

CHEROKEE PRINTING, CHEROKEE IDENTITY

by
William Joseph Thomas

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

November, 2002

Approved by:

Advisor

William Joseph Thomas. Cherokee Printing, Cherokee Identity. A Master's paper for the M.S. in L.S. degree. November 2002. 81 pages. Advisor: David Carr.

Cherokee print was the vehicle for the tribe's national rhetorical strategy, as it contended with the United States and Georgia during the Removal Crisis of the late 1820s and 1830s. Cherokee print manifests an ambivalence concerning acculturation, and an attendant class struggle. This paper provides a historical and social framework for judging the place of Cherokee printing within this charged cultural moment, describes the roles, experiences, and interrelationships of the five men at the heart of this print production, and examines the political role of Cherokee printing through their experiences. Samuel Austin Worcester, Elias Boudinot, Isaac Harris, John F. Wheeler, and John Candy played critical parts in the production of tribal print, but are almost unknown, and seldom discussed. Finally, I want to encourage further study of Cherokee printing and its relation to the forces shaping Cherokee identity in the middle of the nineteenth century.

Headings:

Cherokee Language – Writing – Social aspects

Cherokee Indians – Newspapers

Cherokee Phoenix (New Echota, Ga.)

Cherokee Indians – History

Indians of North America – Georgia – Newspapers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page.....	1
Abstract.....	2
Table of Contents.....	3
1. Introduction.....	4
2. Guiding Questions and Approaches	19
3. Producing the <u>Cherokee Phoenix</u>	22
4. The End of Printing in the East, and Its Beginning in the West.....	52
5. What We Can Know Now and What We Need to Know.....	67
Works Cited.....	75
Appendix One Sequoyah’s Syllabary.....	80
Appendix Two: Front Page of the Cherokee Phoenix.....	81

The people are not simply historical events or parts of a patriotic body politic. They are also a complex rhetorical strategy of social reference: their claim to be representative provokes a crisis within the process of signification and discursive address.¹

1. INTRODUCTION

Americans have a wonderful propensity for study, a seemingly innate desire to understand, analyze, and record. Problems may arise, however, when Americans study others who are quite capable of speaking for themselves. Gayatri Spivak has asked if the others, the subalterns, can speak, and this is a question I apply now to the Cherokee in regard to their invention and use of the Cherokee syllabary, and their establishment of a national press (1988: 271). I intend to discuss the facts of Cherokee print, particularly in the time period between 1828 and 1834, to suggest that printing provided a Cherokee voice. I want to set these facts within a historically relevant framework, and propose to view these events through a critical lens.

The use of print signals the tribe's effort to negotiate with the United States as cultural equals, using a means recognizable as "civilized." But evidence also suggests that Cherokee print manifests an ambivalence concerning acculturation, and an attendant class struggle. I want to encourage further study of Cherokee printing and its relation to Cherokee identity. In order to confirm the importance of Cherokee printing and printers as subjects in a cultural moment worthy of study, this paper will provide a historical and social framework for judging the place of that printing within its parent culture, tell the creation of the Cherokee syllabary, and describe the roles and interrelationships of the

¹ Bhabha, 145.

five men at the heart of Cherokee print production: Samuel A. Worcester, Elias Boudinot, Isaac Harris, John Wheeler, and John Candy.

Typically, the study of Cherokee printing tells of Sequoyah's wonderful invention of the Cherokee syllabary—and that's about it, except mention, perhaps, of the *Cherokee Phoenix*—but any discussion of the syllabary must be set into a larger context of American and Cherokee national events. Following the Treaties of 1785 and 1791, the focus of attention will be the set of events from the turn of the century until the demonstration of Sequoyah's syllabary in 1821. Placing Cherokee printing within an authentic historical framework will help modern scholars to understand the importance it held within its day, and will influence the way we think of the syllabary today.

The most prominent texts for this paper exhibit established scholarship, and in their silences lie problems of visibility inviting further study. While there are many histories available of the Cherokee tribe, especially dealing with its removal from its eastern homelands to Indian Territory in 1838, William G. McLoughlin's *Cherokee Renascence in the New Republic* (1986) is clear, concise, and conscientiously researched. It provides a touchstone against which to place works treating Samuel A. Worcester and Elias Boudinot, who translated and published the earliest works in the Cherokee syllabary. The most authoritative source on Samuel A. Worcester, a white missionary and translator who worked most of his life among the tribe, is Althea Bass's *Cherokee Messenger*, published in 1936. Ralph Henry Gabriel's *Elias Boudinot, Cherokee and His America* (1941), and more recently, Theda Purdue's *Cherokee Editor* (1983), are the sources most cited for Elias Boudinot, the highly-educated Cherokee editor of the *Phoenix* and translator of Biblical texts.

