the war party]…. The moieties governed marriage and burial rites. The Choctaws were exogamous--one had to marry a member of the opposite moiety--and when a Choctaw died, members of the opposite
moiety buried him [or her]" (38). Shakbatina both embraces her role in the Inhulahta, while also defying it by painting her face red. Her action shows her own internal strife over the sacrifice she must make for a crime her daughter did not commit. However, her act may also be interpreted as a new means of integration--a new sharedness among the moieties that will provide a shield against the chaos which is to come. Shakbatina clearly harbors an internal knowledge that the Choctaw must "fight to survive." There can be no pacifists among them. All peoples will be needed to hold off and eventually fight the encroaching Europeans. Adhering to the laws of blood revenge, Shakbatina offers herself as sacrifice to avert war between the Choctaws and Chickasaws. Even though she would have readily stood in for her daughter if, in fact, Anoleta had committed the crime, the fact that she is being killed for false reasons fuels Shakbatina's need for revenge. While she is offering herself to appease the laws of blood revenge under false pretences, her death must also be avenged because she is dying unjustly.

In presenting traditional rites of the Choctaw, Howe raises important questions regarding moiety practices. Moieties were the key organizational component among the early Choctaw. Patricia Galloway suggests in Choctaw Genesis that these differing moieties may have evolved from the incorporation of other southeastern Native peoples as their tribes experienced depopulation due to European contact. These divisions, in other words, may have developed as a way of incorporating the differing heterogeneous groups because the moieties were "exogamous, requiring marriage to someone in the opposite moiety. This may have been a useful device for quickly integrating the two merging populations" (251). In Choctaw Language and Culture, Morris Foster notes that
"standard anthropological interpretations have portrayed Choctaws as matrilineal. While preremoval Choctaws were members of their mothers' moieties (a form of dual organization), there is no evidence for totemic matrilineal clans such as are found among the Creeks, Cherokees, Chickasaws, and Seminoles" (251). In addition, burial practices were governed by the balance of moieties, as "moiety membership was also important in ceremonial events, further symbolizing the unity of the two sides in a shared Choctaw identity" (Foster 251). Therefore, we can infer from Galloway's findings that the division presented by the moiety structure actually allowed the Choctaw to organize a group of heterogeneous peoples into a unified tribe. Thus, rather than signifying division, the moiety structure actually signifies incorporation and unification.

**Her Story of Shulush Homa of Couechitto (Red Shoes)**

Choctaw iksa were essential to their social and political structures. According to Duane Champagne, "In Choctaw society, …social and political solidarity were synonymous. The primary political units in Choctaw society were local family iksa (lineages based on common matrilineal descent) or groups of kindred family iksa that formed local villages" (26). These local villages were also part of a larger central village which formed "a chiefdom or intermediate-level iksa" (26). In all, there "were six major iksa, consisting of several of the chiefdoms or intermediate-level iksa, and these in turn formed two phratries" (26). Similar to the Cherokee political structure outlined in chapter one, the Choctaw local villages were largely politically autonomous. "Decisions in the local, regional, and national councils were binding only if all the villages agreed…. Political authority was thus decentralized, and each locality acted with considerable
independence" (26). Howe's novel clearly takes up the importance of this
decentralization as she shows the ill effects visited upon the Choctaw as a result of one
man's greed and capitalistic mentality--Red Shoes.

Red Shoes, or Shulush Homa of Couechitto, is a central character in Howe's
novel, and historically he was the most famous Choctaw warrior of his time. He, too,
was a man divided. As the storyteller, Divine Sarah, explains in Shell Shaker: "He was a
man with two hearts. The first belonged to the Red Fox, the Chickasaws. The second, a
puny one, was his Choctaw heart" (Howe, Shell Shaker 72). Red Shoes becomes a figure
that is consumed by the market economy introduced by the Europeans. Even as he
attempts to avert this system by playing the French and English against one another for
the Choctaws' advantage, he finds himself becoming increasingly more and more
consumed by a European worldview.

The historical Red Shoes was also representative of divisions. As a key player in
trade relations among the French and English, he was largely responsible for what
Richard White calls the "Choctaw Play-off System." This system was dependent upon
trade with both the French and the English, and Red Shoes was incredibly successful at
playing these two powers against one another until his assassination in 1747. Here it is
important to note that initially material goods united, rather than divided, early Choctaw
society. The market in early Choctaw society was governed by more complex laws than
we associate with capitalism; "instead, economic exchange was deeply embedded in the
larger cultural framework of kinship, religion, and politics" (White 42). Trade with the
English or French took place within a "context of amity and alliance" (43). In the
beginning, cultural ambiguity cloaked Choctaw relations with the English and French; however, as relations developed and trade increased, the English and French desperately struggled against one another to gain alliance with the Choctaw. Part of the English/French tactics were pitting Choctaw chiefs against one another.

Initially, Red Shoes was an esteemed warrior, working alongside Choctaw Chief Mingo Tchito; however, Red Shoes deviated from consensual Choctaw tactics and planned his own attack ("at the instigation of the French") on the Chickasaw in 1731. As a result of his attacks, the Chickasaw sought revenge on the Choctaw and war ensued (White 54). Red Shoes's actions caused outrage among the Choctaw civil chiefs because they were in negotiations with the English, and due to Red Shoes's attack these negotiations were abruptly brought to an end. But as Richard White points out what was worse, [was that] "the sentiments of an ordinary warrior had prevailed over that of the chiefs." The French rewarded Red Shoes with a great medal, like those of the leading civil chiefs, which entitled him to presents equal to theirs. Such a thing was unprecedented and the civil chiefs refused to recognize the war chief's right to either the medal or equality with them. Red Shoes was not of the proper birth to be a medal chief. (54)

Red Shoes went against the traditional structure of the Choctaw polity by asserting his own power over his tribe and using his lone voice to make decisions.

Not only was Red Shoes a man with divided loyalties to both the French and English, but his actions also divided the Choctaw people. White tells us "the rise of Red Shoes marked the beginning of two decades of factional strife, warfare, betrayals, murder, and theft" (54). And "throughout the 1730s, sometimes in alliance with the civil chiefs, sometimes in opposition to them, Red Shoes shifted his loyalty between the
French and English. Rivalries between the civil chiefs and sectional divisions helped thwart attempts to control him, but beyond both of these sources of faction lay a newer division between warriors and chiefs” (55). Red Shoes had a large following and the Choctaw were largely split between their loyalties to Red Shoes and the other civil chiefs, and Red Shoes was continuously split between an alliance with the French and one with the English, as he tried to determine which group would benefit him most. Red Shoes eventually secured “as solid a consensus in favor of the English as had ever existed in the nation” (62). However, the French did not sit by idly. Seeking to establish themselves as the primary trader with the Choctaw, the French paid an assassin to murder Red Shoes "as he escorted an English supply train into the nation” (62). When the supply train from the English arrived, the French stepped in and claimed that the gifts were from them instead. "When the French urged their allies [within the Choctaw nation] to evict the [English] traders… civil war broke out” (62).

While Red Shoes may have caused factional strife and war among the Choctaw, he held firmly to Choctaw cultural beliefs. White notes, "Despite his challenges to the civil chiefs, despite his alliance with the English traders, culturally Red Shoes remained fully a Choctaw. No matter how much he or the warriors who followed him desired English goods, they expected gifts and reciprocity, not greed and hard bargaining” (56). In Howe's depiction of Red Shoes in Shell Shaker, we see a warrior who must confront his own humanity and faults. He is not entirely presented as a villain, or destroyer of Choctaw tradition; rather, he becomes a sympathetic character who loses sight of his original quest to help his people. He is a significant figure because he engaged with the
disruption visited upon the tribe by Europeans. Ultimately, Red Shoes must be sacrificed for tribal unification. Only in Red Shoes's death will the historical ruptures be resolved. In other words, as a figure for disruption, Red Shoes must find peace in order for his spirit to rest, and for the story which is still visited upon the Choctaw in the twentieth century to find an end that can successfully ignite a new beginning, maintaining the fluidity of time.

The symbolic divisions that permeate *Shell Shaker* also extend to the dual "Reds" that are represented by the characters Red Shoes and Redford McAlester. As Howe traces Red Shoes's involvement with the English and French in her novel, she also juxtaposes his story with the fictional Choctaw Chief Redford McAlester. Divine Sarah explains the relationship between Red Shoes and McAlester: "Red Shoes started the war that continues even now, two hundred and fifty years later. I've come to tell you--what is in the past has not passed" (Howe, *Shell Shaker* 72). In the novel, McAlester serves as chief of the Choctaw Nation in the early 1990's; and he is a modern day Red Shoes in that he, too, is using a play-off system. As Red Shoes played French interests against the English, his modern-day counterpart plays the interests of the Italian mafia against the IRA. And like Red Shoes, McAlester is gambling with Choctaw sovereignty as his relationship with the Italian mafia poses problem after problem with the security of the Casino of the Sun. McAlester changes alliances when he feels the Italians closing in. He secures monies from the Italian exchange, and then sends money to the IRA to help them in their fight against the English (Red Shoes in the form of McAlester is still waging war against the British over two hundred years later).
Koi Chitto: The Bone Picker

Similar to Leslie Marmon Silko's Thought Woman who frames her novel *Ceremony*, Mother Porcupine is the agent of action in Howe's novel. Silko writes, "Thought Woman,/ is sitting in her room/ and whatever she thinks about appears./…She is sitting in her room/ thinking of a story now/ I'm telling you the story she is thinking" (Silko 1). Howe uses a similar device to construct her novel. Following this trope in Native American literature, Howe also constructs a figure that is linked to mythology and the oral tradition. Through the creation of Mother Porcupine's textual space, Howe privileges the oral tradition by foregrounding this form in her novel. Moreover, she illustrates the cyclical notion of time by placing the "storying" of Shakbatina (who becomes a figure of Mother Porcupine through the cross-generational telling) at the center of the novel. The middle of the novel is interrupted by Shakbatina's story--the story of the Choctaw--a story she has been telling for generations, and continues to tell in 1991:

*Ano ma Chahta sia hoke oke.* Call me Shakbatina. For six generations I have waited, marking time, daughter by daughter, before splitting my spirit in half, as the great warrior Tuscalusa did before me. While I waited, bustle-skirted ladies blossomed into Flappers grew into hippies, with the symbols of American Indians sewn on their jeans. I have witnessed the panic of 1907, the second confiscation of Choctaw lands. Statehood for Oklahoma. The giddy 20s. The desperate dustbowl years. The crash of ’29, and two World Wars…. In 1831, throngs of ragged children, my descendants' children, were forced out of Mississippi. Walking west with their stomachs in their hands, they were compelled to beg for food and water. I endured the songs they sang for the dead. There was no one left who could tell them the stories of how their grandmothers had once turned themselves into beautiful birds in order to fly to safety. There was no one who could conduct a proper funeral. No one to pick their bones, afterward. Imagine my agony. But their remains, their flesh and blood, seared stories into the land that kept account of such things.
Mother Earth would exact a price. Twenty-nine years later, the white people who pushed my children out of their homelands were driven insane. Witness the destruction of their Civil War and the decades of waste and ruin that ensued. Plantation children were turned into homeless beggars who would one day birth the Ku Klux Klan. Today, their descendants drive by the Nanih Waiya, our beloved Mother Mound, with their car windows rolled up for asylum trying to drown out the ghostly screams of Choctaw children who were walked to death on the road to the new promised land. But they cannot. Now they have seen what happens when Earth and spirit and story are reunited…. Hah, I wonder who will recognize me? (Howe, Shell Shaker 137-138)

Through this chronicling of history, we receive America's history interwoven through Choctaw history, rather than its reverse, which we typically encounter in American historiography. Through the storyteller we are given the history of Removal of the Choctaw people, and their separation from some of their people who stayed behind and would later create the Mississippi Band of Choctaw. We also witness the seeming loss of culture along the trail; however, are quickly reminded of the integration of story and landscape as the trail absorbs the story of Choctaw loss, hardship and death. The land then retaliates. As holder of the Choctaw stories, Mother Earth wreaks havoc on the South because of the destruction they caused to the Natives. We are given the South's history of Civil War and lack of civil rights. This Choctaw history connects Mother Porcupine (in the form of Shakbatina) to the cyclical nature of the text. Moreover, at the end of Howe's novel, Mother Porcupine says, "Hekano, I am finished talking" (Howe, Shell Shaker 222). And the novel ends, as she is the narrator and creator of text. She is the weaver of history as she spins a narrative that spans two hundred and fifty years in the making. She becomes the figure that integrates all of the elements of the narrative, including all of the ruptures. She is myth; and, as a result, she defies temporal, spatial,
and narrative boundaries. She is the shape-shifter that appears in the text as the storyteller Divine Sarah and as her mythical self, Mother Porcupine. As a creator and trickster figure, she is the ultimate powerful being that is able to orchestrate all of the events that are occurring to the different characters.

Mother Porcupine continues the story of Shakbatina by approaching Koi Chitto (Shakbatina's husband) during his mourning process. One of the key figures in Shell Shaker, Koi Chitto (Shakbatina's husband), breaks with traditional rules governing mortuary practices, and thereby sets an entire string of events into motion that plague the Billy family for generations to come. It is important to note that while his actions cause the chaos that will be visited upon his progeny, he is really a mere vehicle for the spirit world as Mother Porcupine instructs him on the actions he must take to release Shakbatina's spirit early. She thereby becomes the director of this narrative. As a member of the spirit world, and the protector of the Billy family, Mother Porcupine becomes the core of Howe's text because she dictates how history will unfold. Thereby power is taken from the Western "authorities" to narrate history, and instead Porcupine Woman becomes the progenitor of what's to come.

Koi Chitto meets with Mother Porcupine in the woods. Following Shakbatina's death, he had "left Yanabi Town and headed south for the Blue Waters" (Howe, Shell Shaker 98). He wandered in solitude for a three-month period. And one evening as he is roasting an alligator tail, "someone pokes him in the back. He whirls around. An old woman with a wizened bronze face stands before him. With her spiny fingers she gestures obscenely at him. He realizes she must be an animal spirit, and smiles
sheepishly" (98). Koi Chitto offers her tobacco and she replies to him, "'Ai, ai, ai! It's bone-picking time… bobbing her head up and down like a porcupine…. 'Ai, ai, ai, you better get going to Yanabi Town. Trouble is coming." Arguing with the porcupine spirit, Koi Chitto replies, "It is not time for her ceremony. Only three moons have passed since my wife's [Shakbatina's] death, three more must pass." However, the porcupine spirit has spoken and she urges Koi Chitto toward what he must do. Unable to defy the request of Mother Porcupine, Koi Chitto begins his trek North toward "the village of his cousins, the Houmas. They believe they are part of the original people, descendants of the crawfish who crawled up from the cave at Nanih Waiya to live in the sun" (99). As he approaches the village, he sees that they are preparing for war, and he knows that he must move quickly to Yanabi Town and carry out the wishes of Mother Porcupine. Realizing that events are occurring from a force outside of his control, Koi Chitto arrives to a town preparing for a bone-picking ceremony. Koi Chitto greets his friend, the brother of Shakbatina or in Western terms his brother-in-law, Nitakechi along the way. Upon their meeting, Nitakechi tells Koi Chitto "I've been waiting for you"(102). They discuss the problems Red Shoes is causing with his play-off trading system, and ultimately Nitakechi explains the depth of the crisis to Koi Chitto:

"The eastern towns of the Choctaws are stirred up against the Chickasaw and their Inkilish okla\textsuperscript{18} supporters. Some of the warriors have brought Chickasaw scalps to sell to men of the Filanchi okla.\textsuperscript{19} He blushes and clears his throat. "Even some Inholahta\textsuperscript{20} men are speaking of war." Koi Chitto understands. When a leader of a peace clan no longer argues against bloodshed, it means more than all the cries of warriors. (Howe, \textit{Shell Shaker} 103)
This moment in the novel of unavoidable war coupled with Koi Chitto's task at hand, to pick the bones of Shakbatina prematurely, create a swarm of chaotic actions that can only be appeased when the Osano (blood sucker), Red Shoes, is destroyed because Red Shoes not only embodies the factionalism among the Choctaw, but he also created it. He originally killed his Chickasaw wife, Red Fox Woman, yet allowed his mother-in-law, Shakbatina, to pay for a crime that Anoleta was accused of, but did not commit. In addition, he becomes corrupted in his quest to play the French and English off of one another. While his intentions in the beginning are admirable and clearly acts of agency, by the end of Red Shoes's "reign" he is visiting as many problems upon his people as the Europeans. He is divorcing himself from the Choctaw ways of governing, and instead on a quest to govern in his own way, making decisions for the entirety of the tribe--decisions that are not his to make. He is presented with compassion and sympathy in Howe's novel, but he also becomes a figure that represents what happens when one loses sight of the importance of the community and traditional values. His moment in history is significant, but also shown as a lesson of what not to do.

Koi Chitto reveals to Nitakechi his visitation by Mother Porcupine and the dream he had following his encounter with her. His words only add to the turmoil in store for the Choctaw: "the river told me that Anoleta was dead. The signs of a coming disaster are everywhere"(Howe, *Shell Shaker* 103). Nitakechi tells Koi Chitto, "I will tell the men in council what you have said…. Shakbatina has been coming into my dreams. She wants you to pick her bones, I am sure of her meaning now. You are a warrior, and her husband. Remember what she did on the day of her death, she sent a dual message. She
painted her face for war, but dressed in white for peace, a very peculiar thing for an *Inholahta* woman to do" (103). Responding with fear as he did to Mother Porcupine, Koi Chitto says, "'But a husband must not pick the bones of his wife…. It's not right, even though I am from a different clan, this is not right. I fear the imbalance this will cause for our children's children.' Nitakechi agrees that this is very unusual, but he insists that Shakbatina must be released early, and that Koi Chito must do it" (103). Once more this "dual message" that Shakbatina sent on the day of her death comes up in the narrative. It shows that changes are necessary to face the effects of colonialism. For Shakbatina, the Choctaw cannot just give up and assimilate, but rather they must assert themselves. Her instincts become primal instincts of survivability. She sees the integration of peacefulness and war as a way for continuance to occur--a way to create an undeniable force that is more powerful "than all the cries of warriors."

