

Cultural Hegemony, Identity, and the Story of the Catawba Nation

by

Jefferson Locke Fortner

June, 2012

Chair: Dr. Ellen Arnold

Department: English

The Catawba Indians, in order to maintain their own identity as an “other” culture, utilized a course of acceptance and collaboration with the Euro-American majority that came to surround them, while ultimately developing a dynamic use of “storytelling”—to establish their own “Living Culture,” and to successfully cope with the challenges they faced versus the status quo of the dominant culture. After, necessarily, having to adapt to the realities of the new society, and setting a course for survival as a sub-culture within that society, the Catawbas have utilized these storytelling techniques to engage in such diverse venues as the Federal Court system—during their recent struggle to regain federal recognition as an American Indian Tribe—as well as the culture at large, in cases of performance in and reaction to the White, Eurocentric interpretation of their role in the overall culture.

Cultural Hegemony, Identity, and the Story of the Catawba Nation

A Thesis

Presented To

the Faculty of the Department of English

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of the Arts

by

Jefferson Locke Fortner

June, 2012

Copyright © 2012

Jefferson Locke Fortner

Cultural Hegemony, Identity, and the Story of the Catawba Nation

By

Jefferson Locke Fortner

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF THESIS: _____
Ellen L. Arnold, PhD

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____
Richard Taylor, PhD

COMMITTEE MEMBER: _____
Andrea Kitta, PhD

CHAIR OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH: _____
Jeffrey Johnson, PhD

DEAN OF THE
GRADUATE SCHOOL: _____
Paul J. Gemperline, PhD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	vi
INTRODUCTION: THE IMPOSITION OF BRITISH NORMS OF IDENTITY UPON THE CATAWBAS.....	1
CHAPTER 1: STORYTELLING WITHIN A LIVING CULTURE: AN EXPLORATION OF SOME CATAWBA TEXTS	7
CHAPTER 2: THE WORLD’S A STAGE: CONFLICTING WORLD VIEWS AND PERFORMING IDENTITIES	27
CHAPTER 3: THE STORY OF THE CATAWBAS: FEDERAL RECOGNITION AND CULTURAL RECONCILIATION.....	42
CONCLUSION	56
APPENDIX: INTERVIEW WITH BECKEE GARRIS	58
WORKS CITED	81

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: ARTICLE FROM *WHITEHALL EVENING POST OR LONG INTELLIGENCER* ...3

FIGURE 2: NEWSPAPER CLIPPINGS FROM *THE CHARLOTTE OBSERVER*41

INTRODUCTION

THE IMPOSITION OF BRITISH NORMS OF IDENTITY UPON THE CATAWBA

In November 1761, a news article appeared in the following London newspapers: *Lloyd's Evening Post and British Chronicle*, *Public Ledger*, *St. James's Chronicle or the British Evening Post*, and the *Whitehall Evening Post or London Intelligencer*. The article covered the treaty terms presented by Col. James Grant of the British Army to Attakullakulla and other chiefs, or Ukus (Uku: translated as “First Beloved Man”), of the Cherokee Indians. The newspapers each covered, to various extents, the details of the negotiations. The *Whitehall Evening Post or London Intelligencer* provided the most thorough level of detail concerning the events of that day.

As background to these articles, it should be noted that the treaty negotiations were the conclusion to what is now known as the Anglo-Cherokee War of 1758-1761, but was referred to by the British authorities and colonial settlers of the time as the Cherokee Uprisings, and by the Cherokees as “The War with Those in the Red Coats.” Colonel Grant had led the final expedition against the Cherokees. This conflict was concurrent with some of the years in which the British were involved in the Seven Years War of 1756-1763 (alternately known as The French and Indian War). During the first part of this conflict between the British and the French, the Cherokees, along with most other Southeastern Tribes, had been allies with the British. However, the Cherokees turned against the British due to various incidents of mistreatment. Still, the Cherokees were never in formal alliance with the French, and the Anglo-Cherokee War found them fighting separately against the British—in addition to fighting the other Southeastern

tribes that had remained allied to the British. At first, the Cherokees battled successfully, clearing British/American settlements over a large area and seizing Fort Loudon, but Grant's retaliatory expedition, in which over a dozen Cherokee towns were razed and crops were burned, established a stalemate, with the British poised for another operation. Attakullakulla and the other Cherokee Ukus were sent to negotiate treaty terms.

Although the extent of details concerning the treaty conference provided by each of the London papers varies, one aspect of the reported negotiations is consistent with each paper: the terms of the treaty offered by Grant, which is presented word for word. The following image, from the *Whitehall Evening Post or London Intelligencer*, captures the British Terms for Peace as the London reading audience would have seen it at the time. Notice article 8, concerning the Catawba Indians (my highlighting), which provides an interesting aspect of the terms for this treaty. The Chickasaw Indians, who at the time were living in a region composed of parts of Alabama and Tennessee (the Chickasaw were removed in 1837), and the Catawba Indians of South Carolina were to be treated by the Cherokees as white men. (See Figure 1)

1. Four Cherokee Indians shall be delivered up to be put to Death in the Front of the Camp; or four green Scalps to be brought in, in 12 Nights from that Day.

2. Fort Loudon, with all its Cannon, &c. shall be delivered up to whatever Garrison the English shall think proper to send thither, either from Virginia or South Carolina.

3. All the Prisoners, Horses, &c. taken from us shall be delivered up as soon as possible.

4. The English shall be at Liberty to build Forts in any Part of the Cherokee Country they shall think proper, for the Protection of their Traders; and have as much Land about such Forts, for Planting and Pasturage, as the Garrisons shall think necessary; which Lands shall not be trespassed on by the Indians.

5. If a Cherokee kills a white Man, the Headman of the Town to which he belongs shall put the Murderer to Death as soon as he is found: If a white Man kills an Indian, they shall not take Satisfaction themselves, but deliver him to the Commander of the nearest Fort, who shall send him down to Charles-Town; and if condemned, some of the Cherokees may see him executed if they please.

6. No Frenchman shall be suffered to come into the Cherokee Country: If any should come, the Indians are to assist, or at least not to prevent, our taking them.

7. The Traders shall not be molested. If the Indians receive any Injuries from them, they are to lay their Complaints before the Governor of Carolina, who will redress their Grievances.

8. The Chicalaw and Carawba Indians are to be considered as white Men, and included in these Articles accordingly.

9. As soon as these Articles shall be finally concluded and ratified by the Governor at Charles-Town, all the Cherokee Prisoners in our Possession shall be brought to Kchowæ and delivered up; and Traders shall be sent up with Goods to supply the Wants of the needy and necessitous Cherokees, which they will exchange for Skins, Furs, &c.

Figure 1

It is interesting to note that the first permanent settlement in what was to become the British colony of South Carolina was in 1670. During the following ninety-one years of occupation and expansion the British had succeeded in establishing cultural hegemony over what was to become the Southeastern United States. By 1761 this cultural hegemony had become pervasive enough that the only specific terms that mentions their Indian allies in this treaty ending the Anglo-Cherokee War is the notion that the Catawbas (and the Chickasaw) “are to be considered as white Men.” The terms are not used in the other direction; the British are not to be considered as Indian. Although we learn from other parts of the article that the Catawbas also gathered some rewards that the British gave them at the close of the treaty conference, we can only assume that the Catawbas, having established their distinction, were satisfied that the “other” Indians, the Cherokees, now had to consider the Catawbas “as white Men.”

This focus upon being officially treated as “white Men” was to be an ongoing concern of the Catawba Indians. Through the years they often did what was necessary to identify themselves with the clearly more powerful European settlers. Having gained the confidence of the Europeans by their co-operation during the Seven Years War and the Anglo-Cherokee War, the Catawbas continued to be valuable allies. Although tensions existed, the Catawba Nation adapted to the European presence predominantly by adapting their behavior. At times, this adaptation was for appearances’ sake only. The historian James Merrell, reflecting in 1984 upon the Catawbas’ tendency to “appear” to adapt to European expectations, notes that during the Revolutionary War, the “Catawbas rose even higher in their neighbors' esteem when they began calling their chiefs ‘General’ instead of ‘King’ and stressed that these men were elected by the people. The change reflected little if any real shift in the Nation's political forms, but it delighted the victorious Revolutionaries” (“Catawba Experience” 561).

However, over time the Catawbas' role of ally to the European settlers began to diminish. First, the Seven Years War ended the threat to the settlers from France, and then the Revolutionary War eliminated the British Government. Next, the Removal of the Cherokees and other tribes left the Catawbas with fewer options as to which groups to be differentiated from—with one major exception. The problem came to be one of having to maintain their separate identity as Indians, but also needing to maintain their closer proximity to whites than to “others.” In another article, Merrell, commenting upon the anthropological writings of Frank Speck concerning the Catawbas, notes that:

The “Catawbas—the third race in a biracial system, and no longer of any real use to the dominant white population—managed to survive in nineteenth-century South Carolina . . . [by] . . . walking a tightrope between neighboring whites and blacks, a balancing act that required sophisticated understanding of an often hostile environment. To retain its separate identity the Nation constantly had to remind whites that Catawbas were neither black nor white . . . survival dictated that adults on the reservation educate their white neighbors about Indian identity just as the natives educated their own children. (“Catawba Studies” 256)

In essence, the Catawbas may be trying to maintain their own identity, but they are still adopting the hegemonic culture of the European settlers, which is the culture of a slave-holding South. Although there is no currently known direct record of the actual concerns and opinions of any member of the Catawbas concerning these changes in their societal dynamics at the time, Merrell notes the change in behavior in the Catawbas as they accept the values of the dominant Whites:

In the nineteenth-century South it was not enough to act like peaceful “Indians” and befriend whites; one also had to hate blacks. Here, too, Indians on the

reservation managed to meet the expectations of the dominant society. In the colonial period Catawbas had treated blacks as whites, adopting some and killing others depending upon particular circumstances. By the Civil War, however, the Indians had learned the racial realities of American life, recognized the danger of being lumped with Afro-Americans, and began to draw boundaries placing Indians and whites on one side of a racial barrier and blacks on the other.

(“Catawba Studies” 256-57)

Whatever the value system that the Southeastern Indians held at the time of contact, it is apparent that within a short time frame the British had successfully planted in the region a colonial society, along with a colonial hegemony. The cultural understandings and proto-institutions of the native southeastern tribes had been superseded by the establishment of British venues for interaction. The 1761 article in the London papers clearly shows that the Southeastern Tribes had accepted British norms as the standards upon which peace would be negotiated, trade would be conducted, and the value of identity would be based. In response, scholars theorize that the Catawba Indians, in order to maintain their own identity as an “other” culture, utilized a course of acceptance and collaboration with the Euro-American majority that came to surround them, while ultimately developing a dynamic use of storytelling in order to “educate their white neighbors about Indian identity” (along with also educating their own children)—which established what Ruth Benedict, writing about the Zuni people of New Mexico (Briscoe 469), would have called their own “Living Culture”—and which allowed them to cope successfully with the challenges they faced versus the status quo of the dominant culture.

CHAPTER 1

STORYTELLING WITHIN A LIVING CULTURE:

AN EXPLORATION OF CHEROKEE AND CATAWBA TEXTS

From the time of our childhoods we all love stories. Our parents and grandparents, our teachers and preachers—and many others within our communities—tell us stories when we are young. Of course, when we tell stories, there are many reasons why we tell them, and there is more involved than just entertainment. For instance, as we listen to “The Three Little Pigs,” and other stories, we learn lessons. In the case of the pigs, the lesson is to take care and do a job right with the right materials. Our parents are quite aware of the lesson involved in the story, and we become aware of the intended lesson either immediately or over time. We should not, however, consider storytelling as an activity limited to children’s tales. Within Indian communities storytelling takes on a much more vital role than in Eurocentric American culture. For Indian communities storytelling is the process wherein the tribe and individuals both preserve their culture and engage in a dialogue with the world; it is a part of their “Living Culture.” As Walter Ong noted in *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*, the shift from an oral-based form of consciousness to one based on writing brings with it a change in the very way humans within a culture think, a process that European culture had undergone millennia before contact with the Americas, but which the Catawbans and other Indigenous tribes are only partially assimilated to. As a result, storytelling remains a vital part of the very thought process of the Catawbans (Bingham, par. 2).

This is not to imply that Indian communities are the only parts of our society engaged in forms of storytelling. Throughout the world there are various ways in which the storytelling

element is used to engage with the world. A project within the United States intended to reach as many citizens as possible is an example in which “oral histories” are being collected and used to help build such engagement and understanding. StoryCorps is a non-profit organization dedicated to allowing as many citizens as possible the opportunity to record and share the stories of their lives. The power of this project lies in the transmission of this idea—the transmission of the meaning of “my life” to you, the listener. A fundamental aspect of the storytelling dynamic involves this dichotomy; Storyteller/Listener. As Dave Isay, a member of StoryCorps, puts it: “Listening is an act of love. . . .It tells people that they matter and that their time on earth meant something, their names won't be forgotten. I think that's all that any of us really wants to know.’ StoryCorps is about listening to people's stories, he says, ‘and it's very, very simple, but it has a power that is enormous’” (Kniffel 42).

StoryCorps visits communities, encouraging pairs of individuals—family members or friends—to interview one another and to listen to one another’s stories. These are not “professional” interviews with scholars. These are life stories shared with those we know. The project began in one community where local kids were encouraged to interview their families. The results were dynamic:

We saw, when these kids did interviews with family members, that the tape recorder gave them the license to talk about things they'd never talked about before. When the tape recorder was turned off, there seemed to be a shift in the relationship, in that there were new lines of communication that had been opened and that lasted far beyond that recording session. When these relatives died in the years after, these tapes became incredibly valuable to those families. (Kniffel 43)

Ultimately, within all communities storytelling can be a powerful force; educating children (and adults) while entertaining, but also allowing the participants to come to an understanding about their lives, and providing a powerful connection with past generations.

Perhaps, in many ways, the nation at large is waking up to the possibilities of storytelling. This is not to say that storytelling hasn't always been a function of Eurocentric American culture. However, in the past Eurocentric culture has focused on specific "disciplines" as forms of storytelling, and was usually loath to label some disciplines as having an oral, or storytelling, component, as in the Social Sciences, such as Anthropology and Sociology, and also in other disciplines, especially in what are called the hard sciences. Now, however, many are coming to view storytelling as a crucial component of all aspects of a culture. For Indian communities this has always been understood. Oral traditions are inherent within the mindset of Indian Nations. They are alive to the many nuances and possibilities of storytelling as a living dynamic, a way to present a living culture—nuances that go well beyond the imagery of two friends sitting around a recording device.