These histories provide only a starting point, though; they do not tell the whole story. In revealing the history and the two most famous men associated with Cherokee printing, they also reveal gaps, absences. Who were the printers? Not much is known about Isaac Harris; his story must be pieced together—still incomplete—from other sources. From October 1886 to March 1887, John F. Wheeler serially published “The Cherokees: Recollections of a Life of Fifty Years Among Them.” Wheeler is also the subject of a recent article by Mary Ann Littlefield (1985); therefore, Wheeler is becoming more a part of this total story. The last printer in New Echota was the half-breed Cherokee John Candy. Since he is the least recorded, he is the most fascinating. Another reason to invite further study of Candy is that, not only was he the first Native printer working in his own language, but he provided the bridge between printing in Georgia and the reestablishment of tribal printing in the Indian Territory. In this order are the stories of these men told—to tie them to the historical events surrounding them and to maintain a focus on the place of print production within the tribe.

National Events Prior to the Establishment of a Cherokee Press

According to George W. Manypenny, the United States entered into twelve different treaties with the Cherokee tribe between 1791 and 1819 (93). The first two, including the earlier Treaty of Hopewell (1785) and the Treaty of Holston (1791), seem to be agreements between independent nations (Manypenny 92-93). Both came to a bilateral agreement on boundaries, and the U.S. recognized the sovereignty of the Cherokees to deal with intruders. The Treaty of 1791 even required a passport for any U.S. “citizen or inhabitant” to cross the Cherokee boundary (93).

The U.S. president, George Washington, initiated the Treaty of Holston at a time when the new American republic was weak, and well aware of the power of Spain to its south and southwest (Woodward 102). Even within the Republic, internal struggles created continuing problems, including the formation of the state of Franklin and the raids by Dragging Canoe and other Cherokee Chickamaugans. The internal strife of the time lessened within a few years, and the position of the new country against Spain strengthened after 1791, with American military victories. Also helping strengthen the new republic against the Cherokee were the death of Dragging Canoe, the dissolution of the state of Franklin, and the Spanish refusal to aid the Indians because of their war against Napoleon (116). In “The Tragedy and the Travesty,” Ward Churchill clarifies that the lack of political power would not preclude the United States from moving toward its “territorial ambitions;” it would only delay them (24).

The United States did solidify its power, and the changes would become evident in future treaties. At the turn of the century, the Cherokees had begun greater measures toward acculturation, spurred on not only by increasing contact with whites, but also by an Indian policy laid out by the Washington administration. The 1791 Treaty had laid the groundwork with an article stating that the U.S. would provide assistance, in the form of monetary aid and implements, to the tribe for their becoming “herdsmen and cultivators” (Woodward 112-13). This assistance was part of that federal policy, administered by the Washington administration, which “called for Congressional control over Indian territories and Congressional funding to civilize the Indians” (McLoughlin, 1985: 398). In *Cherokee Renascence* (1986), McLoughlin specifies the five part plan that emerged between President Washington and his Secretary of War, Henry Knox: 1, the

acknowledgment of the tribe as owners of their land; 2, the establishment of federal Indian agents among the tribes; 3, the proscription that tribes could only treat with the federal government; 4, the appointment of missionaries to live among the tribes, speeding their civilization along religious and educational values; and 5, Indian tribes would cede, “from time to time,” lands they were not cultivating (35-36). All five factors influenced Cherokee development for the next forty years. McLoughlin writes that the “ultimate goal” of this civilization program “was to admit the Indians as equal citizens of the new nation once they had become civilized and Christianized” (1985: 398). Partially as a consequence of the United States’ Indian policy, the turn of the century saw the Cherokees changing their attitudes toward agriculture and cattle as well as toward education and, eventually, tribal governance (Woodward 122-23).

In 1808, the tribe began to fashion a tribal governmental structure, which approximated that of the United States (126). The Cherokees adopted a constitution, with written laws and the explication of legislative and judicial powers that would be vested in this new tribal National Council (126). The Cherokees also began to enforce the proscription that only the nation could authorize land cessions; individuals who ceded land on their own were guilty of treason. The year before, in 1807, Major Ridge, an important tribal leader, helped put to death Doublehead, who sold land without tribal approval (129). Doublehead’s death sentence would come back to haunt the tribe.