Mother Porcupine is narrating the story at hand though, and through her words the Choctaw are narrating their own experience. They do not allow victimization to be written on them, but rather Koi Chitto realizes the detrimental actions that will be set in motion following Shakbatina's bone picking. He becomes an instrument of Mother Porcupine's intentionality. She is the agent of the chaos and she sets this in motion to offer a counter of events to the Anglo invasion. The traditional division of moieties is an essential part of Choctaw life, and ultimately the integration of these moieties will be a form of unification. Hence, Shakbatina's splitting herself in two will finally be a form of integration, but it's going to take at least 250 years for this to happen. And Mother Porcupine is the teller of this story that is 250 years in the making. The chaos must
become more chaotic; the Choctaws have to deal with more "wrongs" before they can make them right. Koi Chitto plays out the actions given him by Mother Porcupine, staying true to the character that Mother Porcupine wants him to be, knowing that the ending/beginning that she narrates will offer a cyclical continuance. Because if the past is the present, ultimately the beginning and the ending are one. Mother Porcupine's actions are also about righting not just problems introduced by the Europeans, but also problems within Choctaw society that existed outside of interaction with the colonists. Furthering the devictimization of Native America, Howe presents situations that have been caused by her own people as well as outsiders that must be righted.

The bone picking ceremony of Shakbatina's body offers another instance in the text where timelessness occurs--the intertwining of past and present. Koi Chitto is the Bone Picker, and as he prepares to attend to Shakbatina's body, he says, "I am the Bone Picker, dancer of death, transformer of life, the one who brings sex, the one who brings rebirth. You must have death to have life. The people live by killing, by stripping the flesh from the animal corpse. The people live by dying. That which dies is reborn" (Howe, Shell Shaker 106). Images of continuance are abundant in this passage. This mortuary ritual was one of the most significant ceremonies among the Choctaw. Ethnologist Patricia Galloway explains that mortuary rituals are what most cultures "consider their profound rite of passage--the nexus at which a society's myth of permanence meets the inevitable recognition of the transitoriness of the individuals who comprise it--so such ritual should come close to reflecting the values and some of the most significant repertoire of a culture" (276). Applying her explication to Choctaw
practices, clearly, the mortuary practices reveal the foundational structures of Choctaw society and culture. According to John R. Swanton, who is largely "considered the father of modern Southeastern American Indian ethnology and ethnohistory (although it was not called that when Swanton was doing it)" (Carleton v), burial custom of the "ancient Choctaw culture was developed so strikingly that more attention is devoted to it by writers on the tribe than to any other native custom" (Swanton 170). Swanton notes two French descriptions of Choctawan burial practices. The earliest version by an anonymous Frenchman is noted here, which describes in detail what happens when a member of the tribe dies:

When a sick person is near death the doctor leaves him and informs his relatives of it, assuring them that he cannot recover. Then the women come to wash his body, paint him, daub his face, dress him in all of the finest clothes which he had, and lay him on the ground in the open space in front of his door…. As soon as he is dead his relatives erect a kind of cabin in the shape of a coffin, directly opposite his door six feet from the ground on six stakes, surrounded by a mud wall, and roofed with bark, in which they enclose this body all dressed, covering it with a blanket. They place food and drink beside him, giving him a change of shoes, his gun, powder, and balls. They say that it is because he is going into another country, and it is right that he have everything he needs in his journey. They believe that the warriors go to war in the other world, and that everyone there performs the same acts that he did in this. The body rests in this five or six months, until they think that it is rotted, which makes a terrible stench (infection) in the house. After some time all the relatives assemble ceremoniously and the honored woman (femme de valleur) of the village who has for her function (distrique) to strip off the flesh from the bones of the dead, comes to take off the flesh from this body, scrapes the bones well, and places them in a very clean cane hamper, which they enclose in linen or cloth. They throw the flesh into some field, and this same flesh stripper, without washing her hands, comes to serve food to the assembly. This woman is very much honored in the village. After the repast, singing and howling, they proceed to carry the bones into the charnel-house of the canton, a cabin with only one covering in which these hampers are placed in a row on poles. The same ceremony is performed over chiefs except that instead of putting the bones in hampers they are
placed in chests locked with keys in the charnel-house of the chiefs. (Swanton 170-171)

This passage, though with bias, does attempt to give a full description of the ritual, and it offers us an understanding of traditional burial practices among the Choctaw. As the "flesh stripper," the woman "is very much honored." And, as a result, we see the extreme importance placed upon this ritual because the one that carries out this act is held in such esteem. Moreover, it calls attention to the ways Choctaw peoples cared for their ancestors through such elaborate rituals, and also through the preservation of their bones. Patricia Galloway adds that other sources available on Choctaw mortuary practices "differ on other details: whether the scaffolds were burned, the sex of the mortuary specialist, whether that individual used a knife or fingernails to strip the flesh, whether the skull was painted red, and the nature of the container for the bones" (300). "These details," she explains, "if they are not simply idiosyncratic, may be attributable to ethnic variations within the Choctaw nation. Since none of the sources is specific on the location of its observations--representing them as applying to the whole tribe--identifying these variations with any specific ethnic subgroup is not now possible" (300). Further interpreting Choctaw burial acts, Galloway asserts "Choctaws are an anomaly: they 'simplified' to one mortuary practice, but in 'simplifying' they chose the more complex mode of treatment" (303).

Burial practices for the Choctaw were also more than a ceremony or honor for the loved one. These practices were an affirmation of the Choctaws' relationship and claim to the southeastern landscape. Galloway puts forth that
places of burial are no accident. In numerous examples throughout the world, they are chosen to reflect the relationship of social groups to their land…. Southeastern people often created an above-ground marker on the landscape by heaping up the bones of the dead as an announcement of the perpetuity of their community. The bones of ancestors, in other words, functioned to structure the world of the living by structuring the supernatural world of the dead; by placing the bones of ancestors one established a settlement charter. (303)

This "settlement charter" becomes essential during the removal period for southeastern Natives as they are forced from a landscape that not only holds their origin myths within its geography, but their ancestors, too. Since the "bones of ancestors…functioned to structure the world of the living," the removal of the Choctaw from their geographical space was doubly harsh because they not only left the bones of ancestors behind, but they left the very markers of structure behind as well.

In the Anglo-historical documents that we have describing the act of "bone-picking," it is often described as gruesome and horrific to the eyes of those describing it, for example the early French and English alike. However, in Howe's hands this ceremony is imbued with absolute beauty, reverence, and eroticism. Her Choctaw version of this history is clearly more true to the Choctaw view of this ceremony than its European "historians" would have noted. She describes the life dance of Shakbatina and Koi Chitto: "Shakbatina's spirit dances around the platform and Koi Chitto can hear her talking to him. 'Dance with me, my husband, this is the dance of life and rebirth. This is my body. Pull away my remaining flesh. I charge you to get inside me. Release me now, so I may watch over our people. Dance the dance that releases me.' She smiles and entreats him to touch her corpse and tear the remaining flesh from her bones" (Howe, Shell Shaker 107). Ken McCullough rightly observes "While the squeamish might
consider the 'Bone Picker' chapter an episode of necrophilia, it is so intensely evocative, so transcendent, that the reader can't help but believe in the power of the ritual" (62). Just as past and present appear to merge so effortlessly in Howe's depictions, so, too, does the spirit world and the "real" world ignite in such a way that there is no way of dividing the two realms in her tribalography.

What follows Shakbatina's bone picking ceremony are a string of chaotic events, war, and misinterpretation. In the eighteenth century story, Shakbatina is attempting to order the events, but Koi Chitto points out that her body was released too early and she is unable to properly protect the Bili family. Anoleta says to her father: "Mother was talking to me just now, but I couldn't understand all her words. She's angry; I feel it. She said something about Bili's daughters" (Howe, *Shell Shaker* 182). Koi Chitto responds, "She shouted at me too…. She was just there…. It's because she does not now yet how to help us; she is still learning to be a spirit, and patience has never been her friend. I fear your uncle and I improperly read the signs. Your mother needed more time on the scaffold before her bone-picking ceremony released her into the spirit world. Trouble is coming and she cannot stop it" (182). Trying to assuage the conflict, Shakbatina's spirit then visits Red Shoes: "She touches the porcupine sash tied around her waist and says it will someday tell the story of what happened to me…. 'Give it up,' she says, floating above [Red Shoes's] head. 'The time has come for you to sacrifice yourself, as I once did.' … 'Greed has conquered you'" (172). Shakbatina is attempting to order the chaotic elements and to avert the war and destruction that is coming and will be visited upon her people through Red Shoes's hands. Further trying to stop the chaos, Anoleta is to kill
Red Shoes to avenge her mother's death. Like Shakbatina, Anoleta knows that she cannot remain strictly an Inholahta--she must wage war on their nemesis: "She quickly puts on her mother's dress, then begins to pull dried plants out of her baskets to make this special meal. She has learned how to brew healing plants into medicines. It is a skill that women of *Intek Aliha* learned. But this will be the first time she has used her knowledge to kill rather than cure" (130). However, she does not kill Red Shoes. She wounds him, but does not successfully kill him. In this regard, she has not fulfilled her role in the story. Only in the repeated twentieth-century version of the story can Shakbatina/Anoleta/Auda right the elements of the story that were not properly acted out earlier.

Just as Shakbatina's body is released too early, another character, Red Shoes, was also not properly "buried," and so he arises again in the contemporary narrative as Redford McAlester just as Shakbatina does in the form of Susan Billy. Discussing the mortuary practices of Southeastern tribes, Galloway comments on the imbalance caused by improper burial--another issue that arises because Red Shoes's spirit is unhappy. According to Galloway,

> John Middleton has considered what he calls "bad deaths," which "take place when the physical elements of the person do not disperse properly and at the same time, or they do so at a wrong time or in a wrong place." Such deaths occur through accident or misfortune, and they lead to variant practices of purification "to remove the impropriety of the death and to produce the situation which enables the deceased and his living kin to start the various processes of transition and transformation properly." (Galloway 278)

Moreover, "The body of the deceased is also a social object, and its treatment can reflect on the milieu from which it came" (278). As a result, the burial of Red Shoes/Redford
McAlester becomes a purification ceremony. Through the repetitions of the story, Red Shoes in the eighteenth century and Redford McAlester in the twentieth, the story is finally re-enacted and balance can be restored through the participants in the story serving their called purpose. Through the narrative, the Choctaw are reliving the past and recreating a "new" past as they rectify the problems in the narrative by living the story as it was originally meant to be told. One couple comes to represent the power of the oral tradition and the unification of the Choctaw Nation, as "the Greatest Giver" finally arrives in the narrative.

**The Arrival of the Imataha Chitto (The Greatest Giver)**

Paralleling Tuscalusa and his wife's relationship, Isaac Billy (the modern version of Shakbatina's brother, Nitakechi) and Delores Love's (Mantema) relationship offers a counter love story to Auda and Red's. Their representation of love for each other and the tribal traditions is strong enough to last a lifetime and it becomes a model as well as a symbol for the reunion of the Oklahoma Choctaws and Mississippi Band of Choctaws because they are reunited at the novel's end after a long separation, just as Isaac and Delores are.

Like other characters, Isaac must rectify his actions in the past (as Nitakechi) and he must marry the "greatest giver": "A dark, pulsating energy flows between Isaac and his past. He was there when his sister Shakbatina exchanged her life for the life of Anoleta. She had sacrificed herself in order to buy the Choctaws more time. But before her death she had told him to find the Imataha Chitto, the greatest giver, and marry her"
(Howe, *Shell Shaker* 73). Nitakechi/Isaac had never planned on marrying until Shakbatina instructed him to do so:

> Until Shakbatina had insisted, shortly before her death, Nitakechi never intended to marry, nor make children…. Even then he dawdled another seven winters before finding the woman who had for years troubled his dreams. Shakbatina said the true *Imataha Chitto* was most likely a woman, and when he found her living in Pacana Village, they married. Mantema, as she was called, was supposed to be safe with her relatives in Pacana. He never imagined the war with Red Shoes would spread this quickly. (185)

While Mantema was taken too early in the eighteenth century story, the ability to repeat the story offers opportunities for fissures to be rectified. It's almost like characters are given a second chance to get it "right." And in the contemporary version, Isaac and Delores find their love, lose it, and ultimately reunite again in an act of marriage by the novel's end. Isaac and Delores become central to the narrative, because although they appear as minor figures, in fact, it is their relationship that will live for eternity. They become the keepers of Redford McAlester's spirit when they are buried with McAlester at the end of the novel.

Over the course of the novel we receive the story of Delores Love and how she brings a renewal of culture to the Choctaw. When her mother dies, Delores wants to have a traditional Choctaw funeral and she "asks her neighbors what songs to sing, what words to pray for a proper Choctaw funeral" (Howe, *Shell Shaker* 150). She is "told to go to Durant because the Billy matriarch would know" (150). As she arrives at the Billy home, Susan Billy opens the door and Delores goes in to visit with Nowatima (Susan Billy's grandmother). Nowatima calls out to Delores, "Hurry up, woman, you're the one I've been waiting for. I am the great-great-granddaughter of *Chunkashbili*, the Heart
Wounder, and she was the granddaughter of Shakbatina whose name doesn't mean 'Wildcat' like people say. Her name means Survivor!" (147). Nowatima begins talking of Choctaw Removal and the hunger that she and others experienced along the trail. And she tells Delores that "on occasion, I myself principally ate dirt" (148). Nowatima literally receives sustenance from the land itself. Since she is the holder of the Choctaw songs that are a form of their orality, it is only fitting that Nowatima survives on the land—a metaphor for the oral tradition—a place that holds and stores the stories of her people. Combining the oral tradition with song, Nowatima must tell the traditional story of Shakbatina, the story of Removal, and her own story and role in it before she can relay the songs to Delores. Once she has finished speaking she spends the entire night singing and teaching the burial songs to Delores: "It was morning before Nowatima stopped singing the funeral songs. Sometimes she hesitates, rocked in her chair as if she were listening to something only she could hear. Then she'd begin again, softly chanting to herself, Wi hi yo ha-na-we, wi hi yo ha-na-we, which would grow into another song for the dead" (149). With this knowledge, Delores returns to prepare her mother's body for burial. Rather than using the "formaldehyde embalming solution" for her mother, Delores prepares her body in the traditional way with "a mixture of baking soda and lavender water" (149). Completing her traditional practices, Delores and her sisters and her brother eventually create a traditional grave for their mother, one that mirrors the burial scaffold of Shakbatina: "[They] put up six poles around their mother's grave. Then they hung vine hoops on top of each pole, and colored streamers of cloth to signify that a burial had just taken place. Delores fasted all day before she began the funeral cry,
just as Nowatima had taught her" (150). Following her mother's funeral, Delores "realized she didn't know enough, so she returned weekly to the Billy house to sit with Nowatima. She continued learning the old songs and, without realizing it, she started a revival of Choctaw music and traditions. Many other women began coming to Nowatima to learn traditional songs and rituals" (150). She is the one who must bury the dead. In fact, her burial of Redford McAlester becomes her last and most important burial of all. "Unlike the years she spent riding bareback in Wild West shows, or acting in the talkies, Delores believes her role as a modern foni miko, bone picker, is the only useful thing she's ever done. But McAlester's funeral is different. Her niece, the cause of his death" (146). Delores's role as a modern bone picker is essential, because as Nowatima says she is the one they have been waiting for.

Throughout the novel the people are longing for the Imataha Chitto, the leader the Choctaws consider to be the "greatest giver." In the 18th century narrative, Anoleta is blinded because she not only believes that Red Shoes is this figure, but she attempts to create him to be so. In the 20th century version, Auda tries to write Redford McAlester's narrative. In fact, when she meets him she imagines that he's the leader she and her people have longed for. Reflecting on this first meeting, Auda remembers that

after he lectured to the Choctaws that night, and said he would give all of his time and energy to reuniting the people in Oklahoma and Mississippi, she realized that he was wholly Choctaw. He told the Choctaw people that they owed it to themselves to elect a chief who would fight the federal government for Choctaw sovereignty. He told them that the threads of American history were interwoven in Choctaw history, not the other way around. All this he explained in the fluid language of their people, and it made her proud. Slowly she came to believe that she'd found a leader, someone to believe in. (Howe, Shell Shaker 20)
Auda's mistake is in believing the "words" of Redford, rather than reading his actions. His story is tainted with lies and broken promises. He wants to be a spokesperson for Choctaw sovereignty and survivance, yet his very actions reveal his corruption and inability to be the "greatest giver." Auda may believe that she's "found a leader," but she has not. What she "believes in" is false. Even to the end, Auda takes her profession as an historian to heart, wanting to tell the story of Red as she would have it be told--and end as she would have it end. History, in fact, has become Red's downfall and almost destroys Auda: "It occurs to her that most Indians in Oklahoma, including [her lawyer, Gore Battiste] don't consider the details of their tribal history as she and Red did. Though there was a difference. She wrote about Choctaw history as a way to correct the misinformation about the tribe, Red saw their history as a means to an end. Perhaps it was the disease that finally consumed them both" (113). Interestingly, here the notion of history becomes equated with a disease. Redford McAlester is destroyed by his obsession with the act of getting revenge on the whites. He thinks that the Choctaw were "absolved by history" to take whatever measures possible to gain revenge (113). However, gambling with Choctaw sovereignty and "with the stroke of a pen, mortga[ging] a thousand years of Choctaw sovereignty--in one night" is an incredibly destructible act to inflict upon his people for his need to avenge. In this regard, Redford is Red Shoes; he is fighting his own people, gambling with their lives and sovereignty into the contemporary story.