Just as, in some ways, mainstream culture within the U.S. is becoming more aware of the powers of storytelling for transferring meaning, there seems to be a growing awareness of the performative aspects of storytelling. Because of this, mainstream U.S. culture has developed an increased awareness of the nature of Indian storytelling—of its power, and especially of its performative nature. There is a growing awareness of the adaptability of cultures in relation to their traditional tales and to current circumstances. As Scott J. Howard, writing as an observer of Indian culture in his essay "Contemporary American Indian Storytelling: An Outsider's Perspective," notes:

Storytellers not only create new stories but also amend traditional ones that are passed down through the generations, sometimes choosing their own details while retaining the story's fundamental characters, plot, and moral. In addition to lending a framework for the storyteller to work within, oral tradition encourages individuality and creativity. Each storyteller adjusts the story to fit his or her audience and enjoyment stems from the individualistic, performative aspects of storytelling and often the listener delights more in the telling itself. In order to teach and transmit cultural values, a storyteller must have a keen sense of his or her listeners. (Howard 50)

Howard goes on to tell us that, for American Indians:

Storytelling conveys the personal, individual side of a people, something that the analytical categories and constructions of history and anthropology cannot. For an outsider, American Indian oral tradition presents the opportunity to experience the beliefs, wisdom, creativity, and humor of the people indigenous to North America; for Indian people it equips them with a tool to deal with the world in which they live. (Howard 52)

This shouldn't imply that American Indian storytelling is focused simply on tales (updated or not), personal experiences, and the recalling of the life events of the immediately passing generations while neglecting more distant historical events. Although oral traditions may work outside of print-media methods in presenting the past that are utilized by Eurocentric America, the historical context of "our story" is very adequately preserved, even if affected by other cultures. Events such as the Removal of the Cherokees or the Massacre at Wounded Knee are passed down in story very effectively. This presents the storyteller with a dynamic tableau in

which to create. As Bruce Ballenger, writing about N. Scott Momaday's *The Way to Rainy Mountain*, reflects:

The merging of tribal and personal memory also means that the reach of the storyteller's memory extends beyond his own lifetime, her own experience. This memory of a past never directly experienced can, in a sense, become lived experience. For example, Momaday tells the story of Ko-Sahn, an old Kiowa woman, who remembers the great meteor shower of 1833 in great detail. She remembers it not because she actually witnessed it—it occurred many years before she was born—but because it is a part of "racial memory," a way of knowing that defies both time and individual consciousness. (Ballenger 793)

The connection to the past becomes the connection to the present, in a circular, holistic manner that is contrary to some European linear conceptions of history and narration. Clifford Trafzer, a Wyandot author, recognizes this way of thinking about historical events and identity when he notes that among Native Americans:

The stories represent historical actions that provide a creative spark in life, offering significant meanings and interpretations of human action with each other and with the natural environment. . . . They provide knowledge and wisdom through the interactions of the first inhabitants of earth. The stories are meant for all time and for all generations, and each time they are told, they offer a creative force that links today with yesterday. Thus, they are not linear like other historical texts, particularly those of Euroamericans. They are circular, carrying the participants in the stories, the storyteller, and the listeners to a time when the first creative activities emerged on earth. (Trafzer 475)

In accordance with this spirit of understanding the importance of storytelling to American Indian cultures, there has been a long history of trying to come to terms with the various Indian mindsets within the overall culture of America. Many dominant culture observers (such as many anthropologists, but possibly not including other observers, such as folklorists) have noted Indian cultures from the “outside.” They have reported their findings in papers and “collections.” Unfortunately, the very dynamic of this exchange is one of “fixing” Indian Culture as a subset of American Culture, and in creating a quaint minority report. This is a dynamic that leaves the Indian Nations subject to the predominant mores. It forces a specific image of how *the* Indian Nation (as opposed to the multitude of tribes and cultures) is expected to act, and sets up the framework, legally and culturally, of what their place in society is. This dynamic can be challenged, and is being challenged, through storytelling.

Storytelling can be an act of outreach, reaching across divides between ethnic/racial groupings, but it can also serve as a tool to break into the awareness of the dominant culture and to recast the mindset confronted there. Increasingly, one such use of storytelling is in challenges to the U.S. legal system. Storytelling is being used to challenge the long history of broken treaties, to call attention to issues of sovereignty and poverty, and to point out the inherent bias of the mainstream culture against adequate adjustments to the current societal dynamics.

Richard Delgado, the originator and proponent of Critical Race Theory, is an advocate for minority uses of storytelling in the Black community, and especially within the U.S. legal system. His comments easily apply to such efforts by American Indians:

In civil rights, for example, many in the majority hold that any inequality between blacks and whites is due either to cultural lag, or inadequate enforcement of currently existing beneficial laws—both of which are easily correctable. For many

minority persons, the principal instrument of their subordination is neither of these. Rather, it is the prevailing mindset by means of which members of the dominant group justify the world as it is, that is, with whites on top and browns and blacks at the bottom. (Delgado 2313)

Delgado goes on to recommend the power of storytelling to counter this prevailing mindset:

Stories, parables, chronicles, and narratives are powerful means for destroying mindset—the bundle of presuppositions, received wisdoms, and shared understandings against a background of which legal and political discourse takes place. These matters are rarely focused on. They are like eyeglasses we have worn a long time. They are nearly invisible; we use them to scan and interpret the world and only rarely examine them for themselves. Ideology—the received wisdom—makes current social arrangements seem fair and natural. Those in power sleep well at night—their conduct does not seem to them like oppression. (Delgado 2413-14)

Ultimately, Delgado advocates the aggressive use of “counterstories” to challenge the conventional thinking of the dominant culture, and to assure that alternative versions of history and alternative ways of being are heard.

Craig Womack, in his book *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*, seems to concur with Delgado, at least as far as the need for Indian voices to be heard:

Whatever we might say about the inherent problems concerning what constitutes an Indian viewpoint, we can still reasonably assert that such a viewpoint exists and has been silenced throughout U.S. history to the degree that it finally needs to be heard. Whatever one might argue about postmodern representation, there is the

legal reality of tribal sovereignty, recognized by the U.S. Constitution and defined over the last 160 Years by the Supreme Court, that affects the everyday lives of individuals and tribal nations and, therefore, has something to do with tribal literatures as well. (Womack 6)

Womack goes on to challenge the dominant culture's very perception of Indians and their role in society by noting that "we are not mere victims but active agents in history, innovators of new ways, of Indian ways, of thinking and being and speaking and authoring in this world created by colonial contact" (Womack 6).

As mentioned, many cultural anthropologists have observed American Indian storytelling, have filed numerous reports and articles, and published "collections" of what they have found. Working for various institutions, their work has been valuable at times for what they have done right, preserving in print native languages that were dead or dying, and recording the tales and folkways of the American Tribes with which they worked. Much of this work was done at the end of the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth century, when the anthropological "collecting" of material was in vogue. Since then—in the last few decades of the twentieth century until now—an awareness that the more dynamic aspects of storytelling discussed earlier should be reflected in collections of "stories" has led to new works being printed that are more fully representative of the material and how it is performed. Most importantly—other than the broader content of the material now preserved—the techniques of ethnopoetics have been utilized to more fully capture the full flavor of the individual storyteller's performance in print. To highlight this development, an exploration of some of the older material versus the approach of ethnopoetics will present some of the strengths of these new collections.

James Mooney was an employee of the U.S. Bureau of American Ethnology. Working in the field in the late nineteenth century, his collection, *Myths of the Cherokee*, was published by the Bureau in 1900. Mooney was able to preserve several stories, such as “What the Stars are Like,” in which a hunting party finds “two strange creatures about so large (making a circle with outstretched arms), with round bodies covered with fine fur or downy feathers, from which small heads stuck out like the heads of terrapins. As the breeze played upon these feathers showers of sparks flew out.” The story, as Mooney has gathered it, finishes in this way:

The hunters carried the strange creatures back to the camp, intending to take them home to the settlements on their return. They kept them several days and noticed that every night they would grow bright and shine like great stars, although by day they were only balls of gray fur, except when the wind stirred and made the sparks fly out. They kept very quiet, and no one thought of their trying to escape, when, on the seventh night, they suddenly rose from the ground like balls of fire and were soon above the tops of the trees. Higher and higher they went, while the wondering hunters watched, until at last they were only two bright points of light in the dark sky, and then the hunters knew that they were stars. (Mooney 9)

Mooney is also able to present examples of tribal history, as in this excerpt from “Hemp-carrier”:

On the southern slope of the ridge, along the trail from Robbinsville to Valley river, in Cherokee county, North Carolina, are the remains of a number of stone cairns. The piles are leveled now, but thirty years ago the stones were still heaped up into pyramids, to which every Cherokee who passed added a stone. According to the tradition these piles marked the graves of a number of women and children

of the tribe who were surprised and killed on the spot by a raiding party of the Iroquois shortly before the final peace between the two Nations. (Mooney 95)

Unfortunately, in both excerpts the reader is left asking, “Who said this? Who is the storyteller?” In all instances, we only get Mooney’s example, not the storyteller’s name or any sense of how he or she told it. The histories carry no names, no stories of families or individuals. It is as if Mooney, as a “Salvage” story-gatherer, is only interested in the central narrative, not in the storytellers or their methods, the context of the stories as ceremony or family celebration, or how they are connected to each other in a living body.

Barbara Duncan, writing in the introduction to her more current collection, *Living Stories of the Cherokee*, refers to Mooney’s work, and notes:

Mooney was “salvaging” cultural materials. His employer and publisher, the U.S. Bureau of Ethnology, had sent its staff to actively collect American Indian materials throughout the country because it knew that other agencies in the federal government were trying to acculturate American Indians as rapidly as possible and, in the process, eradicate much of their traditional culture. (Duncan 17)

In other words, Mooney’s primary issue was to save the material that he, and Eurocentric American Scholars in general, perceived as being a part of the past culture of the Cherokees, the “survivals” as folklorists would call them, since Cherokee was a culture that would not be moving forward on its own terms, because official government policy was engaged in the process of the assimilation of the Indian Tribes into the general culture. Concerns over how the stories were being used in their own day or how storytelling could be used to address current issues were not of importance.

Working in the field shortly after Mooney, Frank G. Speck also worked with the Cherokees. In addition, he was involved in further work with the nearby Catawba Nation. Speck made many trips over several decades to visit Catawba speakers. He published work as early as 1913 and as late as the 1940s. In his book, *Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology: Catawba Texts*, Speck's introduction directly states his aims in collecting: "The results of these periods of work are now made available in collected form to remain as a foundation for grammatical analysis of a now defunct Siouan language" (*Catawba Texts* xi).

It is not that Speck is only interested in traditional tales that are being lost. Nor is he necessarily uninterested in individual/family histories of the Catawbas. Rather, this is all unimportant to his primary purpose, which was the anthropological gathering of the last samples of a dying language, not the current mindset of a Living Culture. We do get some tribal history, such as "Revenge on the Shawnee Raiders (II)" (*Catawba Texts* 28) and "The Catawbas Kill a Chickasaw and Put him inside his Horse's Belly (III)" (*Catawba Texts* 29). However, we do not get names and emotions, nor do we get much in the way of personal narrative. A few stories appear in both the book and in his 1913 article recounting his first trip to interview a native Catawba Language speaker. From the article we can examine the first two lines of a story in the Catawbas' language about a personal encounter with the supernatural, which Speck follows by giving a "free translation" of the tale (included in full):

4. HOW THE GHOSTS WERE HEARD DANCING

Istc'ná udniyá ówehé himúsnEráhA tEraikó isáhe

My mother told me (that) she (and) my father were standing outdoors

Free Translation

My mother told me that she and my father were standing outside the door one evening just after sunset. And from across the river, where there used to be an ancient Indian village, they could hear somebody drumming very hard (and people dancing and singing). But there was nobody over there, where all the noise came from. (“Some Catawba Texts” 329-30)

Within the book, once again, Speck is mainly concerned with preserving the language. All of the tales in both the book and the 1913 article come from only four individuals. His work is limited to these four individuals not because of their acumen as storytellers, but because they are the only four living members of the Catawba Nation who once spoke the language as their first language. He goes on to say:

While the literary merit of the Catawba tales and narratives may indeed be low, the same cannot be said of the historical or philological value of the dictations. No more specimens of Catawba speech may henceforth be hoped for from native sources. Regrettable as the circumstances are, the fact remains that scarcely a score of Catawba terms, and these at best badly pronounced, could be recorded from the one hundred remaining members of the tribe now living on and around the reservation. The language is gone. (*Catawba Texts* xii)

Speck does make note of the role that storytelling played with the Catawbans in the past, but he also notes what he perceives as a change in interests among the Catawbans in their own culture:

It was understood by the Catawba of a generation ago that story-telling was intended to develop the mind, to make children think, to teach them the ways of life. It gave them . . . something to think about; otherwise they would lack the

means of developing their minds through the experiences recounted of others concerning human being and animals. (*Catawba Texts* xv)

Speck attributes this change in interest to specific changes in their culture:

With the introduction of schooling upon the Catawba reservation, hardly more than a generation ago, has come a momentous change in the conditions of culture. The younger Indians are a different people from those of even their parents' generation. They possess practically no knowledge of the native tales and traditions which made animal life and nature in general so mysterious to their ancestors. (*Catawba Texts* xiv)

Several years later Speck returned to the Catawbans along with a colleague (L. G. Carr) to record more stories. This time, instead of being primarily interested in the dying language, Speck and Carr recorded stories in English, but the stories of a storyteller, not someone recalling stories. Published as an article in 1947, entitled "Catawba Folk Tales from Chief Sam Blue," Speck and Carr, writing about the collection, focus on what's past and lost:

With the loss of their distinctive legacy of a century past embodied in the oral tradition of a moribund language, the Catawba have lapsed into a state of apathy toward ideas developed by their "uncivilized" ancestors. Secular interests and economic difficulties have throttled the feelings for non-material culture properties that distinguish the thought-horizon of Indian communities almost everywhere. The Catawba people taken as a group now stand somewhere between that lost age of cultural aristocracy and the nameless status of a recent period in which tradition is literally bound up within the covers of the *Book of Mormon*. (Speck and Carr 79)

Continuing to discuss the situation as they understand it, Speck and Carr lament that:

What comes to us now comes more and more by piecemeal, and we can only hope to foregather fragments of native mythology, anecdotes of supernatural associations in biographical narratives here and there and snatches of nature beliefs of which the following short accounts are examples. Thought of the people is no longer framed to harmonize with natural phenomena, with plant values, the habits and physical make-up and behavior of mammals, birds, insects, fish, and reptiles. It has largely succumbed to the outlook of white associates on the realm of nature and the sphere of mankind, maladjusted in the present life of the people. Meanwhile tales of explanation of nature's ways are rarely told or listened to unless they recount episodes of the day and time. The older sources are dwindling with the demise of each individual of the unschooled generation. (Speck and Carr 79-80)

Both passages equate the old stories with true storytelling and bemoan that type of storytelling as a thing in the past that is being lost. Immediately following their comments they give a few stories told by Chief Sam Blue, but transcribed in the same scholarly prose renditions that Mooney used with the Cherokees. There is no sense of how Chief Blue told his stories. The greatest irony is that, as the last introductory comment of their own just before narrating the tales they gathered from the chief, they present a dynamic story about Chief Sam Blue and don't even think to have him narrate his own story for the collection. For just a moment they are close to seeing storytelling within the culture as a living thing:

Mention has been made of Chief Blue's office as elder of the local Church of the Latter-Day-Saints. Some of his narratives that relate to his experience in this

capacity are interesting as examples of living forces active in the contemporary life of the people. One of his favorite themes, for instance, tells how he demonstrated his power as an endowment of an elder in the creed to restore life to the deceased. Once during a period of poverty he brought back life and health to his only cow whose entrails had suddenly one night come loose in her stall and lay in the hay bringing poor bossie to the point of death. Kneeling by her side he fervently prayed the Almighty for power to restore her, then with a stick moved by primitive faith phenomenal he pushed the fly-infested entrails back into place. The next day she was on her feet and permanently recovered. The wonders of nature's miracles performed by Indian shamans of the past have passed into realities in Mormon belief as the horizon of religious creed has changed! (Speck and Carr 80)

Evidentially, although Speck and Carr noticed and acknowledged the new material, they did not consider it worth more than a mention. Still, whatever their focus, storytelling was being used as a current thing, as a Living Culture.