Meanwhile, the United States government started grappling with questions over states’ rights, and had entered into a Compact in 1802 with the state of Georgia. This Compact agreed that the state of Georgia would cede its western lands to the United States in return for a payment of \$1,250,000 and the promise that the United States would

extinguish Indian title to lands in Georgia and turn them over to that state “as early as the same can be peaceably obtained upon reasonable terms” (Woodward 130). This Compact hung over the heads of the Cherokee until Removal in 1838, and was but the first signal that the state would push until it took control over all tribal lands.

Cherokees were involved in the battles against the Creek Redsticks in 1813 and 1814, even saving, some say, Andrew Jackson’s life. It is important to know that this campaign against the Creeks was what spurred Sequoyah’s efforts to complete his syllabary. Woodward also points out that Sequoyah and the man who would be chief for a long time, John Ross, both “were given ample opportunity to observe their future political foe,” General Jackson (132). Jackson had already begun to make a name for himself when, in 1796, as the representative of Tennessee, he “introduced a resolution which would reimburse Tennessee for the expense of John Sevier’s unauthorized campaign of 1793 against the Cherokees” (121). Jackson set harsh terms for the defeated Creeks in 1814, and was directly involved in treaty negotiations in 1817. And of course it was Jackson who convinced Congress to pass the Removal Bill in 1828.

The general government of the United States, as it was known, had solidified its civic power over its own territory after the War of 1812, and was now in a position to assume greater political power in its relations with various native nations on and within its borders. There were treaties in 1817 and 1819 that forced some Cherokees to give up their claims on their land and move west or accept U.S.-given reservations of their own lands and second-class status. These two treaties show that the power differential between the two nations had changed for good. On July 8, 1817, General Andrew Jackson and Joseph McMinn, governor of Tennessee, met with a Cherokee delegation “at

the Cherokee agency, within the Cherokee nation” to sign a treaty ceding land from the Cherokees who were willing to move to Arkansas (Manypenny 94). That the U.S. was now going to assume greater political power over the Cherokee nation is most evident in the treatment of the boundary line between the two nations: it would in the future be controlled by the United States instead of being drawn up in a bilateral agreement, as before. Manypenny writes, “The new boundary line between the lands ceded to the United States and those remaining to the Indians, was to be run by the United States commissioners, accompanied by such commissioners as the Cherokees may appoint...” (94). Sequoyah was involved in treaty negotiations at this time, and became one of the Old Settlers in the Arkansas territory because of his voluntary removal in 1818.

Elizabeth Arnett Fields focuses on a different aspect of the Treaties of 1817 and 1819: the absorption of the tribe within the United States. She says that these treaties were both “efforts by the federal government to ‘denationalize’ the Cherokees. By granting reservations of land to the Cherokees who wished to remain on their land, the U.S. hoped to assimilate the Cherokees into the general population” (186). This assumption is consistent with McLoughlin’s understanding of the preceding policies by the Washington administration.

Under U.S. law, then, these Cherokees would be considered “free persons of color” (Fields 186). As free persons of color, the Cherokees would be locked out of the upper classes, regardless of their level of education or material wealth. William McLoughlin describes their second class status: “They could not vote, hold office, serve in the militia, or testify in court against a white man; they could not marry whites or send their children to public schools. They were a separate and distinct caste” (1986: 212-13).

Even the missionaries among the tribe knew that the Cherokee would not be treated equally as citizens. An entry for the *Brainerd Journal* for November 25, 1818, includes, “This people consider the offer of taking reserves and becoming citizens of the U.S. as of no service to them. They know they are not to be admitted to the rights of freemen, or the privilege of their oath...” (Phillips and Phillips, 95). So, these treaties propagated a class conflict that would become more exaggerated within the governing of the tribe through the 1820s, more evident in the rhetorical strategy of the *Phoenix* from 1828 to 1834, and more complicated in the *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* decision of 1831.

The pace began to increase after 1820. The Cherokee expended their efforts in acculturating in order to deal with the United States as people deserving equal respect—that is, people who were recognizably civilized in white eyes in terms of education, law, and government. There is a certain ambivalence in how the Cherokees were constructing their sense of self in opposition to an American metropole—maintaining their difference in order to create a Cherokee identity that was acceptable to traditional members of the tribe, and at the same time reaching for a degree of civilization that would be acceptable, if not equal to, white Americans. This ambivalence becomes more prevalent at this time, and is reflected in the *Cherokee Phoenix*. While the tribe’s desire to appear civilized might create an illusion of equality with whites, they could not claim equality because of their lack of power compared to the United States, as a result of their compromised status.