Auda longs to tell the story as she sees fit. Even in the courtroom when she faces murder charges for killing Redford McAlester, her lawyer replies that "I made a promise
to Ms. Billy when I took her case…. I didn't have all the facts at the time, but I still had to keep my word to let her tell the story her way" (Howe, *Shell Shaker* 216). Yet, the story's narration is not Aud's to be told--but Mother Porcupine's. She affirms that the ending must be different than Aud's interpretation. She has set the events in motion that will bring Delores to the Nanih Waiya in order to lay McAlester's spirit to rest.

When Delores is summoned by Mother Porcupine, she is kneading dough that begins turning to mud. She begins hearing voices and she "decides that her imagination is playing tricks. [But] now the words split into two, three, four languages, and more.

She hears many voices, everything that is said, and she is aware that she understands them all" (Howe, *Shell Shaker* 157). The voices tell her that

*The gravediggers are wrong. Not all the ancient burial mounds were stuffed with beloved leaders. Some contain bad people who were given everything in death that they had coveted in life. Shell beads, copper, axes, knives, pottery bowls, baskets, animal skins, blankets. There were times when good people followed the bad ones into the spirit world to care for them. Like the parent of a spoiled child, they were there to give things to the bad ones. Make them comfortable so that they would not want to leave their resting place and harass the living. But when the mounds were opened by grave diggers, these flawed spirits escaped like flesh-eating flies. They passed through many changes. Always becoming predatory. Put your dead chief in a mound so he will be protected from escaping again. Give him everything in death he wanted in life. That way he will never leave it again.* (157-58)

This passage further calls attention to the importance of the southeastern landscape to the Choctaw. Not only does this space hold the bones of their ancestors, but it also houses the spirits of "the bad ones." Like prophecy, Delores remembers the ancient burial practices of those not "beloved," and she knows her calling. The dough that Delores has been kneading turns to dirt and mud and through Delores's vision, she is certain that it is
the mud of the Mother Mound, the Nanih Waiya, and that they must take McAlester's body there for its final resting place. Here again the landscape serves as story, bringing up elements of the past and future, once more breaking temporal boundaries. The mud from the "Mother Mound" is oozing in Oklahoma. The southeastern homeland of the Choctaw is with them in Oklahoma, and they must return to the Nanih Waiya to reconnect the fissures among the Oklahoma Choctaw and the Mississippi Band of Choctaw. Delores says, "The whole Nanih Waiya area represents the cradle of the Choctawan civilization. A long time ago people came from all directions to settle there. It takes a sacred space like that to heal a troubled spirit" (161). Delores becomes the protector of the Choctaw people. She knows that they must give McAlester in death what he wanted in life. Delores says that the Choctaw must "protect him by giving him everything he ever wanted, and placate his troubled spirit" (160). She further explains, "I'm using the word 'protect' the way the old-timers used the word. If we protect him he can't harm our people"(160). Recalling the importance of the collective, Delores asserts that the good and bad must be protected for the good of the community.

Locating McAlester's body at the Nanih Waiya is essential to rectifying his "bad death." Galloway points out that

The location of burials...has a more direct relationship to the world of the present because it becomes a feature of the cognitive landscape, "an idealised material map of the permanent social order."... As researchers concerned with the issues have pointed out, the rites of mourning and especially of the final deposition of the corpse serve to transfer aspects of the deceased's social persona to living members of the group and thus to perpetuate the group.... It becomes necessary not only to manage the structure of the past in the tomb but to assert the immortality of the social order by transferring its theoretically unchanging roles to the living. (279)
From this information we can infer that the cognitive, figurative, and literal landscape become a place of Choctawan identity. To protect the "permanent social order," Red Shoes/Redford McAlester must be buried and "protected" so that the Choctaw people can heal and continue. A recollection of traditional lifeways and burial practices is necessary not just to rectify the current situation, but also to protect future generations. The "structure of the past" must be maintained and ordered. In this regard, Red Shoes/Redford McAlester must go to his final resting place and forever be guarded so that he cannot return and disrupt the Choctaw community again.
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Howe's novel ultimately brings the dualities together in order to lay them to rest at the Nanih Wayih, which is regarded as the birth place by Choctaws. Resolution comes for Red Shoes and Redford McAlester, as his body (a body that has become one) is taken to Mississippi. On the way to Nanih Wayih, Red Shoes's character merges with McAlester's, and he explains to Anoleta/Auda that "It was my dream to have all the advantages the foreigners brought into our nations without surrendering to their rules. It was the same with the casino business…. It's the trappings of time that have changed. Whether it was Bienville and the Filanchi [French], or the D'Amato brothers and the Italians, it's just the trapping of time that have changed for Choctaws" (Howe, Shell Shaker 200). Here Red Shoes/Red McAlester has become a prisoner of time. He/They ultimately find release from time in the literal space of the novel.

Recalling the original story that begins the novel Shell Shaker, the story that comes to Tuscalusa follows a road, an old route. As the novel climaxes, we see that the
story is once again equated with a road, this time "Talihina, Rocky Road." The chapter title, "Suspended Animation," suggests the themes that are played out in this section of the text. We find ourselves in a place, a story, suspended in time. In this textual moment, the present and past collide in a single moment and Red Shoes/Redford McAlester is clearly the same person. Their stories of past and present are contemporaneous. Red asks Auda what she'd like to know, and when she "asks him for the names of the Choctaws he bought off in order to sell the casino project to the rest of the tribal council," he begins replying with ancient names: "Nitakechi, Koi Chitto, and of course, Choucououlacta. Sooner or later they all came around to my way of thinking!" (Howe, Shell Shaker 190). Auda knows that Red is lying to her. He begins telling her his-story and the events of the eighteenth century story of Red Shoes and the contemporary story of Redford McAlester become cloudy, merging in the recalling of events and names. The different versions become confused--in Red's mind they are clearly the same story.

Red and Auda/Anoleta take their final ride in what will be Red's death car on the Rocky Road. In their conversation, we learn that while Red is an Osano, he is also very much in love with Auda/Anoleta. This love will ultimately redeem him for his actions. He reveals to Auda/Anoleta that he killed the Red Fox woman to protect her. In addition, he says that "When Carl discovered you were stealing wire transfer reports and other documents, he told Hector…. The D'Amato brothers wanted you dead, but I couldn't let that happen. I told them I'd handle you. To prove it, I made a bet. If you wore the Italian dress to work, it would mean I was in control and Hector had to leave you alone"
In both versions of the story, Red is trying to protect Auda/Anoleta, but in doing so "they both know the truth of what has happened. The tribe split, land all burned up, her body violated like the land, his shot clean through" (192). In the merging of time on Rocky Road, Auda/Anoleta "reaches her hands out to push away the past, but nothing happens" (199). Clearly, there is no place to put the past. It is present. Red continues telling Auda/Anoleta how the Choctaws' history could have been different. He says, "I made my first bold trade for weapons and other goods with the Inklish in 1729. That success convinced me I could unite the Chickasaws and Choctaws against the foreigners" (199). Auda/Anoleta replies, "But as a result…you played an important role in the mass killings of the Western Choctaws and the Eastern Choctaws for nearly two decades. Your death managed to turn our homelands into one of the most terrifying places on earth" (199). As more elements of the story are revealed, we realize that Red Shoes's actions derive from his need to avenge Anoleta's death:

In this pinnacle chapter, we finally understand the entirety of the story. Anoleta was to have murdered Red Shoes to avenge her mother's death. Yet, she doesn't do so, and as a result once again a member of the Shell Shaker's familial line is killed instead of Red
Shoes. The story keeps repeating. First, Shakbatina figuratively split herself in two to pay for a crime that Red Shoes committed, but was blamed on her daughter. Next, Anoleta, Shakbatina's daughter is killed, split in two because she didn't kill Red Shoes when she had the chance. However, Red Shoes/Redford McAlester is absolved by finally saving Anoleta/Auda's life. He, too, in the textual space has an opportunity to get the story "right." As the car they are driving in continues down the dark road, Auda/Anoleta does not want to free herself from Red. She becomes enchanted with him once more, becoming incredibly comfortable in the car that is taking them to their death. In a bold and beautiful act, Red "blows her a small kiss and unlocks the most hidden passageways of his heart. In an extraordinary moment the car door opens and Redford McAlester pushes her out into the road where she is met by Isaac and Delores" (212). Isaac and Delores take Auda/Anoleta's place in the car and they ride with Red to his death. There they will be together for eternity--Isaac and Delores together, Delores fulfilling her duty as the Greatest Giver in giving her life to ever watch over Red's body. Red knows he is bound for his final resting place, and yet he doesn't want Auda/Anoleta to be doomed to this place with him. In this regard, Red Shoes also becomes a type of giver. He is absolved in the textual space through his selfless act. In the end, his "puny" Choctaw heart wins out to save Auda/Anoleta. He indeed sacrifices himself as Shakbatina's spirit once told him he would have to do, and in his sacrifice, his spirit can finally find peace.

Howe's use of counter clockwise history-telling allows a space for Red Shoes and McAlester to finally find peace within tribalography. She creates a space in which they can be released from the "trappings of time." Mother Porcupine, as a figure of myth, is
strong enough to right the wrongs of past events. By breaking down the boundaries between time and space, Howe shows us that the passage of time no longer necessarily means loss or doom. Cultural change does not have to provoke loss. Rather, history becomes something larger than a mere construct. In Howe's hand it becomes a space of transcending past wrongs, melding them into the present so they can be rectified. History, therefore, can be a positive space for Native Americans; it does not have to be a story of victimization and loss.

At the ceremony for McAlester's death, we see the unification of members of the Mississippi Band of Choctaws and the Oklahoma Choctaws as they begin to chant. As Edith LaHarve, a Mississippi Band Choctaw exclaims, "we've been separated for so long it's hard for us to remember that we once thought of ourselves as one body with different parts, but with one heart. However we always believed this day would come" (Howe, *Shell Shaker* 196). Here Delores, the Greatest Giver, gathers her breath to sing the song for the dead, and as she gathers breath "her gaze shifts and she sees the afternoon sunlight dancing around them, as if birthing new life. She exhales, pushing all herself out of her body and, in this moment, she feels a miraculous beginning as she and the other Chahta women of the Southeast join hands and sing" (197). Following this ceremony, Isaac and Delores stay behind "at the mound to look for something" (219). Merging out of the timelessness of the "Rocky Road," Auda later explains that they found "their destiny. When the police found them, they'd both been shot in Uncle's truck. Their heads facing east…. Toward the Nanih Waiya" (219). Through the story of Red Shoes/Redford McAlester and Auda/Anoleta we know the mythology and what happens to Uncle Isaac
and the Greatest Giver. The other version of the story is somewhat different, reflecting an Anglo-historiography, or just the "facts." One could infer that Isaac and Delores were murdered, but through the oral tradition in the novel form, we understand the underpinning to their story, and the magnitude of their actions. To recall the words of Delores, "Because everything that is important to Choctaws, or all Indians for that matter, is not written down. We have to live the life to know the ways, and so much goes unspoken" (145). Once more, the oral tradition is privileged over the written word, offering up the importance of thinking more globally, or more tribally, about our understanding of history and time and the way Howe conceives it in her notion of tribalography.

In the final court scene of the novel, Auda is absolved of the murder of Redford McAlester when Susan Billy arrives with an old woman who has inside information about McAlester's death. A sight to behold, the two women enter the courtroom, Susan Billy wearing "her best blue suit, with the porcupine sash tied over the shoulder. The old woman wears a traditional Choctaw red dress" (Howe, *Shell Shaker* 214). The old woman, Sarah Bernhardt, testifies on Auda's behalf and through her testimony Auda is acquitted. Bernhardt tells how Hector the Harpoon, one of the mafia members, stepped in to kill McAlester. The woman produces a cassette tape and once it's played, "Hector D'Amato can be heard talking to an unidentified voice, saying exactly what Sarah Bernhardt says he said" (215). As she finishes her testimony, she tells the judge to "go easy on her" for not coming forward sooner. "I'm just a poor old worn-out porcupine,"
she says (217). And in this moment we see that Mother Porcupine is orchestrating even the story documented by the court reporter. She is narrating the story to the end.

Just as the story of the Shell Shaker began the novel, so too does it close it.

Shakbatina says,

Now I must tell you what really happened. Since I had acquired the knowledge of splitting myself in two, I must be the one to tell the story of Itilauichi, who came back to Choctaw Country when day and night were in perfect balance, and Indians had all the luck. My story is an enormous undertaking. Hundreds of years in the making until past and present collide into a single moment. Auda did hold the gun in her hands, gently, as if it were inlaid with jewels. It was then that I slipped my hands in front of her hands, and together we struck a pose. The day was hers, all hers, but it was my day, too. (222)

In this closing, Shakbatina has come back to write/right history. Red Shoes had killed Red Fox Woman, and Shakbatina paid for his murderous act with her life--in this moment she joins with Auda to seek revenge on Red Shoes/McAlester by finally taking his life--the life that should have originally been given to right the wrongs against the Chickasaw. Telling the "story of Itilauichi," which means "to even," Shakbatina has in fact finally evened the score. Here the story has the fitting ending, and it takes place in a moment when "past and present" collide--a timeless space of myth where the possibilities are endless. Shell Shaker comes full circle as we understand how powerful the Shell Shaker's knowledge of "splitting herself in two" is for herself and her people. Her ability to split in two offers her a way to transcend time--transcend in a space that is indifferent to time where "hundreds of years" are no more important (yet also as important) as "a single moment." Time as a construct is broken down. What is past, has not past. Rather
it has grown and evolved and returned in one "moment in time." "Hundreds of years," "a single moment," they are one and the same.

Returning to the theme of time, which began this chapter, Howe makes important observations in the "Author Note" at the end of her novel that I believe deserve our attention here. Howe explicitly unearths the research findings she made while working on this novel. In addition, she discusses in even more detail than in her interview with Harlan McKosato of *Native American Calling* the importance of time and its role in her work:

Important events for Choctawan people seem to have taken place around the autumnal and vernal equinoxes, and the summer and winter solstices. For example, on June 21 or 22, 1847 (depending on whose report you read), after twenty-two Choctaw towns united, Red Shoes was assassinated when the Sun went down. Another story concerns the meeting between Hernando de Soto and Choctaw leader Tuscalusa. Documents tell us that on September 17, 1540, the Spaniards reached Talisi and found it evacuated, but with rich supplies that had been left behind. One explanation is that the townspeople had left for their yearly ceremonies. At Talisi, a runner, accompanied by a man assumed to be one of Tuscalusa's sons, finally came with a message from Tuscalusa. De Soto sent them back to Tuscalusa to gather more information. The Spaniards, meanwhile, stayed in Talisi until September 25, after the Autumnal Equinox, when Tuscalusa finally appeared with supplies, food, carriers, and women for de Soto. I suggest the reason for Tuscalusa's delay was that he was collecting warriors at a ceremonial gathering who would help attack de Soto at Mabila on October 18. Planning attacks on enemies during times of ceremonial gatherings was commonplace in the Southeast. Some two centuries later, in March, 1731, Red Shoes used the same strategy as Tuscalusa. He traveled to a community gathering, telling the French allies he was attending a stickball game. Once there, he assembled a group of warriors and made an attack on his enemies. (Howe, *Shell Shaker* 225-226)

I have quoted this afterward by Howe in detail because it is essential to the argument I have presented here. In this "Author's Note," Howe is clearly acting as a historian. She
is approaching fragments, grappling with historiography, and presenting her findings that have contributed to her novel, which ultimately result in a "tribalography." Her attention to the time shifts, and the reoccurrence of significant events around these shifts, shows a correlation between the oral tradition and time, the ability to explode, collapse, or "collide" time. Moreover, the fact that she ends the novel with all of the sources she used to construct it reveals her integration of history and fiction, the layering of historian and author, and the overlappings of time. Here the landscape has a story to tell and has a merging of time, too, as seen in the historical events occurring around the Earth's time (that of the equinoxes). Howe presents the history of conquest in the story of de Soto and Tuscalusa, the rise of Red Shoes and his "play-off" system, Choctaw Removal, sovereignty renewed in the form of gaming, and ultimately these stories begin to feel much like the ones old grandmother refers to at the end of Leslie Marmon Silko's Ceremony: "I guess I must be getting old…because these goings-on around Laguna don't get me excited any more…. It seems like I already heard these stories before…only thing is, the names sound different" (260). While from different tribes, the trope that Silko and Howe use to present the nature of cyclical time and the oral tradition is clearly the same. Even the figures they use to tell their stories, whether Thought-Woman in Ceremony or Mother Porcupine in Shell Shaker, clearly privilege oral traditions. And with this privileging we are given differing ways to view the constructions of time and history. Through Howe we receive new modes of construction. Ultimately this new way of thinking about historiography--through the lens of tribalography--offers us new ways to approach American Indian Studies and literatures as well as the canon of American
literature. If tribalography can open up ways of seeing in Native texts, certainly it will inform our readings of Anglo-American texts, too. In the next section of this chapter, I will put this theory to practice by investigating how notions of time and elements of Howe's tribalography can extend to and illuminate our understanding of William Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha County.
4. RETHINKING THE SOUTHERN LITERATI: TRIBALOGRAPHY IN WILLIAM FAULKNER'S WILDERNESS STORIES AND GO DOWN, MOSES

LeAnne Howe's fiction draws our attention toward the patriarch of a Southern literary tradition--William Faulkner. Howe's protagonist, Auda, in Shell Shaker, states, "If she thinks I'm one of those perverse William Faulkner Indians, a mute character of the Southern literati, she has another think coming" (Howe 46). Not only is Howe making a jab at Faulkner's representation of southeastern Natives, but she is also making clear that in her version of the "Southern literati" the Native voices will not be silent; in fact they will be anything but mute. Howe's Choctaws are presented with cultural and historical accuracy. She presents the beauty of culture and identity that arises out of tribalism, while celebrating the survival of Native peoples, rather than celebrating them nostalgically as we witness in the "Wilderness" stories of William Faulkner.