In the work of Barbara Duncan, in her introduction to the 1998 collection *Living Stories of the Cherokee*, the sense of what is being accomplished is immediately different: “What makes this book unique is its focus on collecting stories that are being told today by living storytellers” (Duncan 1). Duncan’s sensibilities are not so much focused on trying to preserve the past, searching for the ways the stories have been told, but in how the stories are used today. She revels in variations in the same stories by different storytellers, and in their differences from Mooney’s collections. This is in keeping with the very core of the folklorist’s craft, as defined by Barre Toelken, who noted that “we might characterize the materials of folklore as *traditionally*

exchanged expressive units existing in dynamic variation through time and space in an informal mode of transmission [italics in original]” (Toelken 94).

Duncan goes on to say that, “Stories can be preserved only by being included in living tradition” (Duncan 2). Her interests also go beyond myths and creation tales. She informs us that:

Animal stories, creation myths, legends, ghost stories, stories about places, and stories about family members are included in the repertoires. . . .Others are specific to families and individuals; these are included because they are part of family folklore and because they have been told for a very long time, although they may vary from generation to generation. Stories about healing, about supernatural experiences, about grandfathers and grandmothers, about particular places in the mountains—these are all traditional stories just as much as is “How the Possum Lost His Tail.” (Duncan 5)

In addition, in a development that is completely different from Mooney or Speck, she is interested in how the stories are told, and the best way to represent that on the page:

In order to convey to the reader the fundamental oral nature of these tales and their beauty as they are told, they are presented on the page word for word exactly as they were spoken. Because the storytellers tell their tales in a rhythmic way, the stories are transcribed in lines of different lengths, like free verse, indicating pauses in the teller’s speech. If you read them aloud, or listen to them in your mind, you will hear the stories as the storytellers speak them. (Duncan 2)

Duncan then informs the reader that the stories are presented “as free verse because that style best represents how they are told” (Duncan 23). She notes the rhythmic style of the speakers, and of her refusal to make the stories more acceptable by literary or standard English. Ultimately, her

hope is that “if you will read them aloud, or at least listen to them in your mind, you will hear the voice of the storytellers” (Duncan 23).

The storytellers in the collection are performers. Their work is individual in style, and it is important to capture that, for the full power of American Indian storytelling does not come through without that aspect of the telling. Each of the storytellers is specific. All of the storytellers mention The Trail of Tears. Davey Arch tells of another living Cherokee, one who was telling Arch how the soldiers had taken his Grandmother and Grandfather out of their house at gunpoint when rounding up the Cherokees to put them on the Trail of Tears. This individual, Solomon Bird, is telling Arch and others of the event that happened right there, in front of the house he is now living in, and Arch has an epiphany over the fact that this isn’t one of the old legends, nor is it that far removed in time. In fact, he is hearing a story about real events that happened in reference to “that specific place right in front of his house” (Duncan 95)—a place that he can point to and see and go to. Another storyteller, Edna Chekelelee, tells of a rider coming to warn others of the soldiers coming, and uses the very dramatic effects of drumming and speaking in short rhythmic phrases to build tension and to give a sense of what it felt like as the Removal was happening (Duncan 138).

These contemporary storytellers have been impacted by the Boarding School System. Several storytellers talk about not being allowed to speak their own language in school, and of not learning English until a specific age (5 or 7 years old); they also talk of being disciplined for speaking their own language and having to wash their mouths out with soap for doing it, such as Edna Chekelelee (Duncan 128) and Robert Bushyhead (Duncan 147). Bushyhead goes further in his story to tell his audience the ultimate effect of such treatment:

And the thing about this was

that whenever we could not speak the Cherokee language,
 those of us who became parents
 did not teach their children the Cherokee language
 lest they go through that same thing that we had to go through—
 the being punished. (Duncan 147)

From this brief example—of the typography of the ethnopoetics involved in Bushyhead’s story—you not only get the content of his story, but the impact of how he says it. This use of ethnopoetics to vividly represent the words of the storyteller makes for a much more dynamic, living collection than the staid prose transcriptions of the past, typical of the era of Mooney and Speck, who tended to remove repetitions and embellishments. Duncan’s ethnopoetic techniques provide a connection for the reader with the storyteller. Duncan steps back—and Kathi Smith Littlejohn steps forward. You hear the storyteller’s voice and his or her pauses; you can almost hear the inflections. It is closer to the atmosphere of hearing your own family’s stories. This brings the outsider to the culture closer and allows the common sharing of the humanity of storytelling. Also, ethnopoetics allow you to distinguish between Littlejohn, Freeman Owle, and each of the other storytellers, and to get a sense of individual styles.

The development of the techniques of ethnopoetic transcription has, therefore, been a positive development in American Indian Studies, or for the study of oral presentation within any culture. Providing a transcribed text corresponding more closely to the style of presentation, as opposed to more prosaic paragraphs, does greater justice to the intent of the performer. As Jan Blommaert notes, in discussing the ethnopoetic theories of Dell Hymes, “Narratives . . . [are] . . . primarily organized in terms of formal and aesthetic — ‘poetic’ — patterns, not in terms of content or thematic patterns. Narrative is . . . a form of action, of performance, and the meanings

it generates are effects of performance” (Blommaert 182). Finally, Even in this age of video-recording, producing a transcript that accurately reflects the performance aspects of an oral presentation provides the casual reader, along with the scholar, a text to follow and to study separately, searching for nuances; a close reading can note details that a close viewing might miss. Further benefits stem from the very differences in the media, as Brenda Farnell notes: “The axiomatic difference is one of being freed from the constraints of 'real' time. A reader can jump backwards and forwards in the text, or slow down or stop the process, in order to concentrate upon difficult passages” (Farnell 962).

Certainly, these techniques had an impact on Duncan’s collection of Cherokee stories which, she tells us, is the first major collection to be published in the 100 years since Mooney’s collection (Duncan 1). In comparison, focusing upon Mooney and Speck and considering the more thorough nature of Mooney’s collection, 126 tales told within 427 pages in the original publication, with many tales taking up several pages, versus Speck’s 117 tales told within a meager ninety-one pages—most consisting of the briefest of paragraphs and quite slender content—the impact of such a book upon Catawba Culture should have an even greater impact. Little remains available to the contemporary general reading public concerning Catawba tales, and none easily available in print or digital form. Both Mooney’s and Duncan’s books are readily available, with Mooney’s book available in full text online. Speck’s work, however, is limited to scholarly articles and the one slim volume, available only in some libraries and a scant few used copies. With the 1993 legal success of the Catawbas Nation in regaining full federal recognition from the U.S. government after a twenty year effort (The Catawbas never lost state recognition from South Carolina)—a development that was surely worthy of a few stories—a new collection

would provide dynamic material to share with the “Eurocentric Americans” who live around, and amongst, the Catawba Nation.

CHAPTER 2

THE WORLD'S A STAGE:

CONFLICTING WORLD VIEWS AND PERFORMING IDENTITIES

Catawba history, like all history, is not a static chronology of events. It is a story that is subject to interpretation—to ascriptions of meaning. The meaning of Catawba history is seen through the prism of world views through which the story is approached. Cultures and subcultures each have their own world view. It is not surprising, then, that the ethnic-minority Catawba Nation views their story differently than the dominant Euro-American culture views the same history. The regional White culture has produced several works involving the Catawbas. From the historical romances of William Gilmore Sims to the first-man/first-woman origin story collected by Charles Lanman and included in his travel writings in the 1850s, Euro-Americans have placed their own interpretations upon Catawba tales and history, just as they have with other tribes throughout the Americas. A prime example would be Longfellow's epic poem, *The Song of Hiawatha*. The works of Sims and others who delve into Catawba themes are open to the same criticisms as *The Song of Hiawatha*—that the author's cultural world view permeates the work more than any native world view. Examples of this type of criticism of, specifically, Longfellow's work, notes such issues as his reliance upon European models for the structure of the poem (the Finnish epic, *The Kalevala*) to the cultural bias of Longfellow's adaptations of Indian tales. Cultural bias is precisely the criticism that Joe Lockard levels against Longfellow, claiming that: "As adaptive usage of Chippewa source material, the American version of *Song of Hiawatha* provided an explanatory narrative for a transcontinental transition from aboriginal

inhabitation to white racial dominance, from darkness to light, from unfulfillment to fulfillment, and from abased to ennobled consciousness” (Lockard 114). Such claims of cultural bias permeating a work can also be applied to the 1960 play: *Kah-Woh, Catawba (Thank You, People of the River): A Drama of the Catawbas Indians of South Carolina, and the White People Closely Associated with Them, from 1750-1791*, by William I. Long.¹ Long, a White drama instructor at Winthrop College (now Winthrop University), composed the drama at the request of the York County Historical Commission in 1960. Although many members of the Catawba Nation participated in the large cast of the play, the result was an historical pageant that had more to do with presenting the dominant’s culture’s idea of Catawba/White relations than with accommodating any valid Catawba world view concerning the relationship.

Of course, the White/Catawba Indian relationship began at contact, with the first European explorer, Hernando de Soto, in 1540. Catawba history was impacted at the time, primarily through exposure to new diseases, but after the establishment of the colonial settlement of Charles Town in 1670, interactions increased and the Catawba/White dynamic changed dramatically. The Catawbas were far enough from the coast to avoid immediate confrontation with European settlement, but close enough to be immediately impacted by disease and European trade and technology—especially weaponry. Further weakened by new diseases but attracted to the trade and technology, the Catawbas also noticed the fate of the coastal groups that resisted European settlement. For some tribes the advent of European society into the area meant destruction and/or flight. The Catawbas chose a third way—cooperation and survival. Their primary course of cooperation was that of becoming what Mary Elizabeth Fitts and Charles

¹ The original of this pageant is a single, bound copy in the Special Collections of the Winthrop University Library. I would like to thank the family of William I. Long and Dacus Library Director of Archives Gina P. White along with the Winthrop University library staff for agreeing to digitize the original and make it available through Dacus Online Catalog.

L. Heath have termed “ethnic soldiers” for the White government; the Catawbas and South Carolina officials each quickly realized the value of the Catawbas’ upcountry (Piedmont region) position, where they could act as a buffer from both Cherokee incursions and Iroquois raids into the colony. A secondary benefit was that the Catawbas could also be an effective deterrent to an internal problem: African slave insurrection. The cultivation by the Catawbas of a reputation as fierce warriors aided the tribe and the colony, in that slaves were subject to the fear of being hunted down by Catawba warriors if they tried to escape or rebel, while the Catawbas were somewhat protected from attacks from European colonists—or from other Indians—by the understandable hesitation to engage with such an enemy (Fitts and Heath 147-148; Merrell, *Indians’ Brave New World* 10).

The Catawbas opened themselves to engagement and partnership with the European colonists. White traders brought European goods and exchanged these items for the two things Europeans desired most—and which were valuable in the Atlantic Exchange Economy: deer pelts and Indian slaves. James H. Merrell, in *The Indians’ New World: Catawbas and their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal*, tracks the triumph of trade and the further roles that disease, warfare, and technology played in the eventual acculturation of the Catawbas to European dominance. However, acculturation should not be equated with assimilation. At one point in the Catawbas’ history, the Catawbas sent some of their children to school in Virginia to a fort and schoolhouse that Lieutenant Governor Alexander Spotswood had built for the purpose. However, the Catawbas’ intention was limited to having members of their tribe learn to read and interpret English documents for the benefit of the tribe. As Merrell notes:

The extent of the Indian’s commitment to colonial ways was clear when Spotswood pressed the headmen. . .to join their children in embracing the culture of the

English. . . .The natives politely but firmly refused. They “asked leave to be excused from becoming as we are,” one colonist reported, “for they thought it hard, that we should desire them to change their manners and customs, since they did not desire us to turn Indians.” European trade had triumphed; European civilization had not. (Merrell 91)

From contact to the modern era, the shared experience of Whites and Catawbas appears in texts to present a single, objective history; however, these events have left impressions imprinted upon the beliefs of each cultural group—impressions and beliefs that are only partially similar. Charles M. Hudson analyses Catawba history and finds three common themes that Catawbas and Whites each believe while interpreting that history. These include: “(1) the origin of the Catawbas, (2) the traditional relationship between Catawbas and Whites, and (3) a ‘principle’ governing Catawba history from the colonial era to the present day” (Hudson 122). However, in spite of the commonalities of basic themes, each community comes to a different core belief concerning each theme. The White community comes to the conclusion that: “(1) the Catawbas are descended from Indians; (2) the Catawbas were friends of the colonists; and (3) the Catawbas are the remnant of a once great nation” (Hudson 106). On the other hand, the Catawbas view their history through their own lens—one that displays the influence of the conversion of many Catawbas to Mormonism in the late nineteenth century. For example, the Catawbas refer to their ancestors as Lamanites; “Lamanites” is the Mormon term for pre-contact American Indians in *The Book of Mormon* (a theology and history that mainline Protestant/Catholic American culture rejects). In considering their history, Catawbas focus upon: “(1) the belief that they are descended from ‘Lamanites’: (2) the belief that they were too friendly toward the White colonists; (3) the belief that the Mormon missionaries were the first

Christians who helped them; and (4) the belief that they have progressed” (Hudson 113-114). Essentially, Euro-Americans view Catawbas as the remnants of a great, pre-contact Nation, friendly to Whites, but in decline and in danger of disappearing as a distinct group. The Catawbas view their story as one of survival in spite of being too cooperative with Whites, and ultimately discover a theme of cultural progress under the positive, progressive impact that conversion to Mormonism brought to them.

By 1960, when *Kah-Woh, Catawba* was written and performed, the dominant culture in the United States was aggressively Euro-American centric. White cultural beliefs were centered upon a form of American exceptionalism. Convinced that their position had come about due to divine favoritism, manifest destiny, and innate biological and cultural superiority, the natural desire was to codify and translate their vision of “What American Means to Me” to their children and to the future. From at least the Centennial Year of 1876, Eurocentric America had been engaging in a particular form of celebration of itself and its public culture—the Historical Pageant—which later developed further into the Outdoor Drama. David Glassberg explores this phenomenon in depth in his work, *American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century*. Glassberg notes that the creators of these pageants and dramas collectively had as their goals the “implicit depiction . . . of history, of society, and of social change . . . and the patterns of social relationships entailed in producing a ‘collective’ historical imagery in public” (Glassberg 4).