The Cherokee leaders, struggling to find ground from which to negotiate with the Americans, were an educated, mixed blood elite. They were worthy of respect by virtue of their wealth and education, but not according to an increasingly racial sensitivity. As

“free persons of color” the Cherokee elite were, to the whites of Georgia, a threat that they would have to assimilate or remove. (See Perdue and Green, 1995: 60ff.) But these elite men tried to represent all the Cherokee, including full bloods, who were mostly poor, even by the standards of the day. Perdue and Green note a certain class conflict evident even in the attempt at service: “The centralization of power [in the Cherokee government] came about in part because wealthy Cherokees wanted to protect their property but primarily because they wanted to preserve the Nation” (1995: 13). This class conflict complicated the resolve of the tribe and their confidence in the newly-forming Cherokee state; it may have played a role in the tactics and perception of the Nation's press between 1828 and 1834.

The Cherokee went through great changes in a short period of time. In 1791 they were still largely settled in fairly independent little towns and still considered a threat to wage war against nearby white settlers. Within three decades, the tribe negotiated increasingly complex treaties with the federal government and began shifting from a matrilineal, clan-focused and consensus-based confederation of towns toward the white conception of “civilization.” These steps included learning to cultivate corn, cotton, and other crops the way whites did, to raise cattle and pork, to focus attention on a nuclear family living on its isolated farm, and passing down property in patrilineal order. The Cherokee established a government modeled largely on that of the United States, including a written Constitution, a mounted police force, and divisions of power among executive, legislative, and judicial bodies. The next step in Cherokee evolution would have the power of the written word, in the Cherokee’s own language.

Sequoyah's Invention

Against this dramatic backdrop, the invention of a native means of articulation takes on a highly political significance. Born as George Gist in 1776 at Tuskegee, Tennessee, Sequoyah was the son of Nathaniel Gist, a white trader, and a Cherokee woman variously named Wut-teh or Wureth. Gist arrived in the Cherokee territory during the Colonial period, and encouraged Cherokee warriors to support Lt. Col. George Washington and Virginia governor Dinwiddie in their efforts for the English in the French and Indian War (Woodward 70). Wilma Mankiller specifies that Sequoyah's mother Wureth belonged to the Paint Clan, although the Cherokee Nation Release that includes the "History of Sequoyah" says that she belonged to the Red Paint Clan (81; "History of Sequoyah"). Grace Steele Woodward goes on to say about Sequoyah's mother that she raised the boy by herself, and that the Gists of Virginia didn't claim him as a relative until after he became famous for his syllabary (86). Sequoyah himself was a silversmith who either was born lame or became lame through a hunting accident.

Sequoyah apparently began working on his writing system in 1809, trying pictographs and combinations of symbols for syllables (Perdue, 1994: 117). He had to break from his creation from around 1812 until about 1814 in order to fight in the wars against the British and the Creek uprising. He did serve with the Cherokee regiment in the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. The war convinced him of the need for literacy, since he felt the Cherokees needed to be able to read military orders, send and receive letters from home, and record the events as they occurred (Mankiller 82). He had been involved in "treaty negotiations [of 1817] that culminated in a land cession, and in 1818 he...[had] moved west" (Perdue, 1994: 117).

After his return, Sequoyah redoubled his efforts, creating a syllabary of 85 signs that he demonstrated in 1821 with his daughter, Ayoka, at his home in Arkansas². He traveled back east to teach it to that majority of the tribe still remaining, being rewarded by seeing his invention catch on quickly. The National Council adopted the syllabary in 1824 and honored its creator with a silver medal and a pension. Sequoyah's role fulfilled, he returned to his Arkansas home, and later traveled to Texas and then to Mexico, seeking other members of his tribe.

Within only months after Sequoyah demonstrated this system, thousands of Cherokees could read and write in their own language. The numbers of literate Cherokees kept growing through the next decade, and within all geographic areas of Cherokee settlement (Walker and Sarbaugh, 72). By 1825, the Cherokee Nation was willing to put the power of the invention to their use. That year, they chartered the national press and headquartered it at the tribal capital to be built at New Echota. In order for this plan to be feasible, the spread of literacy had to warrant its expected success.