Returning to Howe's concept of tribalography discussed in chapter three of this project, she explains, "Native stories, no matter what form they take (novel, poem, drama, memoir, film, history), seem to pull all the elements together of the storyteller's tribe, meaning the people, the land, and the multiple characters and all their manifestations and revelations, and connect these in past, present, and future milieus…” ("Story" 42). Tribalography, in other words, is about "bringing things together, for making consensus, and for symbiotically connecting one thing to another" (42). It is integration. Faulkner's work can be re-read through this lens of tribalography to capitalize upon the integrativeness of his Yoknapatawpha County. His body of work is integrative of the
American experience because he brings together the American Indian, African American, and Anglo Southerner in dialogue in a textual space. In this chapter, I will trace a relatively underrecognized thread in his work—the relationship between multiple Southern communities, not just black and white. While Faulkner's representations of African Americans and Southerners have been studied extensively by literary scholars, his Native characters have received little attention. Howe echoes back to Faulkner's "mute Indians" in her work, and if we look at her novel in dialogue with Faulkner's work, we can add to and layer the history of the southeastern landscape further. Thereby, we can resuscitate the voices of southeastern American Indians.

Howe revises Faulkner's representations of Native Americans in many ways; however, one striking commonality that they share is their understanding of history and time. As mentioned earlier, Howe talks of storytelling within her family and they use the present tense in relaying a story, be it a story that could be placed in the past, present, or future. All of these shifts in a typical Western construction of time are integrated for Howe. The past is very much still alive and informing the present. And, of course, Faulkner is famous for his reflections on and theory of time. For Faulkner was is the saddest word because it can never be: "If was existed there would be no grief or sorrow" (Faulkner, Lion 255). Yet there is grief and sorrow. In fact, it abounds in Faulkner's fiction. He shows how the concept of was can never be truly placed in a categorical space in time that is separate from the present, because just as the past is present for Howe, so it is for Faulkner and his Yoknapatawphian citizens. In this regard, the past
does not merely shape the present, but the past is the present. The past is at once contemporaneous with the present moment and it shapes the lives of the characters.

The very reason for linear narratives, or history for that matter, is to place the past in a particular position. Hayden White explores the overlap of the creative/imaginative writer and the historian in his essay “The Fictions of Factual Representation,” providing us with a framework to approach Howe and Faulkner as writers and historians. White notes,

Readers of histories and novels can hardly fail to be struck by their similarities. There are many histories that could pass for novels, and many novels that could pass for histories, considered in purely formal terms. Viewed simply as verbal artifacts, histories and novels are indistinguishable from one another. We cannot easily distinguish between them on formal grounds unless we approach them with specific preconceptions about the kinds of truths that each is supposed to deal in. But the aim of the writer of a novel must be the same as that of the writer of a history. Both wish to provide a verbal image of “reality.” (122)

He further adds, “History is no less a form of fiction than the novel is a form of historical representation” (122). Using White’s theory of historiography, lines between fiction and history blur. As a matter of fact, they unite and conflate. Therefore, when applying Howe's or Faulkner's novels to this theoretical framework, these text become creations of "imaginative reality," while also rewriting the so-called “documented history” of America.

In this regard, history is fiction. To create a place (history) to store away the “past” is a fiction itself because the past can never be compartmentally positioned in a state other than one of “being.” Faulkner’s sense of history and time is one that embraces this radically different approach to narrative and history. His adherence to a non-linear
structure further proves how temporal boundaries in Faulkner’s fiction are always permeable. And here arises the anxiety in his characters—they realize their present is also their past (or their ancestor’s past). This cycle of repetition becomes a cycle of despair and doom. If Faulkner's characters could somehow position themselves outside of time, happiness would ensue, but for these characters placing themselves outside of time is an impossibility. However, in Faulkner’s manipulations of narrative structure, he indeed creates a timeless place for his characters in the novel form, even if within its bindings his characters are encompassed by history and a cyclical pattern of doom.

While Howe releases her characters from the "trappings of time" in the textual space, Faulkner's characters find themselves doomed to a repetitive history and genealogy that echoes what Faulkner projected would be his final book: "My last book will be the Doomsday Book, the Golden Book, of Yoknapatawpha County. Then I shall break the pencil and I'll have to stop" (Faulkner, Lion 255). Howe and Faulkner embrace the cyclical nature of time and history. They also adhere to a particular narrative structure that privileges the oral tradition. Yet, their similarities end here. For Howe "time" or "timelessness" offers continuance for Native Americans. Her narrative is composed in a way that equals continuance and survivance for the Choctaw. But Faulkner's fluid notion of time falls apart when he presents his Indians. Time is static for Faulkner's Indians as we see them vanish from Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha County with the stroke of his pen.

Faulkner's characters, particularly Moketubbe, Sam Fathers (Had-Two-Fathers), and Isaac Beauchamp McCaslin (Ike) for the purposes of this chapter, largely deal with the irruption of the past in the present. These characters find themselves trying to escape
the pattern of their ancestors and their familial histories, yet ultimately finding bleak
solutions. The way we construct history defines the actions of the past, present, and
future. All elements of time are shrouded with the events of the past. And this
inescapable shroud of history is what the characters in Faulkner’s novels find they must
grapple with and attempt to order. Yet, mirroring the frustration of a modern world, these
characters find little solace in their fruitless efforts.

One theme is clear in both Howe’s and Faulkner’s work: the story is the driving
force that will endure. As stories are passed down from generation to generation, we see
“reality” being constructed—the past constantly erupting in the present in either literal or
literary form. The novel, in the hands of the artist (be it Faulkner or Howe), becomes a
way to manipulate time—to make it whatever he/she desires. Faulkner said, "There isn't
any time…. There is only the present moment, in which I include both the past and the
future, and that is eternity. In my opinion time can be shaped quite a bit by the artist;
after all, man is never time's slave" (*Lion* 70). Here Faulkner positions himself and other
artists outside of time. The ultimate progenitor of immortality (in the body of a text)
becomes the writer in this case. Howe, for example, releases Red Shoes from the
"trappings of time" in the narrative space of the novel because he has been trapped in an
Anglo (mis)representation of History. He is only released from the "trappings of time" in
the narrative space of the novel where the artist comes along to give him freedom in this
textual space/time. Since time is a construction itself, the author has full authority to
construct it to fit his/her own purposes or desires.
Faulkner's adherence to the "present moment," which includes both the past and the future is informed by Henri Bergson's relation of past and present. Bergson's *Matter and Memory* offers a philosophy of perception. He states,

Let us admit for a moment that the past survives in the form of a memory stored in the brain; it is then necessary that the brain, in order to preserve the memory, should preserve itself. But the brain, in so far as it is an image extended in space, never occupies more than the present moment: it constitutes, with all the rest of the material universe, an ever renewed section of universal becoming. Either, then, you must suppose that this universe dies and is born again miraculously at each moment of duration, or you must attribute to it that continuity of existence which you deny to consciousness, and make of its past a reality which endures and is prolonged into its present. (Bergson 192)

I want to capitalize on the last part of this Bergsonian quote. The "past" is "a reality which endures and is prolonged into its present." Endurance is a quality that Faulkner privileges. Dilsey is remembered in *The Sound and the Fury* as the character that endures. Further, in Faulkner's Nobel Prize speech, he says, "I decline to accept the end of man. It is easy enough to say that man is immortal simply because he will endure … The poet's voice need not merely be the record of man, it can be one of the props, the pillars to help him endure and prevail" (Faulkner, *Faulkner Reader* 4). If we apply Bergson's idea of the "past enduring" to the way Faulkner approaches endurance and the past, we see that through psychological memory history, "man," and the artist will "endure and prevail." In other words, they will always be in the present, and because of this they will continue.

Bergson takes his theory of perception one step further to explain that virtually everything we perceive is "the past:"

In the fraction of a second which covers the briefest possible perception of light, billions of vibrations have taken place, of which the first is separated from the last by an interval which is enormously divided. Your perception, however instantaneous, consists then in an incalculable multitude of remembered elements; and in truth every perception is already memory. Practically we perceive only the past, the pure present being the invisible progress of the past gnawing into the future. (Bergson 194)

Therefore, if we can "perceive only the past," and perception is ever changing, then we have the tools to continually remake ourselves, even our pasts. We have the ability to continue becoming, prevailing and enduring. The writers acknowledged in this chapter, and in this project as a whole, represent "poets" who are holding the "pillars and props" that allow us to endure. By looking at their differing perspectives, they offer us different ways to view and revise our pasts.

Perhaps Faulkner explains the role of the artist best. His description of the artist's role and the ability to create and construct one's own universe is given here in the following excerpt from a 1955 interview with Jean Stein vanden Heuvel:

I discovered that my own little postage stamp of native soil was worth writing about and that I would never live long enough to exhaust it, and by sublimating the actual into apocryphal I would have complete liberty to use whatever talent I might have to its absolute top. It opened up a gold mine of other peoples, so I created a cosmos of my own space but in time too. The fact that I have moved my characters around in time successfully, at least in my own estimation, proves to me my own theory that time is a fluid condition which has no existence except in the momentary avatars of individual people. There is no such thing as was--only is. If was existed there would be no grief or sorrow. I like to think of the world I created as being a kind of keystone in the Universe; that, as small as that keystone is, if it were ever taken away, the universe itself would collapse. (Lion 255)

And, in fact, if the poet provides us with the ability to endure, then if the artist were removed, so, too, would the structures that hold "the universe" in place. Metaphorically,
Faulkner is absolutely correct in calling attention to the role of the artist. Through the literary imagination we receive multiple perspectives and ways of imagining. The artist does allow man to endure. For example, in chapter one of this project, Diane Glancy's characters are narrating the Trail of Tears to endure this experience. William Melvin Kelley is part of this model, too. The oral and blues traditions of the African American offer a space to narrate experience and prevail. And with LeAnne Howe and William Faulkner, we receive a form of "Southern history-telling." Storytelling or the oral tradition is a privileged space to proceed from, rather than the written/archival space of modern history. Mythologies and the spoken word are as important if not more so than the written. For example, the ledgers in Go Down, Moses say more in the ellipses than they do in actual print. Written history becomes fraught with misrepresentations and silences. Yet the speakers of the word, be they Quentin, Ms. Rosa Coldfield, or Sam Fathers, represent the important strain of the oral tradition throughout Faulkner's fiction. And in writing novels within non-linear structures, Howe and Faulkner clearly privilege the narrative form of oral traditions over the field of history and historiography as we know it. Lewis Dabney points out in The Indians of Yoknapatawpha that "Faulkner reaches back to older cosmologies preceding all society, history, ownership. He is, in fact, the one fiction writer of consequence since before the Civil War to make substantial use of the Indian subject" (4). In exploring the notion of history, Faulkner recognizes the importance of extending our ideas of what this means, not just in terms of content, but in conceptualization too. This is where his theory of time becomes essential to understanding the history of Y County and its inhabitants.
Whiteness and Ethnic Endurance

Time becomes central to all of Faulkner's work, but for this project it is most important in thinking of cultures that endure. For Faulkner, his concept of time, much like his concept of ethnicity, becomes contradictory. Representing southeastern Natives (that are so constructed that even their tribal affiliation, be it Chickasaw or Choctaw, is all but impossible to determine), Faulkner represents a group this is as fading or "vanishing" as the wilderness itself. While this past will clearly continue to haunt the South in the names of rivers and places, for Faulkner they are a dying people. Sam Fathers's death in "The Bear" is a keen example of the bleakness Faulkner foresees for American Indians.

In fact, in one of Faulkner's interviews in Japan, he paints a bleak picture for Native Americans as well as African Americans. In his words, they are the groups that will vanish or assimilate into another race:

The racial problem in my country is an economic one…. Our problem is not based on any hatred of another race, it's simply a fear that if we give the inferior, what we call the inferior, race any more social advantage, he might be dissatisfied with his economic status and he might want to change that. I think that in a few hundred years the Negro in my country will vanish anyway. He will be assimilated into the white race simply because there are more white people. He has a force, a power of his own that will enable him to survive. He won't vanish as the Indian did, because he is stronger and tougher than the Indian. (Faulkner, Lion 182-183)

When trying to reconcile which ethnicity Faulkner sees as surviving, one can become just as confused as it appears Faulkner is himself on this ambiguous issue. In the above excerpt Faulkner sees African Americans as being tougher and stronger than the Natives, which means they won't vanish; yet clearly the idea of "the Negro" assimilating into
white culture seems to contradict the survivability of "the Negro." Mixed bloods are often seen as degenerates in Faulkner's fiction, like Charles Bon, Joe Christmas, or Moketubbe. Or, they can become the forerunners of endurance, like Lucas Beauchamp. In addition, the pure blood Guinean slave in "Red Leaves" prepares to meet his death throughout the story, but clearly leaves a legacy of endurance. Quentin is the strength of the Compson blood line, as is Ike, because they recognize the importance of ending the ideologies of their families, without understanding that as progenitors they could erect a New South by passing on new versions of the old stories--new versions of humanity that undercut the age old story of loss and shame. Speaking of Go Down, Moses, Bruce G. Johnson claims in his article "Indigenous Doom" that "Faulkner not only emphasizes the demise of a Native American cultural identity, but he also rejects the possibility that mixed bloodlines can be synthesized into a productive manifestation of 'cultural hybridity' in the 'split land' of Yoknapatawpha" (119). However, what do we make of characters like Lucas Beauchamp? Is Faulkner really just reinforcing whiteness because those with the Euro/Anglo strain of blood are the endurers? Or is he reinforcing a class system, echoing back to royal bloodlines, whereby a certain family, lineage, or dynasty is privileged? And what do we make of all this alongside his concept of time?

In the hands of William Faulkner, blackness can equal endurance. In fact, Faulkner's African American characters come to represent the transcendental nature of time. In other words, the concept of transcending time for Faulkner is equated with blackness. His stories often attribute the trait of endurance to the ethnic/often black subject. For example, Dilsey in the Sound and the Fury becomes the lone figure at the
novel's end that the narrator tells us will "endure." Benjy is also outside of time in that he is Christ-like, a figure that can transcend linear time, too. Endurance comes to mean something other than lasting or continuing. It becomes elevated to something omnipotent, which is outside of man's (but not the artist's) ability to construct. Time, on the other hand, equals whiteness. Faulkner's Anglo characters endure in a different sense. They persist like time itself. Linear time, or linear narratives for that matter, equals whiteness in the form of Anglo fiction/history. However, as agents of continuation, Faulkner's Anglos are also contaminants. *The Sound and the Fury* offers a prime example of the tension between linear and non-linear time for Faulkner. Jason is emblematic of linear time. And as mentioned above, Benjy and Dilsey are part of a different, transcendent time. Jason will endure in terms of time, but Benjy and Dilsey have an inherent quality that is more than the mere passing of time.

The tension in Faulkner's work arises because he wants to attribute an enduring quality to the ethnic. His mixed blood characters gain strength because of their ethnic properties. However, ironically, whiteness becomes the constant evil that does endure in linear time. Ethnicity is always being undermined, as in Joe Christmas's character. Endurance or power, which is often associated with the land is taken and "controlled" by the white man. Naturalness is attributed to the ethnic subject, and the black subject comes to represent the past of what Native Americans used to be. The romanticized/noble savages become romantic figures of slavery. However, the Anglos introduced both Natives and Africans alike to what they cannot endure--what the Anglos themselves cannot endure--stripped humanity and bodies as property. Ironically, Faulkner presents
his body of work from a particularly Native point of view, but when he begins discussing
the Native his fluidity of time breaks down. That is, he can think with a "Native
worldview" and write within an oral tradition, but when he tries to write about the very
group he's emulating, his ability to construct timelessness vanishes.

Native Americans have been continuously romanticized as being close to nature,
while Anglos have equated themselves with science. Since the ethnic "other" is aligned
with nature, it becomes that which must be conquered. The "other" isn't human;
therefore, it can be colonized and enslaved. "It" can become property. But whiteness can
become property, too--a property Ike can "bequeath" as he signs away his birthright in Go
Down, Moses. In The Sound and the Fury and Go Down, Moses respectively, Quentin
and Ike recognize their "value" as "white property" and they choose to end their
bloodline--a sign of defeat, but also a passive aggressive act to destroy the only thing they
can--their own ability to pass on their "bad" blood. They do not reproduce because they
recognize the persistence of whiteness, and they see it as something "not to be passed
on." The fact that they do not reproduce though means that their mindset is not passed on
either. In choosing suicide, or to never reproduce, they sadly destroy the possibility that
their value systems will be passed on. Ike, who has learned an alternative value code
from Sam Fathers, in choosing not to have children ensures that these ideals of the "old
way" die with him. Sadly, the white characters that recognize the problem with their
"blood line" and its link to slavery and plantation farming economy are the only
characters that have ideals outside of modernity. Quentin, though wanting to transcend
time, finds that he cannot live in a world outside of time or linearity. Even as he attempts
to destroy his grandfather's watch in *The Sound and the Fury*, he realizes that he cannot stop the passing of time. He cannot transcend his whiteness--and in this linear pattern the only fitting end is suicide. Suicide is the only option to abruptly stop the narrative. It becomes the end point in a linear narrative that is driving toward doom.

**Leslie Marmon Silko's Pueblo Perspective and Tzvetan Todorov's "Otherness" Explored**

Faulkner's work continuously presents motion, like the various wagons that represent the continuity of time in *A Light in August*. Motion appears to be moving toward progress, but as noted with Quentin this forward movement can be toward one's demise as well. Progress comes for Jefferson County, but at the steep cost of its indigenous peoples. The Indians of Y County vanish like the landscape itself as the wheels of "progress" keep turning. Native Americans have long been equated with the land, so it is imperative that we understand the Native perspective towards landscape in opposition to that of Westerners. This will illuminate our reading of Faulkner, and also help us better understand the rift created by contact and two strikingly different ways of conceptualizing the world and modes of making meaning.