Although predominantly a product of White American civic institutions, some of these pageants were produced by minority cultures, such as the Lumbee Indian production of the drama, *The Life Story of a People*, in Lumberton, NC, in 1940. This drama, written by Ella Deloria, a Yankton Sioux, and promoted and produced by the Lumbee tribe, tells the story of the

Lumbees from the Lumbee perspective. The choice of Deloria to compose the play was fortuitous, for the play was embraced as an important event in Lumbee history, as noted by Susan Gardner in her article, “‘Weaving an Epic Story’: Ella Cara Deloria's Pageant for the Indians of Robeson County, North Carolina, 1940-1941.” Gardner praises Deloria’s ability to legitimize the Lumbee’s world view, noting that Deloria possessed, “an uncommon and shrewd ability to encode a rhetorical strategy of dissidence within hegemonic and canonical Euramerican narrative forms. Unique to Deloria's contribution was her strategy of relying on Indian people to perform themselves and to tell their own stories” (Gardner 36). This both fulfills and confronts the goals of the dominant culture concerning the production of pageants. Malinda Maynor Lowery, a Lumbee historian, also writing about *The Life Story of a People* and reflecting upon the dominant culture’s usual purposes in putting together pageants, paraphrases Glassberg to note that across America,

Pageant producers and town boosters believed that making history into a dramatic public ritual could bring about a ‘social and political transformation’ that would help the community prosper. . . . [T]hese highly symbolic portrayals of an idealized past promoted tradition as a bulwark against modernity. . . . Progressive educators and social workers thought that pageants could help communities ritually construct “a new communal identity and sense of citizenship anchored in the past.” (Lowery 221)

Unlike the Lumbees, in the case of *Kah-Woh, Catawba*, the Catawbans are not in control of developing the story. Although focusing intently upon the Catawbans, *Kah-Woh, Catawba* is not just about the story of the Catawbans, as part of the subtitle reminds us— “*and the White People Closely Associated with Them.*” Although the “White People” may be in the subtitle, the

White People are the ones who have written, produced, and promoted this tale. The play's "basic theme...is the friendship between the Catawba and the colonist" (Hudson 112), but it is still a story that the Whites are telling from their perspective. Early within the play, the White vision of who the Catawbas are is expressed on a positive note, in the voice of one of the White characters:

[SAMUEL WYLY]

The morals of the Catawbas, for the most part, are high, and they are a very proud people, proud of their ancestry, proud of their friendship with the White man, proud of their women and children, and bestow great love and respect upon the aged. (Long 10)

The emphasis upon how the Catawbas are "proud of their friendship with the White man" is a recurrent idea throughout the play. As noted earlier, this is one point in which the Catawbas and their White neighbors view things similarly and yet differently. The Catawbas view—that their ancestors had been too friendly with the Whites—doesn't find any representation within the play; no Indian character expresses doubt. Instead, the idea is further emphasized by the leading Indian character:

[KING HAGLER]

"White Brothers always help us----and we show love for White Brothers by killing his enemy which is our enemy" (Long 14).

This avoidance of placing a contrary note into the voice of one of the Indian characters should not be seen, however, as intent to silence the Catawbas' perspective. The impulse to avoid controversy is an inherent aspect of such public performances, as Lowery notes in her discussion: "Pageants functioned in part to define the public itself; communities ostensibly agree

on their narratives, but those narratives also glossed over points of contention” (Lowery 225). If productions within communities where the entire community agrees on the narrative avoid “points of contention,” then small wonder that a narrative about the meeting of two cultures, but in which one culture is in control of production, should avoid contradiction of its message of harmony.

This does not mean that the story of the Catawbas is being twisted by the Euro-American culture into something that it is not; rather, the dominant culture is engaging with its own story, and the story of the Catawbas, as the dominant culture understands it. Large sections of *Kah-Woh, Catawba* presents elements of the mutual history of the two cultures with which members of both cultures would probably concur, such as the line already noted, spoken by the character Samuel Wyly. Certainly, a large number of Catawba Indians participated in the production and apparently had few concerns with the overall message. The play, after all, did provide an excellent moment to engage in dialectics over the meanings of history, and of Catawba identity. As Lowery notes in her own studies: “Defining a people is so capricious that hearing stories and having conversations are sometimes the only consistent methods by which we can gain understanding. Such is the power of historical narrative; this is why . . . identity formation is best understood as a conversation between insiders and outsiders, something that changes and shifts over time” (Lowery 254).

As has been seen, the ongoing friendship of the Catawbas with the White colonists is a major theme of *Kah-Woh, Catawba*. During the history of this friendship the Catawbas only turned against the colonists one time, during the initial stages of the Yamassee War of 1715-1717. The Catawbas quickly returned to friendship with the Whites, and even atoned for their

sin. In the play, this is represented as a shameful event, but an important one in the ongoing development of the friendship:

[EMATHLA (Protesting)]

“But Yamassee War not add glory to Catawba Nation.

[KING HAGLER]

People of all nations, be they our White brothers or ourselves, must lend ear to ill deeds as well as good ones. Our people make many mistakes against our White brothers [(and our White brothers) penciled in] make mistakes against us. White friends say we must learn to live together if we are to live. Indian way different from White man’s way----and that sometime cause trouble. (Long 23)

It is interesting to notice that what causes trouble, in the words of the leader of the Catawbas, is that Indian ways are different from White ways. This, of course, privileges White ways as the norm—which they are, when developed from the pen of a White writer. One can only speculate what the actual opinion of the historic King Hagler would have been.

Hudson, commenting upon the Yamassee War’s role in the development of the play, calls attention to the fact that:

The Whites believe that of all the Southeastern Indians the Catawbas were the best friends the colonists had. The Catawbas violated this friendship only once, when during the Yamassee War they attacked the colonists . . . however, even this was atoned for when one of the White characters in the play explains to President Washington how the Whites gained possession of the territory of the Waxhaw Indians. (Hudson 110)

The attack upon the Waxhaws is historically accurate, and is seen as the play develops the theme of atonement for the Catawbas' shameful act:

[MAJOR CRAWFORD]

This area at one time belonged to the Waxhaw Indians. It's a very interesting story. The only time the Catawba Indians ever sided against the Whites was during the Yamassee War, and then only for a short while. Its [*sic*] seems that they were so ashamed of this one action against the Whites that they withdrew and went to Charleston to ask forgiveness. The Governor told them they would be pardoned if they would do something about quieting the Waxhaw Indians and try to make them stop molesting the Whites. Well, the Catawbas came here and wiped out the Waxhaws almost to a man.

[GENERAL DAVIE]

And soon after that, the Whites started settling here. My uncle, Rev. Richardson, was one of the first settlers. (Long 87)

It is important to note that, in the view of the Whites, settling on the land of the Waxhaws was perfectly legitimate; after all, the land was now unoccupied. They were not taking land from anyone. This has always been one of the justifications that White society has used in regards to their ancestors having moved onto Indian lands. In this case, the land was open because their ally, the Catawbas, "removed" the Waxhaws—but the Whites didn't do it themselves. They were merely moving into unoccupied and unclaimed areas.

Another justification that White society has used for their intrusions into native lands is revealed by the following passage:

[KING HAGLER]

White settlers are come in great numbers into our Nation, killing off the big game and intruding upon the Indian lands. I try to be friend, for I expect White Governor to make stand and decide what is right.

[EDMUND ATKINS]

Go. Lyttleton and the Colonial Government are making every attempt they can to be true to you and your people. It is the individual Whiteman, the shiftless, no-good renegade, not the White man as a whole that causes the trouble. (Long 34-35)

Earlier in the play, the character Samuel Wyly even refers to these shiftless, no-good renegades directly with the term “White trash,” a term that entered the American lexicon in the mid-nineteenth century and is anachronistic to the time period of the play. However, the sentiment is clear. Responsible Whites didn’t do it and aren’t responsible for the deed. The settlement and invasion that began on the coast continues. The Whites that are now in-country aren’t under the control of the government, so the government isn’t responsible for the settlers who are stealing land.

As Hudson noted in his analysis of the different world views of the Whites and the Catawbas, the decline of the Catawbas is a major theme of the White understanding of Catawba history. This imagery of decline also permeates *Kah-Woh, Catawba*. Several passages and scenes deal with the diminishment of Catawba numbers, such as the extended scene covering the Small Pox Epidemic of 1759. Long composes the episode to focus upon the death and decline that the Catawbas experience, instead of their survival. This is in spite of the fact that the reunion of the surviving lovers is a touching moment, one that emphasizes their spirit of endurance. The one Indian character who seems to develop the most out of the scene is the Indian named “New

River.” New River seems determined to learn from their experiences and to apply its lessons; he wishes to learn and to help his people. The lesson that he learns is that the Catawbas must rely on the Whites. As New River and another Indian character discuss the needs of the tribe, and the issue of the leadership of the tribe after the death of the chief, King Hagler, New River comments that: “To help Red man in changing world, we need faithful White friend. Red man no longer can live life of past. White man come seeking freedom, and Red man not know how to live new life----need guidance” (Long 70). In other words, in the view of the White audience, everything will be fine for the Catawbas when the Catawbas follow the guidance of the Whites. The Catawbas need to go beyond acculturation to assimilation, and follow the lead of White society.

In presenting their version of Catawba History, the York County Historical Commission and Long put on an elaborate show. *Kah-Woh, Catawba* had a run of four performances in 1960 at Winthrop College Auditorium. Dick Banks, Arts Editor for *The Charlotte Observer*, commented: “The play sketches the early glory and dwindling fortunes of the Catawbas” (Banks par. 4), doubly emphasizing the world view of the dominant culture that the “Once Great Nation” has declined and diminished to a shadow of its former glory. The newspaper also includes a photograph of characters from the play, an Indian brave caught in the act of hoisting an Indian maiden into the air in greeting. The image provides a glimpse of the costumes these characters are wearing, which neatly conform to the imagery utilized at the time in television and movies of an idealized manner in which all Native Americans dressed—a barefoot maiden in a fringed deerskin which is cut above the knees and leaves the shoulders bare, while the young brave is bare-chested and in loin cloth (modestly accompanied with what appears to be boxer shorts from the side portrait). Lowery, further exploring the role of American Pageantry in relationship to

Indian characters, notes that: “Given the importance that many people placed on such visible markers of identity, the pageant presented Indian identity as consumable and easily digestible for non-Indians. . . .Stereotypes were a version of Indianess that non-Indians felt they understood, and their lack of authenticity played to non-Indians’ preferences” (Lowery 223). It can only be assumed that the Catawba actors involved with the production had no greater concerns with the inaccuracy of the dress than they had with the one-sided world view presented. Of course, it must be noted that Chief Sam Blue, the recently deceased (at the time of the play’s production) chief of the tribe, regularly traveled from the reservation into Rock Hill wearing a highly inaccurate Plains Indian war bonnet, in order to play upon White stereotypes of how an Indian should appear.

Ultimately, it is clear that *Kah-Woh, Catawba* is a play that presents a one-sided portrait of Catawba identity. Taking into consideration that Hudson’s field work for *The Catawba Nation* took place within the next two years after the production of the play, there is no doubt that a different sensibility—a Catawba world view—both existed and lacked representation within this “community” production. This can be attributed to Lowery’s observation that community pageants tended to gloss over points of contention, but can also be attributed to the White society’s cultural conservatism. At this point Euro-American culture had prevailed, and was culturally dominant over minority cultures. As noted, American Eurocentric society attributed its success to divine favoritism, manifest destiny, and innate biological and cultural superiority. Whites were now trying to celebrate their culture and their success, and they believed they completely understood the dynamics of their world view. Still, this was a world view that was different from the Catawbas’ world view. As Hudson points out concerning this dynamic:

The Catawbas and the whites are utterly at variance in characterizing the principle that has determined the 'shape' of Catawba history. In part, this difference is probably caused by a difference in values, the whites taking a conservative view of things and the Catawbas a progressive view. Also, the difference is partly attributable to a difference in literacy: the whites, having a long literate tradition, are able to 'freeze' the past; the Catawbas, having been literate for only fifty years or so, naturally emphasize events in the recent past. (Hudson 125)

Ultimately, the reconciliation between these two world views is unnecessary. Indeed, it may even be something to be avoided. Rather than try to come to a consensus as to the meaning of events, more benefit can be obtained through ongoing dialectic and difference. At this point, the dialectic has been one-sided. It can only be hoped that, soon, a Catawba voice will join the renaissance in contemporary American Indian Literature, and that someone from the tribe will place a new work into the dialectic, one that presents events from their own world view. (See Figure 2)



William L. McDermott, left, portrays the part of Catawba Chief Sammel Blue as he tells the Indian story to this group of youngsters at the climax of the Indian Pageant. On hand for opening night (right photo) were, from left,

Mrs. E. F. Hollings, wife of the governor, Mrs. Burrell Maybank, Jr., Lt. Gov. Maybank, Mrs. Davis and Winthrop College President Charles S. Davis. (Photos for The State by Joe Azee) *The State*: n-d



CATAWBA INDIAN HISTORICAL DRAMA REHEARSALS NEAR END

CATAWBA STORY *The State*: Sept. 18, 1960
1st Historical Drama In SC Due at Winthrop

ROCK HILL. — According to Catawba Indian legend, woman came first in the order of creation and dwelt alone in a beautiful valley. Then one day a handsome sky god descended into the valley and, as Adam and Eve, they became parents of the human race. This story is depicted in the opening scene of "Kah-Woh Catawba," the first historical drama of its kind ever produced in South Carolina, now completing final rehearsals here. The drama will be produced Sept. 21-24 at the Winthrop College auditorium under the sponsorship of the York County Historical Commission.

A cast of 106 will portray pioneer settlers and members of the Catawba Indian Nation, the state's only remaining Indian tribe, in a play written by William I. Long, professor at Winthrop. Mr. Long has been associated with North Carolina's outdoor drama, "The Lost Colony," for 20 years and is now technical director of that production. Directing the drama is Christopher Reynolds, a Winthrop instructor who has served as stage manager of the "Unto These Hills" Cherokee drama in north Carolina. The time of the play is set between 1720 and 1780, when the Catawba Nation was at its peak. "Painstaking research and voluminous notes, enough for several Ph. D.'s, went into 'Kah-Woh Catawba,'" said Mr. Long. The title is translated "Thank you, People of the River," a statement attributed to George Washington when he visited the area to thank the Catawba warriors personally for their help in the American Revolution.

Preparations are almost complete for the historical drama, "Kah-Woh Catawba," a story depicting the role of the Catawba Indians of South Carolina during the American Revolution. In the picture at left, York County Historical Commission Chairman Harper S. Gault (right) is discussing the script with author William I. Long of Rock Hill (center) and Col. F. Murray Mack, commission vice-chairman. The play will be given Wednesday through Saturday, Sept. 21-24, in the Winthrop College auditorium at Rock Hill. In the other photo, Gene Blue, grandson of the late Catawba Indian Chief Sam Blue, applies his war paint modern style during rehearsals. Historically, the Catawbas were among the most friendly tribes to white settlers. They consisted of about 1,000 Indians who fought beside the colonists against England and against other Indian tribes. Much of the South Carolina upstate area was the property of the Catawba tribe. In 1840 the Indians ceded the last 140,000 acres of this once vast ownership to the state. Proceeds from the drama will be used to build a museum on the Catawba Indian Reservation near Rock Hill and to expand the play into an outdoor drama next year. The narrator will portray Chief Sammel Taylor Blue, one of the most colorful chiefs of the Catawbas. Other historical characters include Gov. William Henry Lattin, royal governor of the South Carolina colony; George Washington; Thomas Spratt, II, Rev. William Robertson; Samuel Wylie; Patrick Calhoun; Gen. William Davis; and Maj. Robert Crawford. Seventeen elaborate stage settings will depict Indian village life and scenes in old "Charles Towne." All actors are citizens of York County. Special guests for "Governor's Night," Sept. 21, will be Mrs. Ernest F. Hollings and Lieutenant Gov. and Mrs. Burrell R. Maybank Jr. Also invited are members of the S. C. General Assembly joint committee on Indian affairs and approximately 300 members of the Catawba Indian Nation.