Leslie Marmon Silko equates Nativeness with landscape in her article, "Landscape, History, and the Pueblo Imagination." By explaining the ancient Pueblo worldview, we come to understand the interconnectedness of all living things:

Pueblo potters, the creators of petroglyphs and oral narratives, never conceived of removing themselves from the earth and sky. So long as the human consciousness remains *within* the hills, canyons, cliffs, and the plants, clouds, and sky, the term *landscape*, as it has entered the English language, is misleading. "A portion of territory the eye can comprehend in a single view" does not correctly describe the relationship between the
human being and his or her surroundings. This assumes the viewer is somehow outside or separate from the territory he or she surveys. Viewers are as much a part of the landscape as the boulders they stand on. There is no high mesa edge or mountain peak where one can stand and not immediately be part of all that surrounds. (*Antaeus* 84)

Moreover, Silko tells us that "The land, the sky, and all that is within them--the landscape--includes human beings. Interrelationships in the Pueblo landscape are complex and fragile" (85). For Silko, Natives cannot separate themselves from the land. The Western notion of separation from the landscape is unnatural. Silko points out that the ancient Pueblo worldview was one of inclusion. It "never deteriorated into Cartesian duality, cutting off the human from the natural world" (92). Instead, the Pueblo equated landscape with oral narratives, and the "Pueblo oral tradition necessarily embraced all levels of human experience" (87). This oral tradition reinforced the cohesiveness of community because all were called upon for the "remembering and retelling" which was "a communal process" (87). When an individual could identify with "a part of the group and the greater Whole" then he/she could be "strengthened, and the terror of facing the world alone [thereby] extinguished" (93).

This way of seeing the world contrasts with the worldview we often perceive in the journals and writings of European explorers, conquistadors, and colonists. For example, when Columbus first encountered the Americas, he equated the Natives with the landscape, too, but he used this way of thinking for different purposes. Rather than seeing the interrelationships of human beings with the landscape, Columbus saw himself as separate from it. He exploited this inclusive worldview by positioning himself as separate from the natural world, and in this regard he could place himself in a superior
position to conquer the landscape and all that it included. Stephen Greenblatt argues in
Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World that "For Columbus taking
possession is principally the performance of a set of linguistic acts: declaring, witnessing,
recording. … On October 12 then Columbus is not only the medium through which the
crown could claim possession; he also enacts the ritual of possession on his own behalf
and on behalf of his descendants" (57). Columbus's separateness exemplifies a different
way of being and a different way of creating history--an unnaturalness. As a result, his
conquest could be read as a narrative of separation--separation from the land and
separation from self. It is a narrative of exclusion, not a communal experience. While it
is useful for my purposes here to study the perspective of Columbus, I do not mean to
single him out as the sole colonizer perspective. We could turn to several competing
perspectives to analyze the European view toward the Americas during this time of
exploration and conquest. What is important to glean from this argument is that
regardless of Columbus's interactions with or perceptions of the Native peoples, he saw
himself in an elite position to claim the land that he encountered in the name of the
Spanish crown.

The romanticization of Indians in Faulkner's fiction, as well as other writers of the
nineteenth and twentieth centuries, largely stems from the early conceptions made by
explorers and colonizers about these peoples. Exploring the roots of this ideology,
Tzvetan Todorov's book The Conquest of America gives a vast study of the ways in
which Natives of American soil were equated with the landscape in order to be
conquered. As early as 1492, this construction of Native identity, or in this case lack of
identity, was already in place. Columbus equated himself with science that was somehow outside of nature; therefore, he could separate himself from the Natives by viewing them as an essentialized part of the landscape. By equating them with land, which became viewed for its worth as property and commodities, African bodies as well as Native bodies became open to colonization and slavery. Todorov argues that Columbus was not open to what he could find in the Americas; rather, he had predetermined notions of what he would find. Columbus had a hypothesis that he would prove true at whatever costs: "There is nothing of the modern empiricist about Columbus: the decisive argument is an argument of authority, not of experience. He knows in advance what he will find; the concrete experience is there to illustrate a truth already possessed, not to be interrogated according to preestablished rules in order to seek the truth" (Todorov 17).24

An ethnocentric worldview allows Columbus to see himself as elite to those peoples he meets, so much so that he robs them of their personhood and humanity upon encountering them:

Columbus speaks about the men he sees only because they too, after all, constitute a part of the landscape. His allusions to the inhabitants of the islands always occur amid his notations concerning nature, somewhere between birds and trees…. His remarks are frequently limited to the physical aspect of the people, to their stature, to the color of their skin (the more favored if it is lighter--i.e., more like his own). (Todorov 34-35)

Moreover, Columbus sees the Natives as any other living specimen: "Even when there is no question of slavery, Columbus's behavior implies that he does not grant the Indians the right to have their own will, that he judges them, in short, as living objects. It is such that in his naturalist's enthusiasm, he always wants to take specimens of all kinds back to
Spain: trees, birds, animals, and Indians; the notion of asking their opinion is foreign to him" (48). Todorov acknowledges that "Columbus has discovered America but not the Americans" (49).

Understanding this history and identification with or separation from landscape, will help us with our reading of Faulkner's southern wilderness. Elmo Howell points out that Faulkner's "thesis is implicit: the unjust treatment of the Indians by whites" (256). Faulkner acknowledges this in an interview at Virginia: "'I think the ghost of that ravishment lingers in the land.' … That the land is 'inimical to the white man' because of the way it was taken from the Indians" (qtd. in Howell 256). Here, in Faulkner's own words, he makes clear that the land is actually hostile to the white man. Or, to say it better, the land is at odds with the "white man." Unlike the Native relationship to land, the Anglos' relationship is antagonistic and fraught with tension. Therefore, Faulkner's Anglo characters aren't just separate from the landscape, but they are something much more problematic, they are "inimical" to the land. The polemics here cause even greater separation than the modern world.

**Origins of Yoknapatawpha**

Faulkner, speaking of the etymological origins of his Yoknapatawpha, says "it's a Chickasaw Indian word. They were the Indians that we dispossessed in my country. That word means 'water flowing slow through the flatland,' which to me was a pleasant image though the word in Chickasaw might be pleasanter to a Chickasaw ear than to our ear, but that's the meaning of it" (qtd. in Winston 130). This image suggests a "primordial natural place--an Indian Eden before the fall" (Winston 130). It calls
attention to the motion, flow of a culture--one that is not static but ever continuing.

While Faulkner defines the word in this way, H.B. Cushman's translation gives us a more accurate depiction of the ways in which Faulkner's Natives become representatives of land and "land ploughed":

H.B. Cushman, in his *History of the Choctaw, Chickasaw and Natchez Indians*, translates "Yak-ni-pa-tuf-fih" as "land ploughed" …in this we find an inherent Indian-ness combined with a sense of agrarian…. As Marc A. Nigliazzo explains, the name of Faulkner's county is "formed from two words, 'yocona' and 'patawpha,' [and] means 'split land'." What is described is a landscape that is fragmented, divided against itself, compounded of elements of Indian-ness and the destruction of the Indian.

(qtd. in Winston 130)

These conflicting etymological differences in the word "Yoknapatawpha" do offer us interesting ways to approach Faulkner's "stamp of Native soil." This soil is at once split, split in a triangulated system of Natives, Africans and Anglos; and it is also at once integrated as these differing cultural groups intermarry and copulate (either through forced sexual advances or invited ones). Ultimately though, Faulkner's portrayal of Indians adheres very closely with his definition of his created world--they become nostalgic markers of the past, little more than a nod to the "old way." They become as static as names on a map, names of rivers, or names in a Faulkner created world. In this stagnation, there is no room to flow forward except through the combined blood of the African- or Anglo-American. But the Chickasaw or Choctaw chiefdoms of old pass away in Faulkner's view of an encroaching modern world.

Echoing back to Todorov's study of how Natives became likened to landscapes, Winston tells us that Faulkner's essay "Mississippi" written in 1954
describe[s] the roots of his native state, the "real" landscape within which the mythic Yoknapatawpha is situated, evoking the Indian in significantly Biblical terms: "And where in the beginning the predecessors crept with their simple artifacts, and built the mounds and vanished, bequeathing only the mounds in which the succeeding recordable Algonquian stock would leave the skulls of their warriors and chiefs and babies and slain bears, and the shards of pots, and hammer- and arrow-heads…. (ESPL 11-12)." Here Faulkner conveys not only a sense of cultural genesis in the landscape, as well as a convenient vanishing, but also the manner in which the ancestral people (the 'predecessors') and their history actually became the land. This trope of Indian remnants within the actual ground of Yoknapatawpha, particularly in the ancient mounds, is one to which he returns repeatedly. (Winston 131)

Unlike the mounds of Howe's novel, in which the Nanih Waiya becomes a testimony to life and integration of the Oklahoma and Mississippi Band of Choctaws, Faulkner's mounds become a landscape in which his characters are entrapped--the land becomes their tomb, their demise, and only in the earth's soil are there traces of their living.

**Wilderness: War, Frontier, Eden, and Orality**

In the *Collected Stories of William Faulkner* published in 1950, his short fiction "Red Leaves," "A Justice," "A Courtship," and "Lo!," are categorized under the heading "The Wilderness," and as such these stories have come to be known as Faulkner's "Wilderness Stories." Wilderness becomes a loaded term, fraught with numerous meanings; therefore beginning to analyze the fiction in this section requires that we first recognize the multivalence of this term. In Roderick Nash's comprehensive study of the history and meaning of "wilderness," *Wilderness and the American Mind*, he tells us that "Wilderness was the basic ingredient of American civilization…. Yet for most of their history, Americans regarded wilderness as a moral and physical wasteland fit only for conquest and fructification in the name of progress, civilization, and Christianity" (vii).
As he traces the evolution of the term from its etymology, "old world roots," link to the Judeo-Christian tradition, and the use of this term in the Romantic tradition, Nash finally arrives at the ways America appropriated the idea of "wilderness" as a national determination. Nash asserts, "Creation of a distinctive culture was thought to be the mark of true nationhood. Americans sought something uniquely 'American'…" (67). Moreover, "In the early nineteenth century American nationalists began to understand that it was in the wilderness of its nature that their country was unmatched…. And if, as many suspected, wilderness was the medium through which God spoke most clearly, then America had a distinct moral advantage over Europe…” (69). Wilderness, therefore, is bound with connotations of "conquest," "wasteland," "progress," "civilization," and ultimately "Christianity," as America viewed itself as "chosen."

In addition, wilderness connects us to the notion of the frontier. Mississippi was viewed as the "original" American frontier, and therefore, Faulkner's stories can be viewed as a nostalgia or recreation of this time of frontier. The history of this term also brings to mind Frederick Jackson Turner's famous essay about the closing of the frontier, which connotes the rise of industrialism and the turn to modernism and a modern world. Through this "progress," old ways are changed or done away with, and the land becomes a metaphor for this change in Faulkner's fiction. Narrativizing the effects of industrialism, Faulkner portrays the movement from the rural to the urban, the deforestazation of land, and the end of an era in the narrative space of Go Down, Moses. Maybe a lesser known fact about this term is that it refers not only to the opening/closing of the frontier, the land that is slowly being encroached by colonists and eventually
lumber companies, but it also refers to the Civil War battle by the same name--the Wilderness Battle. While Faulkner's wilderness stories connote a bygone era, his stories in the collection and in *Go Down, Moses* show the nostalgia for this older, more "pristine" way of life. Therefore, inherent in this one word--Wilderness--we witness the tropes that make up Faulkner's fiction. It is laden with historical referents, shifts in hermeneutics, nature versus science, the opening and closing of the frontier, progress, war, and ultimately the dawn of a new era--modernity.

Obviously, since Faulkner's "little postage stamp of native soil" is located in the South, the landscape and the families that he writes about bring to mind the history that has marked the South, and more importantly the United States (Faulkner, *Lion* 255). The Civil War is symbolic not only of a new nation trying to reconcile old notions of "being" with progressive new ways of thought, but it's also a battle of economics, of property--most importantly bodies as property. And the imagery of the Wilderness Battle of the Civil War shows the blurry lines which define selfhood--and nationhood. The battleground itself is a frontier: "the area of the Wilderness consisted mainly of underbrush and brackish water, 70 miles wide and 30 miles long. Fighting in this place became an ordeal. Both sides were often invisible and were only able to move by the use of a compass and the sounds of the gunfire from either side. Also, much of the brush in the area caught on fire and so many of the wounded died or suffocated due to the fire" (Carlson). Interestingly, in this key battle nature itself seems to cry out from the battle of man against man. Here, Man becomes aligned with Nature. The attacks that the soldiers are making against one another is ultimately an attack on the landscape as well. And the
landscape responds by becoming a raging force against the violence, erupting in fire and smoke. Ironically, the smoke and fire that results from the battle causes the men to be "blinded" to what they are fighting for, who they are fighting against, and any course of action they may take can very well be revisited upon them since they have no control over the natural elements. They are consumed in the frontier, even as they seek to destroy it and destroy each other, the frontier is responding to their violence.

The invisibility that this battle brings to its participants calls to mind Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man*, and the attempt at identity erasure that can accompany invisibility. The experience of the African can also be aligned with the Natives, who are also not seen. They are even termed as "vanishing" because the lack of presence that Anglo culture allows them in their native land. It can be lack of identity, which is equated with erasure of agency, or it can be a lack of any orientation, be it geographically or even the inability to see others or one's self. What is striking about this battle is that Americans were fighting each other on a battleground where identity became impossible to distinguish and in a landscape that retaliated against the violence by catching fire, thereby causing more death and wounds than the soldiers could inflict upon one another. Also, the very term "civil war" calls attention to the fact that Americans were fighting one another, defining themselves along ambiguous geographical border lines that were constructed and imposed in the first place.

Faulkner's "Wilderness" stories are presented in his *Collected Stories* in the following order: "Red Leaves," "A Justice," "A Courtship" and "Lo!". As Gene M. Moore points out, "the four 'Wilderness' stories involve two independent chronologies
linked only by references to Andrew Jackson" (52). "Red Leaves" chronicles the genealogy of Moketubbe. The "original" Man we can infer is killed by Doom upon his return from New Orleans. We receive the story of the birth of Doom's son, Issetibbeha's, and then the birth of Issetibbeha's son, Moketubbe. The story chronicles Moketubbe's birth and perpetual obsession with a pair of red slippers that Issetibbeha obtained while visiting Paris. While chronicling Moketubbe's rise to chiefdom, his story is told alongside that of a runaway Guinea man who Moketubbe must find to bury with his father. "A Justice" gives us more glimpses of the chiefdom of Doom. We learn more about how Doom poisoned his uncle and cousin in order to become the Man. In addition, we learn how Doom (originally Ikkemotubbe) received his name, symbolically becoming the demise of his people. Sam Fathers's genealogy is also given to us in this story as we learn that Fathers was originally called "Had Two Fathers" because of a continued competition between his father and an African slave for the body of the African woman who is Sam's mother. The third story in the series, "A Courtship," also gives us more information about Ikkemotubbe (later to be named Doom). The story begins with an imaginary boundary being established by Issetibbeha and General Jackson: "They met and burned sticks and signed a paper, and now a line ran through the woods, although you could not see it. it ran straight as a bee's flight among the woods with the Plantation on one side of it, where Issetibbeha was the Man, and America on the other side, where General Jackson was the Man" (Faulkner, Collected 361). Here Faulkner is clearly acknowledging the sovereignty of the two nations, while we are given the story of land encroachment and the beginnings of what would be ultimate removal of Native
Americans from the southern land. While this incredibly important historical moment is captured in Faulkner's narrative, the story that follows becomes a romantic, idyllic one in which Ikkemotubbe and David Hogganbeck compete for the love of Herman Basket's sister. Their courtship becomes a competition between each other and ultimately neither of them gets the girl; however, they do forge an incredible relationship of brotherhood with each other. Valor, loyalty, chivalry--these become the attributes displayed that are suggestive of a nostalgia for a world that existed before the prevalence of race -- when men were men first -- rather than a racial or constructed category. The story idealizes the land prior to white rule of it, thus becoming an idyllic moment in Faulkner fiction. The final story in the "Wilderness" section is "Lo!". And in this story we see the Indians at the White House holding a sit-in because the nephew of the Chief is accused of murdering a white man on Indian property. Though Faulkner deals with the entire incident in a very comical, satirical way, the story becomes one layered with the tensions of sovereignty, echoing not only Anglo/Indian relations but also the tensions between the states that will ultimately result in the Civil War. While each of these stories offer interesting representations of Native peoples in twentieth century literature, for the remainder of this chapter we will focus on "Red Leaves" and "A Justice," and the ways in which these two stories can be read in juxtaposition to the fiction of Choctaw writer LeAnne Howe.