The Charlotte Observer Sept. 22, 1960
Play's Premiere Attracts 2,000

By DICK BANKS
 (Special Arts Editor)
 ROCK HILL, S. C.—"Kah-woh, Catawba" was presented Wednesday night in Winthrop College's auditorium to an audience of 2,000. The play by William Ivey Long proved to be a thing of beautiful costuming and lovely sets.

The play tells the story of the Catawba Indian nation from legendary times through the period of the Revolutionary War when the dwindling tribe helped the colonists against the British.

The dialogue is sensitively handled but it is a play of all talk and almost no action.

The play sketches the early glory and dwindling fortunes of the Catawbas.

After helping the colonists in the French and Indian War, the tribe was beset by smallpox; white man's liquor took its toll; squatters moved into their tribal area. And so the sad story goes.

The visual beauty of this play should be emphasized. Feathered capes of the Indian chiefs, the lovely gowns of the wives of the white colonists, and often the groupings of people on the stage is most artistically handled.

It's an honest play. The scenes are well directed. Characters are so numerous that they seem almost anonymous.

A few stand out: the medicine man, Chief Hagler, and Gen. George Washington. Obviously a great deal of work was put into this play.



CATAWBA PAGEANT—"Kah-Woh, Catawba," a historical drama about the Catawba Indian tribe, opened Wednesday night in Rock Hill. The drama portrays the peak of the tribe's power in the 18th century. Here, Carroll Hester, playing an Indian brave in the drama's opening episode, hoists Indian maiden Willette Gault.

MCF #60-2 CTF

Figure 2

CHAPTER 3

THE STORY OF THE CATAWBAS:

FEDERAL RECOGNITION AND CULTURAL RECONCILIATION

Whenever subcultures within a multicultural society come into conflict, the issues at hand can become more complicated than simply “what happened.” The primary difference between the cultures can actually rest more directly upon different world views. When one of the subcultures involved is the dominant culture of the society, then the questions of justice and of what constitutes an equitable resolution between the cultures are further complicated by the ability of the dominant culture to cast the terms of discussion—the debate, or dialectic—within the terms of their own norms of explication and understanding. This is especially true within the narrow focus of some specific venues. The result, of course, can be a disservice to the other culture, which may, and probably does, possess entirely different ways of seeing the world and the issues at hand. Clearly, the history of an American Indian tribe, a history that is understood by that tribe as a subjective, holistic, and interconnected oral narrative—which does not rely on “pieces of paper” to prove points—puts the tribe at a disadvantage within the document-based, fact-driven, Western dialectic of the American legal system.

Within the dynamic of the legal standing of the various Indian Tribes of the United States, starting from a disadvantageous point is precisely what often occurs. The world view of the Indian Nations—their holistic view of the cosmos, their matrilineal and communitarian spirits, and their interconnected, oral narrative approach to education and tribal history—has always been at odds with the Eurocentric dominant culture’s blend of secular, paternalistic, natural-rights individualism coupled with a previously noted document-supported, fact-driven,

sense of history. Add this crossing of cultures into the dynamic of the dominant culture's legal system, with its specific rules and procedures, and the result is a venue for discussion that is heavily weighted in favor of those who make the rules. Our courts analyze and interpret the laws that other members of the same government create. Subcultures not involved in the process of making these laws, and who find themselves involved in litigation to address longstanding grievances, can be at a disadvantage. Involved in a venue that does not acknowledge their way of looking at the world—and their way of telling the “story” of what has occurred—tribes are forced to play a semiotic game designed with other parameters than their own. The native approach to storytelling becomes inappropriate to the venue, but the venue is still one of storytelling. If the native tribe can adapt to the venue and tell its story in the proscribed manner, then some success can be expected. If the native tribe can also introduce enough of its own approach into the venue—if the tribe can get the “other” venue to see with tribal eyes for a brief period—then it has a chance to not only tell its story, but to bridge understandings.

Within Western culture, the legal system is a specific forum for storytelling. Although the general member of society may not recognize the courts as a venue for such activity, it is clear that the prime function of the legal system is to establish a venue for “what happened.” As Gerald Torres and Kathryn Milun, writing in the *Duke Law Journal*, point out, the telling of stories holds an important role in the work of courts. Within a society, there are specific places where most of the activities making up social life within that society simultaneously are represented, contested, and inverted. Courts are such places. Like mirrors, they reflect where we are, from a space where we are not. Law, the mechanism through which courts carry out this mirroring function, has a curious way of recording a culture's practices of telling and listening to

its stories. Such stories enter legal discourse in an illustrative, even exemplary, fashion. (Torres and Milun 628)

The history of American Indian involvement with the legal system of the United States is a long one. Unfortunately, it is not often a story of a successful involvement, or when successful, not necessarily a story of legal success translating into legal protection. The litigation of the Cherokees during the time leading up to the Trail of Tears is a case in point. The Cherokees' claims were supported by the Supreme Court, but the Court's findings were ignored by President Jackson and the State of Georgia. More cases could be quoted, especially wherein Indian appeals to the legal system were a waste of time from the beginning. The Catawbas were among those affected, and the history of the tribe holds several instances of interacting with the federal government and the federal legal system.

In the 1970s a new wave of litigation on behalf of the various tribes began to take shape. The primary force behind this new push for addressing old grievances was the Native American Rights Fund (NARF). Approaching the Catawbas, along with many other tribes, NARF began to focus on settling land claims that had been alienated from the tribes illegally under the terms of the 1790 Non-Intercourse Act (Loftis). As Torres and Milum note:

The land claim suits filed by various Tribes during the 1970s served as a channel through which some Indians attempted to communicate with the state—this time, through the medium of courts. In order for the state to hear their claims, however, these Indians were forced to speak in a formalized idiom of the language of the state—the idiom of legal discourse. (Torres and Milum 628)

Of course, the Western concept of legal argument is culturally specific to the venue of the court system. The push for redress of grievances by NARF initiated an exploration within the Court

and within the law journals, both of which began to take an interest in this history. The legal system soon pinpointed what, for them, was the crux of the question for the Catawbas Indians: “It is the effect of the Catawbas Division of Assets Act upon the Catawbas Tribe's right to sue under the Non-Intercourse Act that the Fourth Circuit Court must address en banc in the instant case. The tribe's situation is understandably unique, and a review of its history will greatly assist in grasping why the tribe is where it is today” (Ulmer 115).

The most relevant laws that place the Catawbas' situation within its legal context of the time can be briefly summed up. First, there was the Non-Intercourse Act of 1790. The Non-Intercourse Act is the name of a series of laws passed by the United States Congress starting in 1790 which regulated commerce and relations between Indian Tribes and non-Indians. The most relevant aspect of the law, as concerning the Catawbas' claims, was the requirement for Congressional approval of all purchases of Indian land by non-Indians (Loftis).

In addition to the Non-Intercourse Act, the Catawbas were also affected by the Catawbas Division of Assets Act of 1959, also referred to as the Termination Act, a bill passed by Congress terminating the federal recognition of the Catawbas. The point in question for the court, during the 1973-1993 legal appeal for reinstatement by the Catawba—as a federally recognized tribe, and additionally for redress for land illegally seized under the Non-Intercourse Act—was as to whether the Termination Act brought to an end the relationship of “Trust” between the federal government and the tribe as a unit, or whether it referred to individual members of the tribe. Further complicating this issue was the fact that the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) had assured the Catawbas that termination would not affect their claim against the state of South Carolina concerning the lands that had been illegally seized from them. On the other hand, the State of South Carolina argued that even if the land claims against the state of

South Carolina could be held valid the Catawbas were no longer a tribe due to termination; therefore, the land violation would be subject to a statute of limitations of ten years, and the claims could no longer be filed. The 1973 filing with the federal courts would clearly be beyond the ten year period that began in 1959 (Loftis). Finally, throughout the course of the legal contest, the “dialectic” of the legal system was engaged in all the legalese and hairsplitting that is ascribed to it by the general, popular culture. In negotiating the intent of the federal law that impacted the Catawbas’ case most directly, the 1959 Catawba Division of Assets Act (the Termination Act), the Courts became focused upon one specific point: “The question was whether the words “them” and “their” found in the second clause of the first sentence refer to the tribe and its members or the individual members only” (Loftis 203).

One of the benefits of being able to set the agenda and to frame the discussion is the ability to insist that all “relevant” issues are addressed within the venue common to your own culture; this necessarily implies an ability not to address other ways of seeing the world that would come from another culture, and another venue. This is, of course, a specific manner in which to maintain hegemonic control over subcultures and colonized “natives.” As an extended example of this point it can be noted that Maureen Salzer, in her review of Ray Young Bear's fictionalized autobiography, *Black Eagle Child: The Facepaint Narratives*, comments about the arrest of one of the principle characters, a native named Youthman. Salzer notes that, in the novel:

Youthman fights the power of the dominant group. His action backfires, of course. Youthman is arrested. Language, or lack of language in this case, is shown by Young Bear to create realities in a very direct manner; non-Indian cultural hegemony is asserted by the non-Indian community, which requires

Indians to understand and use English while others, the non-Indians, know no Mesquakie. (Salzer 309)

Such issues of cultural hegemony were dominant within the legal venue that the Catawbas were involved in concerning their challenge. Torres and Milum, writing about another Indian land claim that emerged in the 1970s, but which, unlike the Catawba, was not successful, give this insight into what Indian Tribes faced:

The legal structure of the issues allowed the court to evade the duty of explaining the virtues of one version of cultural life over another. Thus, the description of "what happened next" is viewed as an objective question, rather than one that ought to be guided by an evolving set of inter-subjective relations. By distinguishing a pre-literate from a post-literate phase in the life of the Mashpee, for example, the court devalued the oral history of the Mashpee where it conflicted with written documents, even though those documents did not reflect the understandings of the Mashpee at the time the documents were created. (Torres and Milum 632)

If we view the history of the Catawbas' claims from the perspective of the Catawba, we no longer linger over definitions of "them" and "their." Beckee Garris², a spiritual leader of the Catawba Indian Nation, tells the history of the tribe in the way history is normally told, by going to the beginning: "The first treaty that we signed was in—1630s?—with [the] King of England, and that's when we got the 144 thousand square miles. But over time and—you know—and the population—settler population growing and growing—they were encroaching on the land" (Garris Interview).

² Interview with Beckee Garris, a spiritual leader of the Catawba Indian Nation, and employee of the Catawba Indian Nation Cultural Center: Monday, March 14, 2011. 2-3PM. Catawba Cultural Center. Interview edited for clarity. The full interview is available in the Appendix.

Of course, this is a story that is in print. Factual details can fade, or not come to immediate memory when spoken, such as the question of the date in the 1630s. (For point of reference, the first treaties were separate from the later granting of the 144 thousand acres by the King, which occurred with the Treaty of Augusta in 1763). Still, it is the spirit of the history as the Catawbas see it that is being conveyed. As the interview shows, that history is still alive as the Story of the Catawbas:

GARRIS: In the later part of the 1800s—by that time there were only like fifty families of Catawbas that lived here in the area—the South Carolina governor at the time wanted to be rid of his Indian problem again...

FORTNER: [To] get rid of the state reservation now

GARRIS: No. That was before even the state reservation

FORTNER: OK.

GARRIS: So, they wanted it to get rid of his Indian problem because with the treaties that they had signed they gave them, like fifteen dollars a year to live on. I'm sure [that in] 1800, fifteen dollars helped you keep from starving.

FORTNER: Yeah

GARRIS: And so, he told them that if they would move to North Carolina there would be land set aside for them there. But, the thing about it was, he didn't tell the North Carolina governor he was sending them there.

FORTNER: What time period was this?

GARRIS: In the 1800s.

FORTNER: 1800s...right.

GARRIS: When they got there, there was no land, so they were nomadic for a while. Some of them moved in with the Cherokee and married into Cherokees.

FORTNER: I was about to ask if this was the time that they somewhat integrated with the Cherokees.

GARRIS: Yes. Then the rest of the [nomad Catawbas] finally just migrated back—trickled back down in. So, the governor at that particular time took pity on them and gave them the one square mile reservation. (Garris)

The times that followed were difficult for the tribe. Attempts to survive economically and to retain Catawba identity within the larger culture lead to specific ways of interacting with the whites that surrounded them, and with the world at large. James Merrill, studying the monographs, papers, and notes of Frank G. Speck, who collected a large amount of ethnographic material on the Catawbas of the time, sums up the dynamics of cultural survival in this way:

To retain its separate identity the Nation constantly had to remind whites that Catawbas were neither black nor white. Thus survival dictated that adults on the reservation educate their white neighbors about Indian identity just as the natives educated their own children. Tribal leaders taught both as much by example as by words. Speck learned that until early in this century Catawba men, "vagrant archers," had traveled about the region with their bows and arrows putting on shows for pay. Catawba women active in the production and marketing of their pottery were also using traditional skills for economic gain. Speck's friends told of another man who in the 1880s and 1890s put his special knowledge of herbal remedies at the disposal of nearby white people as well as Indians, and the anthropologist watched as Sam Blue himself performed a wide variety of

"chiefly" duties. All of these endeavors, scattered through Speck's published papers, were important symbolic actions that created and sustained the image of Catawbas as a distinctly Indian people with ancient roots in the area and a history of friendship with whites. (Merrill, "Reading" 256)

Things began to improve somewhat in the twentieth century. The Catawbas were still recognized by the State of South Carolina, and they briefly did gain federal recognition, but it was short-lived. The Catawbas' history, as seen by the Catawbas, continues in the oral explanation of Beckee Garris: "When we first got federal recognition, believe it or not, was in 1946—or 47—somewhere along. And then a short twenty years later [*sic*], when Eisenhower was president, he decided to do away federal recognitions of a lot of the smaller tribes" (Garris).

Explaining the motivation for the ending of federal recognition for smaller tribes, including the Catawbas in 1959, Ms. Garris goes on to say that it was due to:

Money—bottom line's money. They didn't want to have—it was another one of those—ever since there was a government within, on these hallowed grounds—is that they've always wanted to get rid of their Indian problem. So, if you get declassified as being federal recognized, it's almost like dehumanizing you—they don't have to worry about you again. I don't think they looked at it that way, but that's what it turned out to be. It was just a—you know—bottom line on everything is money sooner or later. (Garris)

From the federal legal system's point of view, it may appear to be simply legislation to formalize a decision that seems like a logical step; but from the point of view of the recipients of the action, it is a dehumanizing step meant to make your tribe, and the "problem" you represent, go away.