"Red Leaves" (1930): Faulkner's Version of Red Shoes

The "War Between the States" has a long history that begins and ends with slavery, while including the historical tensions between tribal groups and state
governments as discussed in chapter one. The African American experience (or at least as interpreted by Faulkner) is at the forefront of his Yoknapatawpha fiction. However, lesser attention has been paid to Faulkner's treatment of American Indians. Recently, The Faulkner Journal (Fall 2002/Spring 2003) dedicated a special issue to Faulkner's Indians, and as such it is one of the most comprehensive studies we have of Faulkner's Indians since Lewis M. Dabney's work, The Indians of Yoknapatawpha: A Study in Literature and History, published in 1974. Dabney's study focuses on the Wilderness Stories and Go Down Moses specifically. Discussing Indian culture in Faulkner's "Red Leaves," Dabney asserts that "Faulkner shows the remnants of an archaic culture surviving among and on the terms of the intruding whites" (90). This representation of Natives is strikingly different from LeAnne Howe's interpretation in her contemporary novel Shell Shaker. Her twentieth century Indians are not vanishing, but they are negotiating a capitalistic system for their own purposes. Richard White's historical research in which the Choctaw are very much acting as agents and in fact using Anglo authority in a "play-off system" also shows the problematic role in which Faulkner places his Natives of Yoknapatawpha. However, as Robert Woods Sayre asserts, we have the advantage of looking back through the lens of history to read Faulkner, while Faulkner was responding to current beliefs and stereotypes of Native peoples: "In neglecting Indian community and culture, [Faulkner] comes perilously close to another stereotype, that of the Indian without a culture, as a 'child of Nature.' Finally, Faulkner's view of the Indian as 'vanishing,' totally destroyed in the end by white civilization, shows little awareness of
Even though Faulkner isn't necessarily referring to the historical/actual chief Red Shoes as LeAnne Howe does in her novel *Shell Shaker*, there is clearly a correlation between the two representations of this figure of authority—in the guise of red slippers—and the corruption that capitalism and a marketplace economy bring upon the world of the Natives. In contrast to Howe's living twentieth century Indians that are thriving in a market economy; Faulkner's Indians are static—caught in between the worlds of the past and their inability to move into the future. The nostalgia for the past as represented in Faulkner's "Red Leaves" illuminates the changing worldview of the Indians and their futile attempts to understand an Anglo-dominated society. As Three Basket and Louis Berry's conversation illustrates, the Indians themselves long for a pre-contact world that even they cannot recall. In a pattern of dialogue that is reminiscent of Hemingway, the first Native says: "You said it. I do not like slavery. It is not the good way. In the old days, there was the good way. But not now." Then the second responds, "You do not remember the old way either" (Faulkner, *Collected* 314). While this longing for the past is foregrounded in their discussion, the problem with this longing is that there is no way for the Natives to "know" what they are longing for. Yes, they have "listened to those who do" remember the old ways; however, Faulkner romanticizes history through the voices of the two Natives because they have no way of knowing what life was like prior to contact. In Faulkner's fiction, the Indians themselves become markers of nostalgia. As we will see in the latter section of this chapter on *Go Down, Moses*, the Indian way of life
becomes a trope for a lost way of life, one that appears to be more desirable than the one that has replaced it.

In Choctaw history, Red Shoes was a great warrior, largely successful for a time in the strategic system he employed against the English and French. As LeAnne Howe portrays this historical leader, he has a sense of humanity, even though the actions he commits lead to disaster for his tribe and himself. Continuously throughout her novel *Shell Shaker*, Red Shoes is a character that represents strength and endurance. Red Shoes becomes corrupted with his exposure and experiences with the French and English. Thus, he becomes a pawn in a market place economy that he is attempting to control. His greed and lust for more goods and guns rob him of his "pure" Choctaw heart. Faulkner's depiction of his created "Red Shoes" is also destroyed by capitalism. But Howe's depiction of Indians show a thriving people, continuing their cultural traditions and thriving at the turn of the twenty-first century, Faulkner's invented Indians are depicted much like Ishi—they are a vanishing race. In other words, Red Shoes is destroyed by capitalism in both texts, but Howe ultimately emphasizes his strength and endurance, while Faulkner constructs him to vanish.

Numerous critics, including Gene M. Moore and Patricia Galloway, have drawn attention to Faulkner's loose interpretation of the Southeastern Indians. They are not exactly Chickasaws, nor quite Choctaws. Rather they become some conglomeration of the two tribal groups, a blending through Faulkner's imagination and pen. Malcolm Cowley expressed concern over the chronology and genealogy of Faulkner's Indians in his attempts to create *The Portable Faulkner*. In Cowley's attempts to put the stories "in
chronological order with dates, as a record of Yoknapatawphan history beginning with 'A Justice' and 'Red Leaves,' he immediately alerted Faulkner to certain 'factual discrepancies' that would need to be addressed, such as the fact that 'the Indians started out being Choctaws…and ended up as Chickasaws…" (51). Faulkner's response was "'The Indians actually were Chickasaw, or they may so be from now on'" (qtd. in Moore 51). Faulkner never revised his earlier work that was already in print though, and as a result the discrepancies in his stories remain. Opposing Walter Taylor's suggestion that the "Wilderness" stories offer "genealogies, time schemes, [and] even … facts of history [that] are ignored with cavalier disdain" (qtd. in Moore 51), Moore points out that Faulkner can hardly be said to treat the history or genealogy of his Chickasaws with "cavalier disdain"; on the contrary, he chronicles their lineage with the same attention to detail that he accords his McCaslins and Sartorises, and with the same penchant for contradictions and ambiguities. The problem is not that Faulkner ignores chronology, but that his references to genealogy and to historical chronology are inconsistent and often contradictory, and cannot be assembled into a single unified master-plan in which everything falls neatly into place. (Moore 51-52)

Even as Moore asserts here that Faulkner's genealogies and histories are contradictory, we are yet again reminded of the ways histories are constructed, and how more and more these comments recall a critique of history that Faulkner is providing within his fiction. Looking for historical accuracy, critics can very easily see the fictionality or inaccuracy of Faulkner's histories, while they fail to see the fictionality of all "Histories." Yet, the fictionality of history is the very issue that Howe and Faulkner address in their roles as artists and "historians."
In her essay "'Indians': Textualism, Morality, and the Problem of History," Jane Tompkins points out our inability to see beyond our own perspectives. She asserts that "what is invisible to the historian in his own historical moment remains invisible when he turns his gaze to the past" (721). As Tompkins illustrates multiple versions of the history of European-Indian contact, she proves again and again that the person creating the history is privileging a particular "way of seeing" because the historian privileges his/her own positionality. She explains,

Though it is probably true that in certain cases Europeans did consciously tamper with the evidence, in most cases there is no reason to suppose that they did not record faithfully what they saw. And what they saw was not an illusion, was not determined by selfish motives in any narrow sense, but was there by virtue of a way of seeing which they could no more consciously manipulate than they could choose not to have been born. (729)

In other words, Tompkins effectively argues that misrepresentations in histories are not necessarily deliberate. Rather, the historian is conditioned by what he/she sees. Therefore, the notion of "truth" or "falseness" is no longer useful. We cannot know what is accurate because even in our attempts to assemble a truth we impose our own judgements and biases on the historical text. Faulkner's representations of Indians in his fiction allow us a picture of how he sees the world and the Native in this world. While he presents them as vanishing, his awareness to include them as the Natives of his Yoknapatawpha County shows a drive toward a more "truthful" understanding of the histories of the South. And his representation of the Native gives us a way of seeing the Native as the early twentieth century artist may.
Faulkner's Indians are some combination of Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Faulkner's vivid imagination. In Elmo Howell's article "President Jackson and William Faulkner's Choctaws," Howell effectively argues that the Indians represented in Faulkner's fiction are more closely aligned with Choctaws than Chickasaws. While the Chickasaws lived closer to "Faulkner Country" in Northern Mississippi, the Choctaws were located in southern Mississippi. As Howell points out, "Faulkner's knowledge of history is erratic, and since he has the artist's, not the historian's, point of view, he makes no effort to distinguish between the two tribes. As the conception of the Yoknapatawpha saga developed, he invariably labeled his Indians Chickasaws, but he seems to have drawn more freely from the Choctaws, who were more distinctive in tribal customs and practices" (Howell 252). Moreover,

when Faulkner began writing his Indian stories, he showed little interest in their tribal origin. In 1931, in "A Justice," Doom is a Choctaw: in subsequent stories he is a Chickasaw. In "Mountain Victory," published in 1932, Francis Weddell is a Choctaw chief; in "Lo" of 1934, he is a Chickasaw chief. As the conception of the Yoknapatawpha saga developed the Indians were invariably labeled Chickasaws, but Faulkner remained unconcerned about variation in customs and ceremonies. (258)

Faulkner's conflation of these two tribal groups is interesting because he is creating an "Indian" based on the Mississippi world that he knows. Even though he conflates customs between the two tribes, Faulkner is sensitive enough to grant his Indians a tribal affiliation, rather than throwing all cultures of American Indians together into one group labeled "Indians." Faulkner does not accurately convey the specific tribal culture, but his effort to be "tribally specific" shows his commitment to give a full portrait of the South's history.
The effects of capitalism invade the Indians of Faulkner's "Red Leaves." The Natives (called Chickasaws though clearly a loose invention of Faulkner's) "wear the white man's clothes in curious ways, and they cannot get their feet into the red slippers Issetibbeha brings back from a trip to Paris paid for by the slave trade" (Dabney 94). Though unable to find comfort in the clothes of the Anglos, or fill their shoes, Faulkner's Chickasaws attempt to adopt traits of the Anglos as well as understand the Anglo worldview. As the story opens, Three Basket and Louis Berry are walking through the slave quarters discussing the slaves and they are unsure what to do with them. One option is to sell them, but if they do, then they don't know what to do with the money. We receive a critique of capitalism through their discussions because they have adapted to the white man's way of being in the world--by taking slaves and maintaining a plantation/agricultural economy--however, they are unable to completely embrace the values of a capitalistic system as shown through their inability to see the "importance" of slave labor.

As the story unfolds, we receive the genealogy of Doom, the progenitor of Issetibbeha and Moketubbe. We discover that Issetibbeha is dead and that his son, Moketubbe, is in search of Issetibbeha's slave so that the slave can be buried with his dead father. They are attempting to bury Issetibbeha, but they cannot bury him without his horse, dog and slave. Interestingly, particularly in lieu of Faulkner's genealogical treatment, Doom/Ikkemotubbe (Issetibbeha's father) becomes the Man after his uncle and cousin (the next in line) die mysteriously. Doom acquires lots of land and slaves and begins plantation style farming. He is the person: Ikkemotubbe, David Callicoat, and
eventually Doom who we are told in the appendix of *The Sound and the Fury* that
"granted out of his vast lost domain a solid square mile of virgin North Mississippi dirt as truly angled as the four corners of a cardtable top…to the grandson of a Scottish refugee who had lost his own birthright by casting his lot with a king who himself had been dispossessed" (Faulkner, *Sound* 403).

Told alongside the story of Doom and his grandson Moketubbe, is the story of a runaway slave--a Guinea man that runs from his own doom. He is to be buried with Issetibbeha and accompany him to the afterlife. During the slave's attempted escape from slavery and death, he is bitten by a snake. And in this moment he proclaims that he will "live" in spite of the bite. He continues to run, but in a circle. We see the futility of his escape, yet also his proclamation of humanity in his determinedness to live despite the overwhelming odds that are stacked against him. His life becomes a direct juxtaposition to Moketubbe's. The slave becomes the representation of life, even in death; and Moketubbe becomes the representation of death, even in living.

The red slippers that Issetibbeha brings home from Paris in "Red Leaves" become symbolic objects that signal the demise of a Chickasaw dynasty. The Indians and Anglo-Americans attach different symbolic values to the slippers. For Moketubbe, these slippers come to represent chieftdom. Karen Rhodes convincingly argues in her essay "The Grotesque Economics of Tragicomedy: Cultural Colonization in Faulkner's 'Red Leaves'" that

The slippers point out one of the more crucial irreconcilabilities of cultural economics in the story, for they bring all three cultures into perspective. The slave being chased is barefoot, the natural state and the one most normal and effective for the slave. Moketubbe should also be barefoot or
in moccasins, for he has no need of European shoes, but instead he wears useless slippers which endanger his life, yet still he will not part with them because of their symbolic value. This mechanical refusal to face reality highlights the reification of the Euro-culture's fluid use value for slippers petrified into symbolic value in the Indians' culture. (Rhodes 75)

Moketubbe's obsession with the slippers and achieving chiefdom cause him to begin destroying his own people in his quest to be "king." Mirroring the Red Shoes of Howe's novel, Moketubbe is a transitional figure, caught between two ways of being, the "old way" and the "new way" introduced by the Europeans. As such, the slippers as an object of desire come to represent Moketubbe's lust not just for the shoes, but for the ability to rule and acquire more of anything and everything accessible to him, including slaves.

Throughout the story, Moketubbe is described as lifeless and degenerative. He "was already diseased with flesh, with a pale, broad, inert face and dropsical hands and feet" (Faulkner, Collected 321). The only thing that brings life to the new chief is the red shoes: "At three years of age Moketubbe had a broad, flat, Mongolian face that appeared to exist in a complete and unfathomable lethargy, until confronted by the slippers" (321). Here it is clear that the slippers create life in Moketubbe, yet they also become his very demise. As objects that signify colonialism and Native desire for European objects, these slippers become a mixed trope, like Moketubbe's identity, signifying both motion and non-motion.

Further, Moketubbe is portrayed as "fat, inert," tropes for his sloth and greed (Faulkner, Collected 322). The description of his body signals the corruption he encounters through the shoes. Moketubbe is degenerating, which is suggestive of his "negative" blood. Moketubbe's body becomes corrupted by capitalism, and like his body,
the land too becomes corrupted/raped/pillaged. Rhodes claims that the Indians in Faulkner's story can neither identify with the present or the future, and nowhere is this witnessed more abundantly than with Moketubbe's struggle with the shoes. According to "Bergsonian terms the Indians display an inelasticity of thinking that allows them to live neither in their past traditional world nor in the present Western world" (Rhodes 73). When Moketubbe removes the shoes, his flesh comes "back into life, like up from the water, sea" (Faulkner, *Collected* 327). However, in his obsession with the shoes he is constantly trying to squeeze his feet into them, and as the group chase the Guinea slave throughout the wilderness, Moketubbe falls--becoming lifeless. "They had forgotten that Moketubbe still wore the slippers; when they reached the place Moketubbe had fainted. They removed the slippers and brought him to" (Faulkner, *Collected* 337). Unable to complete the ritual due to the slippers, Moketubbe finds that he cannot live in the old way, (a way he can't recall because his obsession with the slippers began as early as age three), nor can he fill the shoes of the Anglos and live in a capitalistic society. Even as he tries to do so he finds himself falling and experiencing lifelessness. He only experiences life when looking and admiring the shoes, yet he cannot fulfill his life while wearing them. He finds himself in a catch twenty-two situation--one of doom--like the name his grandfather prophesies. By equating Moketubbe with the land, we begin to see that the destruction capitalism is having upon the Natives is also being visited upon the landscape--something that Faulkner explores more deeply in *Go Down, Moses*.

Other objects cast off by the Europeans also signal the contrasting value systems at work among the three cultural groups, while also nodding to the all important theme of
motion (or lack thereof) in Faulkner's fiction. Steamboats rot much like plantations that are overgrown and dilapidated—tropes for a critique of history. Steamboats are being replaced by Progress. Faulkner implies this same replacement with the Natives, too. Like the castoff shoes that come to represent ruler status to Moketubbe, the dilapidated steamboat becomes the "mansion" of a desiccated and vanishing race as symbolized in the rotting flesh of Moketubbe. The non-movement of the steamboat in its natural habitat—the water—and its imposed movement (by slaves), further demonstrates the demise of the Natives because of their inability to completely understand and embrace the Anglo value system. Even as much as Moketubbe has embraced the other culture, he still cannot move forward in this system so foreign to him. His lack of motion stands in stark contrast to the perpetual motion of the Guinea slave.

Motion equals continuousness and in "Red Leaves" the African slave clearly becomes the marker of survival and life—a figurehead for endurance that the Chickasaw tribe lacks. Comparing the slave and one of the Chickasaw, Faulkner writes that "the two men, the one motionless and the other running, looked for an instant at each other as though across an actual boundary between two different worlds" (Faulkner, *Collected* 331). But they're not two separate worlds; however, they are both "dead." Moketubbe is portrayed as death living and the Negro as living death. The Guinea slave is always presented in motion—Moketubbe stagnant. As representative of his people, the Negro attests to endurance, survival. His cunning ability to read the signs of the wilderness enable him to elude his captors for a long period of time. Moketubbe, even with the placement of the slippers on his feet, cannot lead the hunt, a hunt that must be completed
to complete the ritual of burying his father. To him these slippers may signal leadership, but in fact they lead to doom. The slave's knowledge of the wilderness, much like the Natives and the representation of Sam Fathers and Ike in *Go Down Moses*, links the slave with something primal and natural. And in the slave's case, unlike the Native's, this naturalness has an enduring quality. The story's conclusion shows the continual motion that the slave makes, even though it is in vain: "vain motion of his frustrated swallowing. A piece of water-loosened mud carried away from his chest and broke at his muddy feet, and in the empty gourd they could hear his breath: ah-ah-ah" (341). The water doesn't quench the slave's thirst because he cannot even swallow it, but it does accomplish an incredibly significant task: it makes him visible. As the mud loosens, he becomes more and more visible. Even approaching death he is breathing and representing life in striking contrast to the Indians.

Returning to the notion of blood, it is also important to note that Moketubbe is not the rightful heir to the chiefdom. Through Doom's measures, although never explicitly stated, it is implied that Doom kills his uncle and his cousin, so that he can become the new Man. Bruce G. Johnson argues that "Moketubbe is not only childless, but is described as a virtual walking corpse, and the patriarchal line of this Native American clan is doomed by the end of this tale" (Johnson 116). Mirroring Greek tragedy, the line is doomed from the beginning as well as "by the end of [the] tale." Dabney points out that

The New Orleans adventure skipped over in the other [Wilderness] tales is sketched in here--the Parisian nobleman who helps Doom pass as a chief in that wide-open scene, the West Indian woman whom he gets pregnant and brings home to the plantation when he is chief in fact, and is married
Here the ability to pass becomes central. Rather than the typical mode of passing due to skin pigmentation, here Faulkner allows Doom to "pass" as a chief. Thereby, showing that the bloodline of Doom/Moketubbe is not the rightful one. He cannot endure. Like Faulkner's Charles Bon or Joe Christmas, Moketubbe is a mixture of blood that contributes to his inability to live in the modern world.

In contrast, the slave has pure African blood. He is from Guinea. Johnson asserts that "By the end of this story, the capture of Issetibbeha's runaway servant reveals there is no escape from the curse of slavery. Not only does the servant pay for this knowledge with his life, but the Indians too are doomed by their ritualized subjugation of others to their own 'master' race" (118). Therefore, we can infer from this statement that the curse of slavery and of capitalism comes from the "Anglo" strain of blood. Like the Sutpen's and Compson's, the bloodline is so corrupted it cannot endure. In the end, capitalism corrupts everything it touches, including those "closest to nature"--the Indians.