The federal government moved forward with its “Division” of Catawba assets. There were, of course, unintended consequences:

Those fifteen square miles, they divided it up. It was no longer a reservation, and so they divided it up between the tribal members that were on the roll. They used the 43 roll, and then the 63 roll, as to who was Catawba. They gave every tribal member, regardless of age or sex, five acres of good land—I don’t know what they call good land around here—or seven acres of the bad land—poor land. It was put in the Catawbas’ parent’s name. Supposed to be in trust, but nobody knew anything, because of lack of education here. Didn’t know the ramifications of—you know. You have five children, so you get twenty five acres, and each one of them get five acres. Well, even during the sixties, people that lived on the reservation, probably forty-five/fifty percent of the houses were substandard—didn’t have running water or bathrooms. Most of them had electricity, but that was about it. And so, some of the families borrowed money on the land to pay [to] improve their living conditions—and most of them lost it, because of jobs and other things. So, the ones that got the land, back then, didn’t get the land. And, you know, it’s nothing—like you say, you can’t cry over spilt milk. But it was—it’s just the way things were. (Garris)

There were two tracts of land, however. A federal reservation, the one that was divided, and a one square mile state reservation. Many that lost their land drifted back to the final remnant of the reservation, as they had in the past. The federal and state governments had not divided the state reservation, and so the Catawbas never lost their state recognition. This was to be a crucial difference for the Catawbas, in contrast to the Mashpee and other tribes that filed suit in the

1970s. For the Mashpee and others, the trials hinged upon whether the individuals involved could still claim definition as a tribe. For the Catawbas, their continuing tribal status could not be questioned. Therefore, the case hinged upon whether their relationship of trust with the federal government as a tribal entity, the “guardianship” of the federal government in essence, had come to an end in 1959. This also brought into play the Non-Intercourse Act, for these lost lands were now subject to the fact that, after the Termination Act, none of the transfers of land to their new, non-Indian owners had been approved separately by Congress, nor had the various lands lost by lease and seizure by the state legislature in the 1800s.

The task of the Catawbas, during the twenty years of the legal challenge, was not only to build a case based upon the legal dialectic established by Western Eurocentric dynamics, but also to convey their story within that framework. As Torres and Milum point out, for the Mashpee this had proven too great a task:

We should suspect that the legal coding through which such translation is conducted highlights a problem inherent in the post-modern condition—the confrontation between irreconcilable systems of meaning produced by two contending cultures. The post-modern condition is a crisis of faith in the grand stories that have justified our history and legitimized our knowledge. The very idea of what we can know is unstable. The crisis in the law that emerged with the Legal Realists and the attempts to reconstitute formalism—as the basis for survival of the “rule of law”—also reflect our post-modern condition. In the case of the Mashpee, the systems of meaning are irreconcilable: The politics of historical domination reduced the Mashpee to having to petition their “guardian” to allow them to exist, and the history of that domination has determined in large

measure the ways the Mashpee must structure their petitions. The conflict between these systems of meaning—that of the Mashpee and that of the state—is really the question of how can we "know" which history is most "true" (Torres and Milum. (628-629)

Of course, in a legal challenge, there is more than one story involved. By the very nature of litigation, there is an opposing point of view. As noted earlier, the State of South Carolina contested that the Catawbas Division of Assets Act of 1959 had taken the Catawbas' claims out of the fiduciary relationship of trust with the federal government, and had therefore started the clock ticking on a statute of limitations, a time factor that was now finished and in the past. Fortunately, outside of some other legal moves that the Catawbas had available to them—specifically, the intent to file suit against every single landowner holding a contested claim on the disputed land and thus challenge each claim, one by one—the “courtroom of opinion” did not only involve the legal system. On top of favorable media coverage, the courtroom of opinion also involved Congressional Hearings. Furthermore, the Catawbas' position was helped by their willingness to come to a negotiated settlement:

All I ask is that, we have worked honestly among ourselves to resolve our problems and we have dealt honestly with the State and with the Federal Government. I am not here today seeking something, simply because I am an Indian. I am here because we were mistreated illegally and immorally, and that is what I want corrected. . . . I know if I was a landowner and someone came on my land and told me I had to move off it because of something that happened 200 years before, I would not like it, either. So I understand their [the present property

owners'] feelings, [and] I am willing to work in any framework that we can do to reach a fair and equitable settlement.” Gilbert Blue, Catawba tribal chief.³

³Settlement of the Catawbas Indian Tribe Land Claims: Hearings on H.R. 3274 Before the House Comm. on Interior and Insular Affairs, 96th Cong., 1st Sess. 33 (1979) (testimony of Chief Gilbert Blue). (Ulmer 101)

Ultimately, the Catawbas prevailed; the Mashpee did not. However, even though there was a “settlement” with the Catawba, does that truly redress the damage? Within a Western Civilization dynamic, a settlement is intended to be exactly that; a redress of grievances; but within a holistic, oral narrative society, can a monetary “settlement” fully address the need to bring the story of “what happened” to the foreground, as it is intended to do by the dominant culture’s standards? William Bradford, writing in the *American Indian Law Review*, suggests that all of the American Tribes are in need of more than monetary or other legal settlements. What America most needs is a Truth and Reconciliation Commission, modeled on such other Commissions as the one in South Africa at the end of the Apartheid Era:

As a non-law centric process, reconciliation proceeds not through courts but through an ad hoc institutional framework known as a "truth and reconciliation commission"("TRC"). Although it is deeply imbedded in and reflective of the "contested site of history" where it is born, a TRC is typically a political organ created by a post-authoritarian government to investigate the gross human injustices of the previous regime, construct and publicize an unflinching historical record, provide a forum for catharsis and penitence, and guide the national transition to democratic unity. (Bradford 137-138)

Bradford believes that addressing the issues that would emerge would place our common history to the forefront and compel America to truly understand itself:

Painful stories and lessons will have to be told and learned. Insecurities will have to be addressed, consciences assuaged, fears allayed, courage mustered.

Reconciliation is difficult to commence and easy to abandon. Social groups unwilling to repair past harms may be unwilling to reconcile; it may be hopelessly naive to think otherwise. However, if Indian and non-Indian peoples can fashion a common historical understanding upon which to ground a more peaceful joint future, the frontier of justice will be thrown far further than could have been imagined even a generation ago, and a new American Manifest Destiny as exemplar and defender of global human rights may well be carried to all corners of the earth (Bradford 174).

Whatever the need, or perceived need, for a TRC in America, at least the story of the Catawbas has had some form of closure. In this instance, a minority group was truly able to come forward and engage with a different way of telling their story. They were ultimately able to make the “other” culture that surrounds them “see” their claims from their point of view. The settlement was one that acknowledged both culture’s needs, while addressing, partially, the wrongs committed upon the tribe. Chief Gilbert Blue had this to say when expressing his approval of the settlement: "I feel like we're on the edge of a new day for the Catawba people. Nothing will replace the loss of our lands but this settlement is a tool that will allow us to create a better way of life for our children" (Loftis 209)

CONCLUSION

This study has focused on various forms of storytelling utilized predominantly by the Catawbas, but—in the case of *Kah-Woh, Catawba*—also by the dominant culture, in order to define the Catawbas. From the histories, courtrooms, and congressional hearings, to traditional stories and the stage, I have attempted to review and consider what is available. I experienced some limitations. An example would be attempts to gather contemporary material currently being produced. Several members of the Catawba Nation are occasionally active as storytellers, but scheduling conflicts prevented me from attending performances. I am therefore indebted to Beckee Garris for graciously scheduling time to talk to me in person and allowing me to interview her for this study. Beckee discussed the Catawbas' history from the Catawbas' point of view, and also discussed the role of storytelling when the tribe needs to negotiate with corporate and government entities. In addition, Beckee told me two Catawba tales, "How the Chipmunk got Its Tail" and "How Possum Fell in the River." Finally, Beckee told me her own unique story, which she works into talks at churches, involving the parallel meanings you can find in crafting pottery (Beckee is a traditional Catawba Potter, among her many other roles) and in the crafting that God puts us through in developing our lives. Beckee's adaptation of storytelling to discover parallels between traditional pottery and ongoing faith is an excellent example of elements of the type of Living Culture discussed in the Introduction. As I noted in Chapter One concerning both Cherokee and Catawba material, there had not been a collection of Cherokee stories after James Mooney's 1900 collection, *Myths of the Cherokee*, until Barbara Duncan's 1998 collection *Living Stories of the Cherokee*. A similar situation exists in relation to Catawba stories, in that there has not been a significant collection of Catawba stories since Frank

Speck's 1934 collection *Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology: Catawba Texts*. The most recently published Catawba material of any nature is, once again, a work by Beckee Garris; her telling of "The Yehasuri: The Little Wild Indians," illustrated by Andrew Cohen, in which she warns the readers about the Yehasuri, the "wild little Indians who inhabit the native spirit world of the Catawba" (Garris, *Trickster*, 137). This tale is included in the wonderful graphic novel/short story collection, "*Trickster: Native American Tales: A Graphic Collection*." Considering the obvious vitality of Beckee's work, and the activities of other storytellers, such as the former chief, Donald Rogers, certainly a new collection of stories, in the vein of Barbara Duncan's collection, would be a welcome addition to Native American culture.

During my research for material for this study, I also experienced some difficulty concerning whether there were any members of the Catawba Nation engaged in other literary pursuits. Perhaps there is a poet, playwright, or fiction writer among the tribe who is producing work today, but I had little success in finding material. Once again, considering the involvement of the tribe in the production of *Kah-Woh, Catawba*, and also considering the play's cultural bias, coupled with the depiction of the Catawbans in the historical romances of Sims and other writers, there seems to be an opportunity for the reinterpretation of the Catawbans' history and culture—in the voice of the Catawbans. Perhaps a time will come when one of the active storytellers of the tribe will wish to explore other venues of expression.

APPENDIX:

INTERVIEW WITH BECKEE GARRIS

Jefferson Fortner interview with Beckee Garris, a spiritual leader of the Catawbas Indian Nation and employee of the Catawbas Indian Nation Cultural Center

Monday, March 14, 2011. 2-3PM. Catawba Cultural Center.

Two back to back recording sessions: First recording started after introductions and conversation initiated. Throughout the first session there are noises of movement, scratching sounds, wind sounds. There is also the low-level sound of ambient American Indian music in the background. Interview has been edited for clarity.

FORTNER: My interest in the Catawbas started when I took a class on Native American literature, and because I live up in Gaston County, right on top of the Catawbas River, where, you know, everything around me is Catawba this and Catawba that, I live on Catawba Avenue...

GARRIS: OK; Before we do this: My name is Beckee Garris,

FORTNER: OK

GARRIS: B E C K E E

FORTNER: Yeah, OK.

GARRIS: G A R R I S...and yes, you have permission to record me.

FORTNER: OK (laughs) Thank you. And I'm Jefferson Fortner, of course, and—I should have done that from the beginning.

GARRIS: Yeah

FORTNER: OK! You've been through this before.

GARRIS: Yes. (Laughing)

FORTNER: (Laughing) I have not. (Both laughing) This is new for me here.

GARRIS: Well, I'm transcribing a recording that I helped a USCL professor, and students as well, do of my great-aunt, who is 96.

FORTNER: OK

GARRIS: We recorded her, and they started off with that, so I just wanted to make sure that your bases were covered so that I can't come back to you later and say, "No, I didn't say that."

(Laughing)

FORTNER: Well, I appreciate that. What is the focus of what you're recording with her?

GARRIS: it's just oral traditions of what she remembers when she was growing up and who her parents were and who her husband was and sort of that history. Her husband was Landrum George and he was in WWII . . .

FORTNER: OK

GARRIS: . . . and I'm just finding out things about him that I didn't even know by doing this . . . that [he] was drafted during that time and he was married, but because they didn't have any children he was automatically one of the first ones that was drafted.

FORTNER: Sure

GARRIS: So, the first platoon that he was in when he went to Germany, every single one in his platoon got killed but him.

FORTNER: Oh, my.

GARRIS: When he recovered from his injuries, they made him a sergeant and put him over a troop.

FORTNER: Uh..hum...

GARRIS: He was teaching them the artillery—how to shoot—and he was showing them how—you know—to crank it up and turn it and train it on a building. There was this white house that was on top of the hill from where they were and they went in and there were twenty one German soldiers in there they captured.

FORTNER: My Dad—my father—was also in WWII, but he was on a troop carrier in the Pacific. He saw a lot of action, and he did see some onshore action cause he was a reconnaissance guy before invasions—so he would have to go in—[but he] didn't ever—wouldn't really talk about it that much, so we never really heard a whole lot about it.

GARRIS: Is it too late to go back and talk to him now?

FORTNER: Oh yeah, he passed away.

GARRIS: That's unfortunate.

FORTNER: He and three of his brothers—my dad was one of twelve kids—so four of them were in WWII and none of them really wanted to talk about it, and now they've all passed on [except for] only the youngest, the baby, who—he's the baby but he's 80 something [and] he was too young to go.

GARRIS: Fortunately, but then I guess Korea got him?

FORTNER: Actually, I think he was too old, for one thing [or] got an exemption for

GARRIS: How fortunate for him.

FORTNER: I'm not exactly sure how that worked...

GARRIS: Fortunate for him

FORTNER: I think that it was college or something—as long as he was in college he didn't have to go. I believe was the case

GARRIS: Considering it wasn't—it was just an action and not a war—totally understand it

FORTNER: Were you ever [able to] talk to anybody else—Chief Rogers or anything? [About joining this interview session]

GARRIS: (sigh) No (laughs)

FORTNER: OK

GARRIS: He has to [go to] meetings after meetings. He's been in Washington several times.

FORTNER: Yeah—well every time I call....

GARRIS: Yes... (Laughing)

FORTNER: He's not here. (Laughing)

GARRIS: Yes. (Laughing) [And in the] next couple of weeks, they're headed out again [to] USET—that's the United South-Eastern Tribes—and all the federal tribes get together to try to see what needs to be done to protect the native rights and then also to see what needs to be taken out of the governmental bureaucracy—cause there's (sighing) a lot of that...

FORTNER: Yeah. Can we pause for just a minute? I want to make sure that...

[Recording stopped at this point to check quality of recording and then restarted]

FORTNER: Yep. It is working much better and maybe I'll stop making so much noise here. [To eliminate sounds of movement in the recording up to this point]

GARRIS: And I'll speak louder

FORTNER: OK, thank you. Umm—so, yeah, I'm sure there's quite a bit of bureaucracy involved with the federal government in anything.

GARRIS: Well, it's just like with us—the last treaty we signed with the federal government and the State of South Carolina was in 1994, and South Carolina still has not honored—yet again—another treaty.

FORTNER: Right...

GARRIS: The federal government was a little bit better for a while, and then they came in and says—oh, by the way, you can't use 638 Grant Money—that's money that the federal government gives tribal entities to help with their government issues—not much government issues—but helping to run the government offices. For seven years they were paying Cultural Center salaries, and then the BIA—which, you know, is the Bureau of Indian Affairs—came in and says, oh no, you can't pay Cultural salaries with that money. You can pay anybody else's salaries, but you can't pay culture. So, they made the tribe pay seven years' worth of cultural center salaries back.

FORTNER: To the federal government?

GARRIS: To the federal government. And you're talking that when there were—started out there was—we had twenty one full time staff members here. So, now we went down to six volunteers that kept the place open for two years until we finally got a little grant—and when we got paid two hours a week, we thought we'd died and gone to heaven

FORTNER: I bet so.

GARRIS: Then it got up to four hours, and then sixteen hours, and now, through some small grants and programs that we do here, we're back up to nine full time and two part time staff.

FORTNER: But, still, it's not as...

GARRIS: But it's still not as—(sighs)—vital

FORTNER: And, it's not reliable...

GARRIS: Not reliable...right.

FORTNER: Not vital in what way? You're not able to provide vital services?

GARRIS: We're not able to—we still do programs—and they're very informative, educational programs, but with less staff. It's not to where it was, and what it can become. So, we're in the

process of revamping the program now, because we've changed some of it along the way, but a lot of it has stayed the same. So, people who that have come back year after year—we're going to have to bring something updated to make them want to come back year after year. With the school systems we were getting—esp. from October to December—we were getting a program a day, sometimes two programs a day. Since the school system has gotten the way it is, with the money situation and laying teachers and everything off, we might get two a week.

FORTNER: Oh, sure. And you said something at one time to me on the phone about your concerns about how they were going to drop pre-contact and contact information from the school system?

GARRIS: Yes.

FORTNER: Can you give me a little back ground on that, because I'm not really clear on that?

GARRIS: Well, I don't know if it's all of the whole country, but in South Carolina they [plan] to change the school cullriculum—(laughing) I can't even say that word, but you know how to spell it.

FORTNER: curriculum.

GARRIS: Yes (laughing)—I get tongue tied—they want it to start at contact and go forward, and study the effects of Europeans coming here, and the slavery issues and the current issues, but they want to leave how it affected the native people out.

FORTNER: So—if I understand—what they want to do is show what happened when the Europeans showed up. . .

GARRIS: yes.

FORTNER: . . . but not give background to what was here before.

GARRIS: Right.

FORTNER: OK... do they intend to incorporate that into the dynamic of talking about contact, or are they truly just not going to cover it?

GARRIS: I don't know—because I was told this second hand. They got emails—and say, well, blast the school system and say—no! You need to know what was here. You need to know how it affected what was here, and you also need to know what was already here helped develop what later on became after contact.

FORTNER: How dynamic was their teaching about pre-contact America, anyway?

GARRIS: We probably had about two chapters, and it was only in, what—fourth and seventh grade—it was covered

FORTNER: That's probably about right, because I first starting reading about it in about the fifth grade. Now—of course—that's back in the sixties, but I do know that, as I matured and read more, I realized—oh my God, there's so much more here.

GARRIS: Well, just in this region here, before contact, there were 26 different dialects spoken

FORTNER: Of what Nations? Of what tribes?

GARRIS: They were a gambit of Eucheek, Cherokee, Catawba, Iroquois, Peepees—and—a lot of the tribes that were here when they got here are no longer here because of the diseases and the wars and the famines that came along after....

FORTNER: Right...so...we're aware, just through place names, of some of them, such as the Cheraw—I don't know—there's no Cheraw left?

GARRIS: Sugaree

FORTNER: Sugaree—right. That's quite a dynamic impact, too

GARRIS: And the only language left that is still spoken fluently is Cherokee. And we're in the process of trying to revive a dormant language—our language—and it's...

FORTNER: How do you approach that?

GARRIS: We hired a linguist—(laughs) when we had money to pay [her]—and she—Claudia Heinemann-Priest was a French-German Canadian, and she could speak six languages, fluently, and some smitherings of some other languages. So when she came in, there was still at that particular time some of our elders that remembered some of the words and phrases. After about three years of going back and forth with tribal members...they decided to use the International Alphabet, because we have 3 “A”s, 3 “E”s, 3 “I”s, and 3 “U”s—and that sounds like a lot, but then, when you consider that we only have, like, 28 or 29 letters in our alphabet, where [the] Cherokee have 86. So, it’s hard, in some aspects, because we don’t have someone alive now that can give you how it was pronounced correctly. But languages evolve all the time...

FORTNER: certainly...

GARRIS: So now, it may not be spoken how it was in the past, just like people don’t use ancient Latin...

FORTNER: or, for that matter, Old English...Middle English...

GARRIS: So, it’s going to be the new fluency

FORTNER: That’s interesting. Now were the works that Frank Speck did back in the...

GARRIS: That helped. And then there was another one. I want to say—Leader

FORTNER: Could you spell that? I’m not familiar with that?

GARRIS: It’s L I E T H E R.

FORTNER: OK.

GARRIS: He came through in 1856 or 57, along in there, and he was just traveling through. I don’t really rem—I’ll have to go back and research what he was actually—why he was here, but he took some notes, and said that there was a Catawba that was with their group who also was

the cook, and he said—just to [?] time, whenever they were sitting around the campfire, he would ask him what certain words were in Catawba—and he would tell him—so there's like, I want to say about two pages we've incorporated and, with that, when Juan Pardo came through in the 1500's one of his soldiers wrote, like, 150 words in Waccan. Since Waccan is loosely related to Catawba, those words have been incorporate in there too.

FORTNER: Very interesting. Now you also said at one point, on the phone—about Frank Speck—you said that the stories even, you are recovering a lot of them.

GARRIS: Right. Through him.

FORTNER: Right. But your own grandfather was...?

GARRIS: Chief Samuel Taylor Blue. He was...

FORTNER: Say it again.

GARRIS: Chief Samuel Taylor Blue. He was chief, off and on, for forty years, and he was one of the last three fluent speakers of the language, and his sister, Margaret Brown, and his wife, Hester Louisa Canty-Blue. Granny Sally Brown died in—um—53. Grandpaw died in 59, and Granny died in 63. I was old enough to remember Grandpaw and Granny—his wife—Hester. But I can't recall her voice. I was like 14 when she passed away, but I can't recall her voice.

Now, Grandpaw I can. Cause he was this dynamic figure, in life, and I can remember him doing some singing and drumming and speaking to dignitaries or visitors who came to see him. But we weren't allowed around him. That was at the age where children should be seen and not heard

FORTNER: On the other side of that, though, was that—it was a case where—therefore the stories weren't getting passed on?

GARRIS: Yes. Now, there are a couple of stories that, some of the older generation remember, and so we got those, and then we have a recording of Aunt Elsie talking about the possum.

FORTNER: Aunt Essie?

GARRIS: Elsie...

FORTNER: Elsie! OK.

GARRIS: Elsie Blue.

FORTNER: Yeah. Elsie Blue.

GARRIS: George.

FORTNER: OK.

GARRIS: She's talking about this possum—thought he was so beautiful—and he was struttin' around, and then—so he climbed out on this limb over the river and he looked down and saw this ugly animal. He was going to strike at it or something—but it was his own shadow, and he fell into the river—cause he was so ugly.

FORTNER: Well, that's an alternative to the possum stories. I mean—we've all heard how possum lost his tail—or the hair on his tail—but that's another possum tale that I wasn't familiar with.

GARRIS: Yes.

FORTNER: That's not one that was in Frank Speck's book, either, was it?

GARRIS: No.

FORTNER: Well. That's interesting.

GARRIS: So, that's one that we had.

FORTNER: That was never lost.

GARRIS: That was never lost, and so it keeps—and at least we have her recorded saying it and then can try to write it in the Catawbas language the way she told it to start with

FORTNER: Sure. So, you do some storytelling?

GARRIS: Yes.

FORTNER: At what kinds of venues do you do this?

GARRIS: Sometimes do them here when we have school programs. Sometimes I go out to different organizations, and I've done several times at USCL. I've done one at Queens College in Charlotte, and then the new museum in Greenville—the upcountry museum. I've done one there, and then I'm going back in on April 14th and doing another one—but that is through USCL.

FORTNER: Will you be doing anything with the upcoming Powwow?

GARRIS: I will be there, but I won't—I'll more or less be the door checker, to make sure you paid your fee to get through the door (laughs).

FORTNER: Will anybody else doing tales there?

GARRIS: We're still in the process of working—probably the Chief will be telling some.

FORTNER: Well, that will be interesting.

GARRIS: And then there may be another storyteller from another tribe that—who's coming.

FORTNER: OK. Now, you—yourself—how many stories do you work with? What's your repertoire like?

GARRIS: Well, since we have so few—I use the ones that I know in Catawba—like “How'd the Chipmunk Get its Stripe”—there's two different stories of that one. “Snail and Frog Going for the Doctor” And then I incorporate some from some other tribes that I have been allowed to use: “How Raccoon Looks the Way he Does Today”—but we also have a raccoon one. I'm going to have to go back and check on that one and see, because you hear so many stories over time when you visit other people. You notice I have to talk with my hands—though you can't *see* it!
(laughs)

FORTNER: That's fine! I do the same thing!

GARRIS: They go into different places and going—how the stories—even within tribes that didn't have connections to each other through time—how similar they are. The only thing that I've seen that's major, major different—than our stories—than the others—is our creation story.

FORTNER: OK...

GARRIS: Our creation story—and I'm totally convinced that it's because we were a matriarchal society—they would automatically start with the woman. The woman was already here and created and she lived in this cave. It was like a paradise or like a Garden of Eden. She was enticed by a butterfly one day and she just followed it. Eventually, she got lost—lost sight of the butterfly—and this cloud man came down to help her, even though he knew that once he left the clouds he would not be allowed to return. He felt such compassion for her that he came down and helped her, and then the creator said, because he had gone against what he was told, that now—instead of them living forever—they would have to toil for their labors and their food, and that they would know that the end of their life would be coming when their hair turned as white as the swans.

FORTNER: That's a lovely story, actually. OK. Have you ever thought about its overall meaning? I mean—I know you said that because of the matriarchal society—you have any other thoughts on that line? Obviously, you've put some thought into this.

GARRIS: I have. It's the spiritual meaning behind life and that regardless of where you are—where come from—there are going to be always rules and regulations that you had to follow...not only to protect your surroundings, but yourself.

FORTNER: Cool

GARRIS: The ramification of going against the rules is death, in the end.

FORTNER: Right—and change, in the short term.

GARRIS: And change—Yeah.

FORTNER: OK...That's a great story. Now, I've touched base with you, and—really, this is more with Chief Rogers—but he said that he uses storytelling sometimes in his negotiations and everything.

GARRIS: Yes

FORTNER: Do you have any insights into how he approaches that, or anyone else?

GARRIS: It's—once again it's just like the creation story. It's a matter of—you have to help your fellow man—because I know he talks about—like I say—the Chipmunk Story. It starts out that you have chores you have to do, and you have to look out for each other. That's the way it was within the villages, and the families even today still look out for each other.

FORTNER: Right. . .

GARRIS: These two chipmunk brothers were sent out together—the acorns and the nuts and the berries—and so as long as they were in sight of momma, they were very diligent about doing what they were doing. The further away they got away from momma, [the] slower they got, and then they started playing and chasing each other, and the youngest one's back started itching. He asked his brother if he would scratch his back for him. We all know that big brothers truly love helping little brothers, so he had to ask him (laughing) repeatedly to—ask him if he would scratch his back. Then he did and it felt so good—he was thanking him, you know—for—and, course, big brother gets tired of helping little brother. He stops scratching, and little brother asks him why did he stop scratching his back, because the itch was still there. And so, to make sure that little brother didn't pester him anymore, whenever he started scratching his back this time, he brought out his claws and he scrapped them down his back, and he hurt his little brother.

When he realized that he had hurt his little brother, he was apologizing. Like we say—we always say—number one, he was sorry because he hurt him, but—number two—you know little brother—the first thing he was going to do, he was going to run back and tell momma—and so he would be in trouble again. So, little brother thought, actually, he was really teasing him about stripes were being there, and he tells him to go down and look in the water—see his reflection—and then we bring up—boy, that was when you really could see your reflection in the water, before pollution came along...

FORTNER: (laughs)

GARRIS: ...and then he looked and saw ‘em, but instead of being angry at his little—at his big brother—he liked the stripes. He thought they were nice. He thought they were pretty cool; and so, then little broth—big brother—was sort of jealous, cause he didn’t have the stripes either. Then we bring up—well why is it that when little brothers have something big brothers don’t have, they want it to? Then, he scratched his back, and so that’s how the Dəpendataksuksu³ lookss the way he does today.

FORTNER: Uh, that’s—uh—could you say it one more time?

GARRIS: Dəpendataksuksu

FORTNER: I may send you an email and ask you to spell that out for me!

GARRIS: I’ll send it to you! But it actually translates into “one whose back is striped”

FORTNER: OK! That’s neat!

GARRIS: Yeah! And so, when native people tell stories, they tell stories for you to get the message. It’s for you to take away from it what you think it means. But, then we also give them three examples. It was—you know—do unto others—you help me, I’ll help you—and, the last but not least—you scratch my back, I’ll scratch yours. (Laughs)

³ Text and Formatting copied from: <http://sites.google.com/site/catawbaculturalpreservation/history>

FORTNER: (Laughing) OK. Which would make it a good story for—like you said—as Chief Rogers does—uses this when dealing with corporations, and I guess government entities. Right?

GARRIS: Yeah.

FORTNER: Now, we talked a little bit about the whole process—for the twenty year process to get federal recognition—but there's not a real recollection of how anybody was necessarily involved in that whole process, right?

GARRIS: Right.

FORTNER: That's unfortunate. You know, I was kind of thinking that this probably all fit in at the time there, too.

GARRIS: Right. The first treaty that we signed was in—1630s?—with [the] King of England, and that's when we got the 144 thousand square miles. But over time and—you know—and the population—settler population growing and growing—they were encroaching on the land, and then also by this—[sounds from the hallway] do you want me to shut that door?

FORTNER: (whispers) Don't worry about it.

GARRIS: OK. By this time there were less Catawbas because of—like you say—the diseases more than the wars or the battles, And so, they started at leasing the land out. Then, when we first got federal recognition, believe it or not, was in 1946—or 47—somewhere along. And then a short twenty years later, when Eisenhower was president, he decided to do away federal recognitions of a lot of the smaller tribes.

FORTNER: I'm aware of that, but I'm uncertain about what their justification was for all this?

GARRIS: Money—bottom line's money. They didn't want to have—it was another one of those—ever since there was a government within, on these hallowed grounds—is that they've always wanted to get rid of their Indian problem. So, if you get declassified as being federal

recognized, it's almost like dehumanizing you—they don't have to worry about you again. I don't think they looked at it that way, but that's what it turned out to be. It was just a—you know--bottom line on everything is money sooner or later.

FORTNER: Sure.