Paradoxical in relation to the rest of the tale, the final scene of "Red Leaves" "partly restores the dignity of the tribe" (Dabney 117). The elders watch the slave drinking water that he cannot swallow and they experience an "awareness of the black's humanity [that] humanizes them" (Dabney 117). "With Moketubbe offstage, their pride and decorum stand out as distinctly Indian--a legacy to Sam Fathers" (Dabney 117), and the story that follows in the sequence of Faulkner's "Wilderness" stories--"A Justice." "Red Leaves" is a story of the effects of capitalism on the Southeastern Natives.
Faulkner's portrayal of them is that they cannot survive within this system. As signified by Moketubbe's lack of motion and inability to "rule," we are clearly moving toward the vanishment of his race. This story is a precursor to the events that will unfold for the Natives in Faulkner's later fiction, *Go Down, Moses*.

"A Justice" (1931): The Genealogical Roots of Had-Two-Fathers (Sam Fathers)

In "A Justice" Faulkner once again calls attention to the oral aspect of history as multiple layers of his Yoknapatawpha saga unfold through several narrators. Quentin begins the narration of a story-within-a-story framework, only to have Sam Fathers pick up the narration later in the story. So this as-told-to story becomes filtered through Herman Basket, who tells the story of Sam Fathers's birth to Sam, who is narrating the story to Quentin, who is ultimately telling the story to the reader. This complex, integrated mixing of history-telling calls attention to its construction and the multiple levels and perspectives we must cipher through to gain some semblance of truth.

Sam Fathers represents both the positive and negative aspects of some of Faulkner's most beloved mixed blood characters. He is the Lucas Beauchamp with Native blood; however, unlike Lucas he is portrayed as a figure of the past—a past world that is passing away in *Go Down, Moses*. Yet, in "A Justice" Sam lives on the fringe of the quarters, and he speaks to the whites as his equals, requiring that his voice and requests be heard and answered.

Quentin sets up the narrative of the story as a genealogical/historical tale of Sam Fathers' origins: "He lived with the Negroes and they—the white people; the Negroes called him a blue-gum—called him a Negro. But he wasn't a Negro. That's what I'm
going to tell about" (343). Speaking to the performative nature of oral traditions, Quentin tells us that "I would always bring him some tobacco. Then he would stop working and he would fill his pipe…and he would tell me about the old days. He talked like a nigger—that is, he said his words like niggers do, but he didn't say the same words—and his hair was nigger hair. But his skin wasn't quite the color of a light nigger and his nose and his mouth and chin were not nigger nose and mouth and chin" (Faulkner, *Collected 344*).

Here Quentin is phenotypically evaluating Sam and his differences from "typical" African American features. In some ways his childlike curiosity can be equated with the scientific approach that early explorers attributed to the New World and their attempts to define or categorize different groups of people who didn't have the same phenotypical appearance as themselves. Even at the age of twelve, Quentin has already internalized the constructions of race. His confusion arises from his inability to appropriately label Sam in one sphere or another. Clearly, through the story Quentin is trying to understand how he should classify this liminal figure that seems neither at home in either the black or white world, yet also fits in some special way in both of them. At once, Sam is a figure on the periphery. He is an insider to a group that is "vanishing" and an outsider to groups that are a part of his bloodline.

When Sam picks up the narration, he immediately turns to his Native roots, calling attention to the Native "dynasty" that originally dominated the South. The Man: "owned the Plantation, the Negroes, my mammy too. He owned all the land that I knew of until I was grown. He was a Choctaw chief" (Faulkner, *Collected 344*). Privileging his Native blood, Sam reflects upon the Native stories that he received from Herman
Basket as stories that define his identity. Through this recollection, given to Sam through the elder Herman Basket, the Choctaw are perceived as clearly owning the land, or in their terms the land was their agricultural domain. Prior to Doom there was less encroachment of the land by the Anglos. However, Doom creates a fissure in the Native community when he returns from New Orleans. Doom is the original "Man's" sister's son. In other words, he is the nephew of the present Chief. Following a patriarchal system, not inherent in Choctaw society, which is a matrilineal tribe, Faulkner presents a new Man that is not the rightful heir to the chiefdom. In "A Justice," all those in line to be The Man die mysteriously, or like Sometimes-Wakeup, they refuse to be the Man because of Doom. As a result, Doom becomes the new Chief of the tribe, and with this power he signs away the Native rights to Yoknapatawpha. "Doom's name was Ikkemotubbe then, and he was not born to be the Man, because Doom's mother's brother was the Man, and the Man had a son of his own, as well as a brother. But even then, and Doom no bigger than you are, Herman Basket said that sometimes the Man would look at Doom and he would say: 'O Sister's Son, your eye is a bad eye, like the eye of a bad horse'" (Faulkner, Collected 346). Even at an early age, Doom had a "bad eye." There was something negative about his character that his family recognized. However, they were powerless to stop the events that Doom put into motion.

The multiple names given to Doom show the evolution of his character. He was originally named Ikkemotubbe, and known among his tribe by this name. When he leaves the wilderness and begins working on a steamboat, he takes on another pseudonym, David Callicoat. And finally, he is named Doo-um by a Frenchman in New
Orleans: "My name is Doom now,' Doom said. 'It was given me by a French chief in New Orleans. In French talking, Doo-um; in our talking, Doom…. It means the Man" (Faulkner, *Collected* 348). Doom becomes inducted into the colonial system as he is named by the Frenchman. He becomes the progenitor of colonialism among his tribe with the taking of an un-rightful name. Doom is passing as a chief while in New Orleans, but as mentioned above, he is not the rightful chief of the Chickasaw. He goes outside the "natural" lineage of chiefdom to take what he desires, much like the colonists took the land and peoples as property for their own desires. Further, Doom becomes obsessed with the broken steamboat much like his grandson, Moketubbe, will become obsessed with the red shoes in "Red Leaves." Doom's taintedness is passed to his grandson Moketubbe. They are not rightful ones to be the Man, and even Moketubbe has the violent streak of Doom. Like Louis Berry, we as readers are left to assume that Moketubbe poisons his own father to get the shoes and chiefdom from him.

In "A Justice," Doom, The Man's sister's son, returns from New Orleans with a black woman that becomes Sam's mother. The black woman has a husband, and yet she is also "visited" by Craw-ford, the Chickasaw man that is Sam's father. When the black woman gives birth to a child, her husband approaches Doom and shows him the "new man"—Sam Fathers. When Doom asks what's wrong with him, the man replies "Look at the color of him" (Faulkner, *Collected* 357). Clearly, even from this exchange between the slave and Doom, there is a somewhat "faier" system of slavery under Indian law. At the very least, the African Americans still have humanity. The enslaved husband can approach Doom in hopes of "justice" being served on Craw-ford (the Chickasaw man that
is Sam's father). However, to be fair Doom's concern with this incident isn't to help the black man's predicament; rather, his motive is one of "establishing absolute power" (Dabney 79).

After a series of comical events, including a cock-fight in which Doom gives the black man his own cock to fight against Craw-ford's, the issue between the two men is ultimately achieved by constructing a fence. A constructed border is imposed between Craw-ford and the black man's home: "He [Craw-ford] and Herman Basket built the fence" (Faulkner, Collected 358). This incident is interesting because Doom has ordered that an "unnatural' border be created among the men. Of course, this created border can be linked to Manifest Destiny and Doom's role in signing over the Chickasaw lands--creating a border between the Indians and Anglos that is self-imposed, a man-made construction that is symbolic of a colonized landscape.

Dabney rightly asserts that Sam rejects "the identities imposed by white men and black" (74). "Sam's tale is toward racial justice. He tells of his Indian father's pursuit of his mother, and for all his sense of Indian identity the story sides with her black husband" (Dabney 75). Faulkner's tale focuses on the Native identity of Sam Fathers; however, like the Guinea slave in "Red Leaves," the black man of "A Justice" is physically superior to the Native, Craw-ford. The black man can jump over this fence, but Craw-ford cannot. The Indian is presented somehow as unequal--not matched physically with the African, who has an agility and physical superiority over him.

Quentin tells the story of Had-Two-Fathers in his adult years, or at least his young adult years. He thinks back to the time and place that Sam relayed the story to him and
he remembers "I was twelve then, and to me the story did not seem to have got anywhere, to have had point or end" (Faulkner, *Collected* 359). Only through growth does Quentin come to understand the importance of Sam's story. Sam will meet his end before Quentin fully understands the importance of his story. Sam becomes likened to a figure in a museum, even in the moment Quentin recognizes something is special about it; although he's too young to fully understand it. "I believed that I could still see Sam Fathers back there, sitting on his wooden block, definite, immobile, and complete, like something looked upon after a long time in a preservative bath in a museum" (360).

"A Justice" comically portrays a Native system during its heyday. We see Natives and Africans interact, resolve issues, and cohabit the southeastern landscape. However, through the framing of this story, Sam Fathers acting as storyteller to young Quentin, we see that the Native community lacks other Native "listeners" to continue the oral tradition. These Native listeners are absent from the textual space and instead replaced with an Anglo listener who won't carry on the tradition. Rather, his life will end in suicide. Sam's lack of a Native listener signals what is to come for him and his people in *Go Down, Moses*. *Go Down, Moses* becomes Faulkner's bleakest portrayal of the Natives and the closing frontier, as he captures the changing landscape and world through the eyes of Ike, a young boy coming of age and growing old through the textual space of the novel/story cycle.

*Go Down, Moses* (1942): The Finale of Yoknapatawpha's Native Dynasty

More than any other collection of Faulkner's fiction, *Go Down, Moses* reveals the "history" of the frontier. The natural elements of frontier, as represented by the Bear and
Sam Fathers, are juxtaposed to the wheels of progress--the railroad, lumber companies. The wagon is replaced by the automobile, land changes hands and becomes commodified, and Faulkner presents a dying age that is being replaced by another. Ike is a central character in this movement, too. As a Bildungsroman, we see through Go Down, Moses how Ike relates to the wilderness, grows, learns through the guidance of his surrogate father, Sam Fathers, and as he ages, Ike witnesses the change of the frontier, the loss of it, even as Sam begins to prepare for the loss of his own life.

Recalling the imagery of disorientation in the Wilderness Battle of the Civil War in which soldiers used their compasses to find their way because their senses were useless to them, Ike finds himself wandering alone in the wilderness of Faulkner's Go Down Moses--he becomes alien and invisible. And in these moments of "identitylessness" he relies on the teachings of Sam Fathers and he asserts his agency. Ike survives and thrives in the wilderness because he is equipped with the knowledge that Sam Fathers has imparted to him--a knowledge that is both Native and native to American soil.

As a child Isaac shoots his first deer, and as he walks up to the buck, Sam Fathers, his guide through the wilderness, instructs him on the proper conduct: "Don't walk up to him in front…. If he aint dead, he will cut you all to pieces with his feet. Walk up to him from behind and take him by the horn first, so you can hold his head down until you can jump away. Then slip your other hand down and hook your fingers in his nostrils" (Faulkner, Go Down 158). Through this exchange, young Ike is learning the role of hunter and the respect he must have for the hunted. When Ike does as Sam instructs, the boy then draws "the head back and the throat taut and drew Sam Fathers' knife across the
throat and Sam stooped and dipped his hands in the hot smoking blood and wiped them across the boy's face" (158). Hence, Ike's rite of passage is performed. Through the hot, smoking blood of his first kill, Ike becomes marked by Sam. Not just marked by the blood of the deer, but by the blood of Sam, the blood of Sam's ancestors, the Native and the African, the blood of kings, and the blood that has soaked into the wilderness:

They were the white boy, marked forever, and the old dark man sired on both sides by savage kings, who had marked him, whose bloody hands had merely formally consecrated him to that which, under the man's tutelage, he had already accepted, humbly and joyfully, with abnegation and with pride too; the hands, the touch, the first worthy blood which he had been found at last worthy to draw, joining him and the man forever, so that the man would continue to live past the boy's seventy years and then eighty years, long after the man himself had entered the earth as chiefs and kings entered it;--the child, not yet a man, whose grandfathers had owned the land long before the white men ever saw it and who had vanished from it now with all their kind, what of blood they left behind them running now in another race and for a while even in bondage and now drawing toward the end of its alien and irrevocable course, barren, since Sam Fathers had no children. (159)

As a boy of ten, Ike makes his way through the wilderness and he stands "against a big gum tree beside a little bayou whose black still water crept without motion out of a cane-brake," and he hears a "big woodpecker called Lord-to-God by negroes, clattered at a dead trunk" (Faulkner, Go Down 194). The imagery presented here is of death and lack of motion: stasis. Already this moment foreshadows what will happen to the Mississippi frontier. When Ike realizes the bear is watching him, he doesn't move, rather he stands "holding the useless gun which he knew now he would never fire at it, now or ever" (194). Ike's mentality here is one of respect. He is akin to the bear and Sam. He has a respect for nature, for men, and so he cannot destroy them. As a pupil of Sam Fathers, Ike has the inability to destroy what he respects. Unlike other members of his family, Ike
shares a kinship with the land, so much so that he refuses the right to "own" the land, knowing that what is natural is unownable. Yet, his mentality, like Sam's, is one of a "vanishing breed" in Faulkner's world. Sam and Ike are emblems of nobility, but a nobility that is dying and lacking the ability to continue, or move forward.

The following summer, Ike continues to learn the codes of the wilderness. He travels into the wilderness without his gun, travelling "farther into the new and alien country than he had ever been, travelling now not only by the compass but by the old, heavy, biscuit-thick silver watch which had been his father's" (Faulkner, *Go Down* 199). Recalling the historical Wilderness Battle of the Civil War, Ike, just like the Union and Confederate soldiers, finds himself alien and lost in the landscape of the wilderness. All he has to rely on for his survival is a compass and a watch, yet even these objects will not point him in the right direction. These man-made objects of "progress" do not work for Isaac in the wilderness landscape. Just as the men of the Wilderness Battle found themselves consumed by the hell they visited upon nature and the battleground they created there, Isaac, too, would have been consumed without understanding the ways of the Old People. Isaac decides to completely relinquish himself and move into the wilderness: "He stood for a moment--a child, alien and lost in the green and soaring gloom of the markless wilderness. Then he relinquished completely to it. It was the watch and the compass. He was still tainted. He removed the linked chain of the one and the looped thong of the other from his overalls and hung them on a bush and leaned the stick beside them and entered it" (199). Here we see that Isaac cannot truly enter the wilderness until he relinquishes these ties to the "outside"/modern world. Ike enters the
wilderness, which is yet another part of his growth. He learns respect for the land. He throws away the mechanisms of progress, man-made objects, and time itself, and he enters the wilderness--in many ways becoming part of the wilderness. In fact, he is so competent at reading the signs of the forest, that he is able to rely entirely on the wisdom Sam Fathers has imparted to him. He gives himself over to it, rather than fighting or trying to conquer it. Instead, he relies upon the teaching of Sam Fathers (the representative of nature and it's keeper): "When he realized he was lost, he did as Sam had coached and drilled him: made a cast to cross his back-track…. He did next as Sam had coached and drilled him" (199). Yet even in all of his "moving, not hurrying, running, but merely keeping pace," he continues to be in motion that appears to be taking him nowhere, yet in this moment he witnesses the bear. "It did not emerge, appear: it was just there, immobile." Then "it faded, sank back into the wilderness without motion" (200). Ike's motion seems to be futile here as he is going about in circles, but in fact his motion enables him to "see" the bear. He's not blind to nature, which man is a part of. In fact, the bear represents nature, while simultaneously representing man. Once more this idea of equating man with nature reminds us of the inclusive Native worldview that Leslie Marmon Silko describes. In Go Down, Moses, the bear becomes the man/nature figure that is aligned with Native Americans. The bear is vanishing just like the Indians in Faulkner's wilderness. In this textual moment, Ike "sees" humanity through the bear. He is capable of seeing through a Native perspective because of the teachings of Sam Fathers. Unlike young Chick in Intruder in the Dust who is unable to see Lucas's humanity, Ike is given knowledge. He understands humanity, even in nature. But even
in this moment of receiving knowledge, the bear and what he represents is fading, sinking back into the wilderness without movement. The Bear, since "he's the head bear" is viewed as "the man" (190). This Bear-man in Faulkner's story is equal to another race that Faulkner presents as vanishing. The bear becomes the personification of the land, a symbol of the wilderness, all of which is vanishing with the Natives. Movement for Faulkner is a representation of progress and life; therefore, the lack of it equals death or non-endurance.

The story of "The Bear" climaxes when Major de Spain and the other hunters find a doe and fawn killed near their campground. Major de Spain says, "'It was Old Ben…I'm disappointed in him. He has broken the rules. I didn't think he would have done that…. But now he has come into my house and destroyed my property, out of season too. He broke the rules. It was Old Ben, Sam.' Still Sam said nothing" (Faulkner, Go Down 205). Once more the bear is equated with man. Major de Spain thinks he can rightfully kill Old Ben (the bear) for coming into an area that was originally Old Ben's roaming grounds. For Major de Spain, the bear has broken the rules that Anglos have applied to property. These rules include the recognition of boundaries on a natural landscape. The unnaturalness of this ideology is shown here as the bear clearly does not adhere to Major de Spain's rules of staying off the Anglos' property. Rules and boundaries become foolish in this context as we see how incredibly constructed these ideas are in the Anglo worldview and their understanding of themselves as separate from or alien to landscape, rather than as part of it. The irony here is that the Anglos actually "destroyed the rules" or created the rules when they came upon the Americas and
American Indian "property." Or perhaps another way to interpret this is that the Anglo-Americans imposed their on rules on the landscape, rules that were alien to the Natives. Rules that turned nature and man into property. A thought process that was alien to Native Americans before contact, as I pointed out in chapter one with Eric Cheyfitz's argument regarding White law.

The vanishing of the frontier, the bear, and the Indian come together as Ike reflects upon this moment in the wilderness with the hunters, just prior to the killing of Old Ben:

Later, a man, the boy realized what it had been, and that Sam had known all the time what had made the tracks and what had torn the throat out of the doe in the spring and killed the fawn. It had been foreknowledge in Sam's face that morning. And he was glad.... He told himself. He was old. He had no children, no people, none of his blood anywhere. For seventy years now he had had to be a negro. It was almost over now and he was glad. (Faulkner, Go Down 206)

After Old Ben is killed, Sam Fathers simply lays down to die. He is described as follows:

"He lay there--the copper-brown, almost hairless body… the wild man not even one generation from the woods, childless, kinless, peopleless, motionless" (236). Like the myth of the vanishing Indian, Sam Fathers fulfills this role in Go Down, Moses.

Boon Hogganback, who is one-quarter Chickasaw, prepares Sam's body for burial. Sadly, Boon is also symbolically responsible for Sam's death in that he is the one who ultimately kills the bear. Thus, Boon continues the legacy of doom and ill will upon himself and his Native people. Elmo Howell argues that "The death of Sam Fathers in William Faulkner's 'The Bear' marks the passing of the wilderness from north Mississippi. It also reflects Faulkner's indifference to historical accuracy, for in his
account of Sam's funeral he confuses the customs of the Chickasaw and the Choctaw Indians, the two major tribes that occupied what is now the state of Mississippi" (257).

While I agree with Howell that Faulkner's indifference to historical accuracy is evident here, I think what is more important is Faulkner's descriptive details of Sam's funeral which shows Faulkner's attempts to integrate a genuine cultural ritual of a Southeastern tribe. Howell further notes that "The Chickasaw Indians were a practical people and buried their dead as soon as possible in the most convenient place. The Choctaws probably furnished the idea for the platform. Their funeral rite was elaborate, the most curious and distinctive of all their ceremonies" (257-258). Here once again we see Faulkner taking authorial agency and conflating the two Southeastern tribes. Yet, much like Howe's moving description of the bone-picking ceremony in Shell Shaker, Boon's attentions to Sam's body and the ritualistic process are presented with emotion and sensitivity in Go Down, Moses.

The preparation of earth and body are presented here:

The low mound of unannealed earth where Boon's spade-marks still showed and beyond the grave the platform of freshly cut saplings bound between four posts and the blanket-wrapped bundle upon the platform and Boon and the boy squatting between the platform and the grave until Boon, the bandage removed, ripped, from his head so that the long scoriations of Old Ben's claws resembled crusted tar in the sunlight, sprang…. (Faulkner, Go Down 241-242)

Boon tells McCaslin: "This is the way he wanted it. He told us. He told us exactly how to do it. And by God you aint going to move him. So we did it like he said, and I been sitting here ever since to keep the damn wildcats and varmints away from him and by God--"… (242). Through this traditional funeral, Sam's identification is clearly aligned
with his Native culture, rather than his African one. Recalling Howe's depiction of the Choctaw funerary practices in *Shell Shaker*, Sam Fathers' platform burial reminds us of Shakbatina's funeral and the bone picker that comes to release her spirit. Boon acts as the overseer in the same way that Koi Chitto does in *Shell Shaker*. With the ritual complete, Sam can now peacefully move into the afterlife.

The living are the ones who cannot escape the sorrow though. And in the final conversations between McCaslin and Ike, the dispossession, "bequeathment," and relinquishment of the land occurs. McCaslin questions Ike,

Relinquish. You, the direct male descendant of him who saw the opportunity and took it, bought the land, took the land, got the land no matter how, held it to bequeath, no matter how, out of the old grant, the first patent, when it was a wilderness of wild beasts and wilder men, and cleared it, translated it into something to bequeath…. Not only the male descendant but the only and last descendant in the male line…you think you can repudiate. (Faulkner, *Go Down* 245)

And Ike humbly replies

I cant repudiate it. It was never mine to repudiate. It was never Father's and Uncle Buddy's to bequeath me to repudiate because it was never Grandfather's to bequeath them to bequeath me to repudiate because it was never old Ikkemotubbe's to sell to Grandfather for bequeathment and repudiation. Because it was never Ikkemotubbe's fathers' fathers' to bequeath Ikkemotubbe to sell to Grandfather or any man because on the instant when Ikkemotubbe discovered, realized, that he could sell it for money, on that instant it ceased ever to have been his forever, father to father to father, and the man who bought nothing. (Faulkner, *Go Down* 245-246).

In "A Justice," when Grandfather Compson asks Quentin what he and Sam Fathers were discussing he replies, "Nothing." This nothing that is the land--this nothing that is Sam Fathers's genealogy is actually *everything*. Ike recognizes that land cannot be held in property. His attitude toward land is like the Native attitude prior to contact. It is the
pre-capitalistic attitude that will not be passed on or transferred to another because Ike is and will remain the last in his line. And as Ike says, "Sam Fathers set me free" (286). Ike is ultimately set free of the curse that is upon his family, the Natives, and the land. He is released from the curse of capitalism through the tutelage of Sam Fathers.

Returning to LeAnne Howe's term tribalography which began this chapter, we can see how a reading of Faulkner through the lens of tribalography helps us not only understand differing cultures and perspectives more clearly, but we come to understand the presentation of these differences and the ways history can be rethought, (re)membered, and rewritten. I have worked here to show that Faulkner's concept of time is closely aligned with the Native notion of cyclical time--the ever presentness of the past. In addition, Faulkner's attempts to present cyclical time works like "clock-work" until he attempts to present members from his own class/race/gender. In other words, while Faulkner has the perspective of "Other," and he's writing about a different cultural group, he can present characters with transcendental enduring qualities. Yet, when he looks inward and presents the white, male Southerner, the fluidity of storying is replaced with linearity. This linearity thus takes all men toward their doom because in a linear space there is a beginning and there will be an end.

Faulkner's Indians though at times surviving in a cyclical space, ultimately become trapped in linear time in Yoknapatawpha. As Sam tells stories to young Quentin in "A Justice," we begin realizing that the Native storyteller no longer has a Native audience; instead, his audience has been replaced with linearity itself in the form of a young white boy. Moreover, Sam's prodigy in *Go Down, Moses* does not have Sam's
blood in his veins. Rather, Sam finds himself teaching the codes of the wilderness to another young white boy, Ike. Sam has no family, nor children of his own to foster. With his death, the Indian vanishes away along with the wilderness landscape.

Walter Taylor explores the ideas Faulkner had towards his Native characters in his article "Yoknapatawpha's Indians: A Novel Faulkner Never Wrote." Yet, unfortunately, we'll never know how Faulkner's Indian novel may have ended, but we can guess that the ultimate "history" of the Yoknapatawpha Indians would have been strikingly different than LeAnne Howe's contemporary characters. Even though Faulkner presented his Indians as vanishing, they were indeed a part of his Southern tales. And in reading American literature throughout the twentieth century, we see that one thing does endure and that is the Native voice. In 1815, William Ellery Channing put forth that the oral literature of the Aborigines is a model for a distinctive national literature in that it represents their unique worldview. The language of the Native becomes the "very element for poetry" (Channing 313). As early Americanists tried to create a national government and literature, time and again they turned to Native models. Perhaps today if we turn to alternative models of thinking, such as Native tribalography, we can illuminate our ways of reading and seeing American literature and history in the twenty-first century.
Southern Literatures and the Twenty-First Century: Enduring or Becoming?

Throughout this project I call attention to the ways we can dismantle the concept of the Southern master narrative and expand our imaginings of southeastern America. The South has never been just a space for African Americans and Anglo-Americans. While this project draws attention to this and offers a triangulated view of South that would include American Indian voices; it is also crucial to think of the implications in the twenty-first century of the Hispanic population in the South. In researching the material for this project, I have become increasingly aware of the shifting demographics in the American South. The idea proposed here of a polyvocal South needs to be extended to include other voices, including those of Asian Americans, Latinos and Latinas, and other voices that comprise the South. In just the past ten years, rural Southern communities have experienced interesting changes due to the influx of migrant Hispanic workers. In addition, Louisiana has experienced a significant growth in its Asian American population due to the fishing industry. Looking at migrations occurring in the twenty-first century South would illuminate the multi-vocal region that I am currently extending and exploring in American literary studies.

This dissertation explores the movements across the American landscape, including the removal of the Cherokee and Choctaw Nations and the Great Migration of African Americans. One unexplored area of this study is the migration of Anglo-Americans from the South as well. As we broaden our approach to the voices comprising
the South, it is also necessary to broaden the boundaries. Not only can our physical bodies move across landscapes, but our constructed boundaries of these landscapes can also move. Oklahoma, though often mentioned throughout this project, is a geographic space that deserves more attention. As a space constructed as "Indian Territory," Oklahoma has a rich history. Oklahoma is a state that ultimately brings displaced "Southern" peoples together once again in contact and in a state of community. In contemporary novels, like Toni Morrison's *Paradise* (1997) or Jewell Parker Rhodes's *Magic City* (1997), Oklahoma becomes a contested site where multi-ethnic "Southern" exiles converge in the hopes of inventing a new regional, and national, community. Exploring Oklahoma's history, including its naming and initial Native "residents," while also looking at its landscape as a "new" home for numerous Native nations can extend our conceptualization of South. Moreover, the Tulsa race riots of 1921 that Parker Rhodes addresses in *Magic City* can once more offer a historical space that parallels and juxtaposes the Native American, African American, and Anglo-American experiences. Through exploring the history and literature of this state, Oklahoma can offer a new way to look at Southern communities and literatures because Oklahoma offers a model that is very Southern in kind. As the literature of the South is in some sense a literature of exile, we can even locate our idea of a "New, New South" in a region that is itself not geographically in the South.

Broadening the boundaries of Southern literatures can also allow us to escape fixed notions of regionalism. Peter Applebome's book *Dixie Rising: How the South is Shaping American Values, Politics, and Culture* is an interesting study in the ways values
and ideals traditionally associated with the Southern region have extended throughout "middle" America. Because of our current political situation in the United States, it is clear that the ideologies of the South are not bound to a fixed geographical region. A view of the South can necessarily be identified with Americanness itself. Applebome says, "American life is being defined in the political middle where North and South, liberal and conservative, secular and religious, old and new intersect" (347). While at times Applebome's work can be problematic, he does make interesting points about our nation's current imagining of itself. And in the afterword of his book, he makes a striking comment regarding race relations in America. Quoting a man from the 1997 Popham Seminar, an annual seminar held by civil rights activists that "tends to be nearly all white," Applebome notes,

> At the meeting's close, Egerton, who has a preacher's passion for the South's moral burden on race, got up and quietly noted that in the end it falls to the South more than any other region to redeem both itself and the rest of the nation on race. "If there's anyone out there who knows what segregation is, what separate but equal is, it's us," he said. "We've been down that road, and we know what's there. And God help us, if we decide to go there again." (352)

This quote seems a fitting one to end this project. I began this project discussing ways that the South has become the "National Other." It is a marginal space, a wasteland if you will, where the entire nation can place its racial problems and conflicts. As I stated in the introduction of this project, the South, largely, is the place where Americans can locate their prejudice, racism, hatred and violence of the "other." It becomes the space that holds the racial tension of the entire nation. If this is the case, then we as literary scholars of Southern literatures have a responsibility to address this "moral burden on
race." If the South must "redeem both itself and the rest of the nation on race," then a fitting place to begin is by reevaluating our "Southern narrative," histories, labels, and constructs. It is time that a shift occurs in Southern studies so that this microcosm of America can be more representative of the very voices that speak to it and inform it. All voices from southeastern America need to be included in this shared narrative that is "the South" and ultimately America, too.

\[1\] J. Anthony Paredes uses this term in *Anthropologists and Indians in the New South* (2001) as he discusses the defining factors of the Old South, the New South, and what he and others (including myself) are proposing to move towards: a New, New South.

\[2\] The photographs and images in the exhibit "are part of the Allen/Littlefield Collection, and are on deposit in the Special Collections Department, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University" (Without Sanctuary). The title of this exhibit alludes to William Faulkner's work *Sanctuary*; ultimately, suggesting *Sanctuary* can come for the whites of the American South, but not African Americans.

\[3\] Pub. by Harkrider Drug Co., Center, Tex.

\[4\] Kelley begins his *A Different Drummer* with an epigraph from Henry David Thoreau's *Walden* that includes the selection from which Kelley took the title of his novel.

\[5\] Kelley's choice of naming here is an allusion to Shakespeare's famous character Caliban in *The Tempest*.

\[6\] At this point in her article, Harris notes that "By 'white supremacy' I do not mean to allude only to the self-conscious racism of white supremacist hate groups. I refer instead to a political, economic, and cultural system in which whites overwhelmingly control power and material resources, conscious and unconscious ideas of white superiority and entitlement are widespread, and relations of white dominance and non-white subordination are daily reenacted across a broad array of institutions and social settings" (1714). I find this distinction of "white supremacy" profoundly important and have chosen to cite it here to further point to the importance of the power systems that she is describing in her argument.

\[7\] The presentness of the blues discussed here will become particularly important in my chapter on William Faulkner's understanding of history and time, and the continual presentness of narrative.

\[8\] Thadious Davis makes an interesting argument regarding the ellipses in the ledgers of *Go Down, Moses* that I discuss in chapter four of this project on William Faulkner.

\[9\] See Kenneth Lincoln's *Indi'n Humor: Bicultural Play in Native America* for an in-depth study of the uses of American Indian humor in ethnic literatures.

\[10\] See Duane Champagne's *Social Order and Political Change: Constitutional Governments Among the Cherokee, the Choctaw, the Chickasaw, and the Creek* for a complete description of the Green Corn ceremony among the different southeastern tribes. Champagne points out that "As in Cherokee society, each year the [Choctaw] community was purified by participation in the Green Corn ceremony. Since all debts and difficulties were supposed to be settled before the cleansing ceremony, most transgressions of personal conduct were purified by the annual absolution" (18). In addition, in Howe's novel, Tema, Auda's sister, explains that "Women are the essence of Mother Earth. We create life and during Green Corn, we shake shells to reconnect with all living things" (Howe, *Shell Shaker* 152). So through these two descriptions we can view the ceremony as one of absolution and reconnection.

\[11\] Here is one link between the South and Oklahoma—the presentness of the past is evident in the landscape. Also, Harjo's poem "New Orleans" discusses the Mississippi River and the linkage to Oklahoma. See the afterword of this project for a discussion of this linkage between the South and Oklahoma.
This argument regarding geography arises from Mary Pat Brady's discussion of "literary production" and the "spatial practices of capitalism" in her article "Specular Morality, the War on Drugs, and Anxieties of Visibility" in Making Worlds (111).

This term was coined by D.L. Birchfield in his work The Oklahoma Basic Intelligence Test: New and Collected Elementary, Epistolary, Autobiographical, and Oratorical Choctologies.

Howe states, "The word Osano, used in the novel to mean 'horsefly' or 'bloodsucker' comes from a song by Choctaw Sidney Wesley, recorded by ethnomusicologist Frances Densmore about January 1933" (Shell Shaker 226). The first time we see Howe use the term in the novel, a character is describing De Soto, but Red Shoes and Redford McAlester later become labeled Osanos, too. Please see the "Author Note" at the end of Shell Shaker for a longer explanation of Howe's use of this term.

Regarding this Choctaw term, Howe tells us, "Some liberties have been taken with the Choctaw language in the novel. I use the verb itilauichi, meaning 'to even,' as a noun for 'Autumnal Equinox.' After studying the historical Choctaw calendar names in Byington's dictionary and in his papers at the Smithsonian, as well as Henry S. Halbert's articles on the Choctaw language and culture, I reasoned that there may have been many phrases used by early eighteenth-century Choctaws for the equinoxes that have fallen out of use" (Shell Shaker 225).

This idea stems from a personal conversation about Native American politics and literatures with Dr. Paula Gunn Allen. As we discussed different issues in Indian country, Gunn Allen explained that it was impossible for American Indians to be pacifists because of their place (or lack thereof) in U.S. politics. I am drawing on Dr. Gunn Allen's beliefs here to explain what I argue Howe is suggesting in her novel.

Howe appears to be offering a critique of more recent Choctaw history as well in her depiction of Chief Redford McAlester. There are striking parallels between the story of McAlester and his sexual assault on Auda and the more recent chief of the Choctaw tribe, Chief Hollis Roberts. In 1997, Roberts was "charged with seven felony counts of sexual misconduct involving three women…. The acts allegedly occurred between 1990 and 1993 at the Durant headquarters of the nation's third-largest American Indian tribe." Roberts was also brought up on charges in 1982 "that he misappropriated $10,700 in tribal funds. The jury in that case deadlocked, and Roberts later pleaded guilty to two misdemeanor counts" (Jury Seated 2).

In the beginning of Shell Shaker, Shakbatina uses this chant as she approaches her death. This chant means "the people are ever living, ever dying, ever alive!" (Howe, Shell Shaker 5).

In her book Games of Property, Thadious Davis comments that "Tomey's Turl's textualized origin appears to be a word game analogous to the Sphinx's riddle that Oedipus solves. His lineage is embedded in the 'facts' and the ellipses bound and recorded riddle-like in the McCaslin commissary ledgers and 'decoded' in the winter of 1883-1884 by another grandson of Carothers McCaslin, Isaac 'Ike' McCaslin, a boy of sixteen, who functions as a detective solving a crime puzzle and as a reader creating meaning in a fashion similar to Quentin Compson in Absalom, Absalom!.… Turl's birth is signified by the words of the text, and both his father's identity and his father's incestuous rape of his mother are interpreted from the silences and ellipses within the text" (14).

See Cheryl Harris's article "Whiteness As Property" for an in-depth discussion of ethnicity/race as property.

While Stephen Greenblatt's thesis in Marvelous Possessions is often critiqued for being too sympathetic to Columbus, Greenblatt does agree with Todorov's thesis regarding Columbus's reading of signs in the New World: "As Tzvetan Todorov has shrewdly remarked, Columbus was less an intense observer than an intense reader of signs, and the details that he notes here as elsewhere are not attempts to record the world as it presented itself to his eyes but compilations of significant markers" (86).

See Annette Kolodny's The Lay of the Land.
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