GARRIS: So, those fifteen square miles, they divided it up. It was no longer a reservation, and so they divided it up between the tribal members that were on the roll. They used the 43 roll, and then the 63 roll, as to who was Catawba. They gave every tribal member, regardless of age or sex, five acres of good land—I don't know what they call good land around here—or seven acres of the bad land—poor land. It was put in the Catawbas parent's name. Supposed to been in trust, but nobody knew anything, because of lack of education here. Didn't know the ramifications of—you know. You have five children, so you get twenty five acres, and each one of them get five acres. Well, even during the sixties, people that lived on the reservation, probably forty-five/fifty percent of the houses were substandard—didn't have running water or bathrooms. Most of them had electricity, but that was about it. And so, some of the families borrowed money on the land to pay [to] improve their living conditions—and most of them lost it, because of jobs and other things. So, the ones that got the land back then, didn't get the land. And, you know, it's nothing—like you say, you can't cry over spilt milk. But it was—it's just the way things were.

FORTNER: Uh-huh—but this set up the dynamic for the last push for federal recognition.

GARRIS: Right. Well, because of the land, and because that was done—they automatically just did it—or either they gave people who were already—what they call the old part of the reservation, which was the 635 acres which was the state reservation, the original state reservation they had given the Catawbas in the later part of the 1800s—by that time there were

only like fifty families of Catawbas that lived here in the area—the South Carolina governor at the time wanted to be rid of his Indian problem again...

FORTNER: [To] get rid of the state reservation now

GARRIS: No. That was before even the state reservation

FORTNER: OK.

GARRIS: So, they wanted it to get rid of his Indian problem because with the treaties that they had signed they gave them, like fifteen dollars a year to live on. I'm sure [that in] 1800, fifteen dollars helped you keep from starving.

FORTNER: Yeah

GARRIS: And so, he told them that if they would move to North Carolina there would be land set aside for them there. But, the thing about it was, he didn't tell the North Carolina governor he was sending them there.

FORTNER: What time period was this?

GARRIS: In the 1800s.

FORTNER: 1800s...right.

GARRIS: When they got there, there was no land, so they were nomadic for a while. Some of them moved in with the Cherokee and married into Cherokees.

FORTNER: I was about to ask if this was the time that (stutters) they somewhat integrated with the Cherokees.

GARRIS: Yes. Then the rest of the [nomad Catawbas] finally just migrated back—trickled back down in. So, the governor at that particular time took pity on them and gave them the one square mile reservation.

FORTNER: Right.

GARRIS: And so, whenever [the] federal government finally did this—because that was one acre of state reservation that was incorporated into the larger realm of federal reservation—they didn't want that one acre. That was how we stayed a state recognized tribe, but we were no longer a federal tribe. Then—when the money and the land was divvied up—that was an illegal act because it wasn't ratified by congress, and so that was where the thirty year court battles came in to get federal recognition back.

FORTNER: OK. We were talking a minute ago about the whole storytelling process involving it, and we said that there was no [stories]—but there are stories, obviously—you're telling it now, and I assume that during the whole trial process, someone was out there saying, "Well, here's the story"

GARRIS: uh-huh—yeah.

FORTNER: We just don't know, now, who was involved with that.

GARRIS: Well, whenever the lawsuit started back up—and actually it was some Indian lawyers from out west that came and approached the tribe and said, well, we're working on these for other people, for other tribes to regain their land back—we would like [to] come and help you. And so, at that time they incorporated and elected a chief, Gilbert Blue which was Sam Blue's grandson.

FORTNER: And Sam Blue is also your Grandfather.

GARRIS: Great-Grandfather

FORTNER: Great-Grandfather. So, Gilbert Blue to you is...?

GARRIS: IS—uh—First Cousin

FORTNER: First Cousin

GARRIS: Yes. So, he [was] elected a chief—assistant chief—and [along with] three executive committee members. They were working at that, and after the settlement in '94, he resigned.

That's when they had the new elections and that's when Donald Rogers was elected chief.

FORTNER: Who is current chief

GARRIS: He's current chief

FORTNER: OK...very interesting. You had said at one time [you] had some takes on storytelling used with pottery process.

GARRIS: Yeah

FORTNER: How does that work?

GARRIS: Actually, I incorporate it into a sermon that I do at churches. (Laughs)

FORTNER: Into a sermon?

GARRIS: Yes. (Laughing) Yes.

FORTNER: OK!

GARRIS: Cause you know, in, uh—Isaiah 59—somewhere along there—it states that, “Lord, you are the potter, and I am the clay.”

FORTNER: OK—Yes!

GARRIS: So I—while I'm standing there talking—I have a piece of clay in my hand, and I'm pinching out a small bowl. Then on the table I have different stages—or I had different stages—of the pottery from it—then finished and left. Then I have one that was fired, but broke; And then I have one that is finished—almost perfect—but not quite. (Laughs)

FORTNER: Yeah...that's great.

GARRIS: I go through the stages and I go back to Genesis 26:27—where he created man out of the clay—and I said, it's just like us today—we have to go through these same stages as making

these pieces of pottery. *We* have to be shaped. *We* have to get a firm foundation. Then, sometimes we get kind of rubbed on, and sometimes stepped on, and sometimes the fire—the heats we have to go through—through trials, and tribulations, and divorces, or losing jobs, or anything else. But, to get the shine on there—and I hold up a river rock—because that’s how we put the shine on it. I had done this story several times, and then all of a sudden it just hit me—and I said, you know—all these stumbling blocks that we hit sometimes...

FORTNER: Oh, that’s—yeah—that’s a great analogy.

GARRIS: I said, maybe that’s God’s polishing stone—He’s getting your rough edges off, to shine you to, to be what you’re supposed to be. . .

FORTNER: That’s great!

GARRIS: . . . and if you don’t go through the fire, you don’t come out on the end who you’re supposed to be.

FORTNER: Now, have you used this outside the sermons at church? Have you done it at any of the other settings that you sometimes do stories?

GARRIS: I haven’t, but that’s a good idea. (Laughs)

FORTNER: (Laughs) Yeah . . .OK...well, maybe we can work on that

GARRIS: Yeah, OK.

FORTNER: I think that would be good. I think I’ve got all the questions I was thinking about coming down here. You got anything you can add?

GARRIS: Well—you know, talking about within the churches and everything else—Native people have always been spiritual, and even though how Christianity was brought to them, in not so gentle [a] way, they could still see, you know, that our spirituality and Christianity weren’t miles apart—they were interconnected.

FORTNER: Christianity as it should be

GARRIS: As it should be—yes, because there've been several different chiefs within different tribes that have said, you know, you come to me preaching to [us] about your God, and each one of you come here from a different faith—but you're still preaching out of the same book—so once you come together, from this book, then I will believe.

FORTNER: Right...sure.

GARRIS: But then, like I say, we always knew there was a creator, a supreme being, cause in Catawba it's Wareh—[that's] W A R E H—and it translates to “the one who never dies.”

FORTNER: Oh, interesting...cool. I know that there's an impact of Mormonism here, and it's something I can relate to— cause—my own family being raised Methodist—but my father became a converted Mormon. So, [I've] been exposed very much to the Mormons and everything, and I have several friends in [the local Ward]. Why is there such a pronounced relationship here with the Mormons?

GARRIS: Whenever they first came here, they also were ostracized by the outside communities. They didn't want this new religion coming in and taking over, so they were welcomed here because—not only because of the *Book of Mormon*—which, their teachings is that Native Americans are part of the twelve lost tribes of Israel.

FORTNER: I was aware of that.

GARRIS: Like I said, it's always because of the adversity and the hardships that was placed on them. They came here, and Grandpaw Blue accepted it and embraced it, and even housed all missionaries that came through here whenever they weren't allowed to out in the outside community and preach, or mission to.

FORTNER: Had there been that much contact between the Mormons and the Catawbas before your Grandfather Blue?

GARRIS: That part, now, I can't say

FORTNER: OK

GARRIS: Because, Grandpa was born in—around 1873

FORTNER: So, he would be in—about his 20s in [the] 1890s

GARRIS: He would [have] been in his—right.

FORTNER: Cause—granted—I didn't do enough reading about that background,⁴ but my take on it was that the Mormons had come in right about that time

GARRIS: Yeah—and he not only welcomed [Mormon missionaries] into his house, sometimes he hid them in his house, because they were beaten. There's one report of where a couple of them were tarred and feathered.

FORTNER: Ugh. Much different today, of course. My father, who's now passed away, also brought the Mormons through the house and everything; but, of course, it was not a controversial thing.

GARRIS: Right

FORTNER: Well, that's very interesting. OK, well, I'd really want to thank you for taking time with me today

GARRIS: No problem.

FORTNER: Cool—and if I get a chance to speak to Chief Blue, I'd like to do that, too.

GARRIS: OK

FORTNER: Thanks.

GARRIS: OK... Thank you.

⁴ I have since reviewed more literature on this subject.

FORTNER: Thank you. I'll cut that off there. [The Recorder, which was cut off at this point]

Works Cited

- “America.” *Lloyd's Evening Post and British Chronicle* (London, England), November 16, 1761 - November 18, 1761; Issue 678. *Gale Cengage Learning*. Web. 15 July 2011.
- “America.” *St. James's Chronicle or the British Evening Post* (London, England), November 17, 1761 - November 19, 1761; Issue 108. *Gale Cengage Learning*. Web. 15 July 2011.
- “America.” *Whitehall Evening Post or London Intelligencer* (London, England), November 17, 1761 - November 19, 1761; Issue 2446. *Gale Cengage Learning*. Web. 15 July 2011.
- “American News.” *Public Ledger* (London, England), Thursday, November 19, 1761; Issue 581. *Gale Cengage Learning*. Web. 15 July 2011.
- Ballenger, Bruce. "Methods of Memory: On Native American Storytelling." *College English* 59.7 (1997): 789-800. *JSTOR*. Web. 8 Dec 2010.
- Banks, Dick. "Play's Premier Attracts 2,000." *The Charlotte Observer* 22 September 1960: (n.p.). *ychistory.org*. Web. 30 April 2012.
- Bingham, Art. "Review of Walter J. Ong's *Orality and Literacy*." *engl.niu.edu/wac/ong*. Northern Illinois University, n.d. Web. 9 June 2012.
- Blommaert, Jan. "Applied Ethnopoetics." *Narrative Inquiry* 16.1 (2006): 181-190. *Communication & Mass Media Complete*. Web. 26 June 2012.
- Bradford, William. "'With a Very Great Blame on Our Hearts': Reparations, Reconciliation, and an American Indian Plea for Peace with Justice." *American Indian Law Review* 27.1 (2002/2003): 1-175. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Feb 2011.
- Briscoe, Virginia Wolf. "Ruth Benedict Anthropological Folklorist." *The Journal of American Folklore* 92.366 (1979): 445-476. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 June 2012.

- Delgado, Richard. "Storytelling for Oppositionists and Others: A Plea for Narrative." *Legal Storytelling*. Spec. issue of *Michigan Law Review* 87.8 (1989): 2411-2441. *JSTOR*. Web. 8 Dec 2010.
- Duncan, Barbara. *Living Stories of the Cherokee*. University of North Carolina Press, 1998. Print.
- Farnell, Brenda. "Ethno-Graphics and the Moving Body." *Man* 29.4 (1994): 929-974. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 June 2012.
- Fitts, Mary Elizabeth, and Charles L. Heath. "'Indians Refusing to Carry Burdens.'" *Mapping the Mississippian Shatter Zone: The Colonial Indian Slave Trade and Regional Instability in the American South*. Ed. Robbie Ethridge and Sheri M. Shuck-Hall. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2009. 142-162. Print.
- Gardner, Susan. "'Weaving an Epic Story': Ella Cara Deloria's Pageant for the Indians of Robeson County, North Carolina, 1940-1941." *Mississippi Quarterly: The Journal of Southern Cultures* 60.1 (2006-2007): 33-57. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 12 June 2012.
- Garris, Beckee. "The Yehasuri: The Little Wild Indians." *Trickster, Native American Tales: A Graphic Collection*. Ed. Matt Dembicki. Golden, CO. Fulcrum Publishing, Inc, 2010. 137-142. Print.
- Garris, Beckee. Personal interview. 14 March 2011.
- Glassberg, David. *American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990. Print.
- Howard, Scott J. "Contemporary American Indian Storytelling: An Outsider's Perspective." *American Indian Quarterly* 23.1 (1999): 45-53. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 Dec 2010.

Hudson, Charles M. *The Catawba Nation*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1970. Print.

Kniffel, Leonard. "StoryCorps Oral History Project: Listening as an Act of Love." *American Libraries* 36.11 (2005): 42-45. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 Dec 2010.

Lockard, Joe. "The Universal Hiawatha." *American Indian Quarterly* 24.1 (2000): 110-125. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 June 2012.

Loftis, Lynn. "The Catawbas' Final Battle: A Bittersweet Victory." *American Indian Law Review* 19.1 (1994): 183-215 . *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Feb 2011.

Long, William I. *Kah-Woh, Catawba (Thank You, People of the River): A Drama of the Catawbas Indians of South Carolina, and the White People Closely Associated with Them, from 1750-1791*. Rock Hill, SC: York County Historical Commission, 1960. Digitized file.

Lowery, Malinda Lowery. *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South: Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010. Print.

Merrell, James H. *The Indians' New World: Catawbas and their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989. Print.

Merrell, James H. "The Indians' New World: The Catawba Experience." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 41.4 (1984): 537-565. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 July 2011.

Merrell, James H. "Reading 'An Almost Erased Page': A Reassessment of Frank G. Speck's Catawba Studies." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 127.4 (1983): 248-262 . *JSTOR*. Web. 15 July 2011.

Mooney, James. "Myths of the Cherokee." Sacred-Texts.com. John Bruno Hare, 2001. Web. 5 Dec 2010.

Salzer, Maureen. "Ray Young Bear's Cantaloupe Terrorist: Storytelling as a Site of Resistance."

American Indian Quarterly 19. 3 (1995): pp. 301-317. *JSTOR*. Web. 23 April 2011.

Speck, Frank. *Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology: Catawba Texts*. 1969

Reprint. 24. New York: AMS Press, 1934. Print.

Speck, F. G. "Some Catawba Texts and Folk-Lore." *Journal of American Folklore* 26.102

(1913): 329-30. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Dec 2010.

Speck, F. G. and Carr, L. G. "Catawba Folk Tales from Chief Sam Blue." *Journal of American*

Folklore 60.235 (1947): 79-84. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Dec 2010

Toelken, Barre J. "A Descriptive Nomenclature for the Study of Foklore Part I: The Process of

Tradition. *Western Folklore* 28.2 (1969): 91-100. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 June 2012.

Torres, Gerald, and Kathryn Milun. "Translating Yonnondio by Precedent and Evidence: The

Mashpee Indian Case." *Duke Law Journal* 1990.4 (1990): 625-659. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Feb 2011.

Trafzer, Clifford E. "Grandmother, Grandfather, and the First History of the Americas." *New*

Voices in Native American Literary Criticism (Smithsonian Series of Studies in Native American Literatures). Ed. Arnold Krupat. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993. 474-487. Print.

Ulmer, Mark. "Tribal Property: Defining the Parameters of the Federal Trust Relationship under

the Non-Intercourse Act: Catawba Indian Tribe v. South Carolina." *American Indian Law Review* 12.1 (1984): 101-145. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Feb 2011.

Womack, Craig. *Red on Red: Native American Literary Separatism*. Minneapolis, MN:

University of Minnesota Press, 1999. Print .