The Rise of Cherokee Nationalism and the Creation of a Cherokee Press

Further evidence of the intertwining of Cherokee printing and Cherokee cultural identity is the coincident time of their rise. Evidence of Cherokee nationalism crystallizes after the establishment of a republican tribal government in 1825. This government would be centered in a newly-created town called New Echota, built to serve as a capital in what is now northwestern Georgia. One of the first official acts of the

² Appendix One shows Sequoyah's syllabary as it appeared in a lithograph prepared for the American Board.

government was the Legislative Council's authorization for a well-educated Cherokee man, Elias Boudinot, to establish a printing press there and begin publishing a tribal newspaper in both English and Cherokee. Boudinot had the tribe's approval to raise funds, and he and Samuel Worcester, a white minister sent from the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, put out the prospectus for the *Cherokee Phoenix* stating its purpose as an official organ of the Nation, to publish its "laws and public documents...and matters relating to the welfare and condition of the Cherokees as a people" (Woodward 144). Indeed, the public buildings authorized to be built at New Echota included "a Council House, a Supreme Court building, and a print shop," as well as houses for "the Reverend Samuel Worcester, Elias Boudinot, and Boudinot's printers" (151). The very structuring of New Echota shows that the Cherokees were establishing institutions that marked them as "civilized," and thus capable of discourse with the United States.

Since one of those civilized institutions is the press, the *Cherokee Phoenix* was to be, from the outset, a voice for the Nation. It is the basis of this paper that the *Cherokee Phoenix* was founded for two explicitly political purposes, and that these purposes required that the paper make use of both fonts, English and Cherokee. The first purpose was to create a sense of tribal unity, a necessity in negotiating for the tribe's best interests. The second was to prove that the tribe was "civilized," that is, recognizable as a political entity to the United States and thus deserving to be taken seriously and allowed their own space instead of being absorbed or removed out of this space. Print proves civilization in the creation of a written record, giving the printing people a narrative, documentary history. Print also provides a voice with which to advocate for oneself,

permitting discourse, references, and dissemination in uniform formats. In this civilized and civilizing role, print is explicitly a political tool.

These two purposes, creation of tribal unity and civilized advocacy, seem to be at odds: the first is ethnocentric, especially in making use of a written form of a language marking the tribe as other than white; the second seems to encourage acculturation. My contention will be that this ambivalent rhetorical strategy did not work. The tension required for this kind of balancing act broke apart under the strain. I will address this tension further in succeeding sections of the paper.

In 1824, while the Cherokee were dedicated to creating a national identity and voice, the U.S. created a separate Office of Indian Affairs within the War Department. Previously, all U.S.-Indian treaties had been negotiated by the War Department. The Bureau of Indian Affairs would not be transferred to the Department of the Interior until 1849, and the War Department clamored to have the BIA returned even into the 1880's. The War Department's stance seems evident of the attitudes of the time: Indians had three options: assimilate, remove, or be exterminated (see Manypenny xv). And, as Manypenny points out, soldiers are not best trained to teach the arts and practice of civilization (xxxix). It would be the Secretary of the War Department with which the tribe would have to treat in the 1830s.

Other American actions were soon to follow. In 1825 the President of the United States began urging Congress to consider removal of Indian tribes from the southeastern states westward, beyond the territory settled by white Americans. According to Manypenny, he had been encouraged by the state of Georgia, which demanded that the title to Cherokee lands be extinguished, as the U.S. had promised the state in the Compact

of 1802 (98). Georgia's request specifically references the Compact and the failure of the United States to accomplish its promise in Treaties with the Cherokees in 1817 and 1819.³ Georgia had two precedents that gave them hope, from Tennessee and South Carolina. The United States negotiated the Treaty at Tellico with the Cherokee in 1798 in part because of a request from the state of Tennessee. That state legislature had written the President, asking for a treaty to extinguish Indian titles within its borders on the basis that the Indians there were "tenants at will" (McLoughlin, 1986: 46). South Carolina's example was more recent: Article 1 of the 1819 "Treaty and Convention with the Cherokees" involved the United States' extinguishing Cherokee land claims within the territory of that state (ASP II, 87-89). President Monroe's argument for removal included his belief that the Cherokees could not be assimilated and that, unless moved, the tribe would suffer a "degradation and extermination [that] will be inevitable" (Manypenny 99). The portion of the speech reported by Manypenny acknowledged indirectly that white settlers were the cause of the Indians' distress, but did not assign them blame. The speech also affirmed that the country's expansion was inevitable, and that therefore, the United States could do nothing to help "protect" these otherwise helpless Indians against their own demise.

Two important events marked 1826, evidence of the tribe's political responses to these increasing pressures. The Cherokee adopted a Constitution remarkably like the American document, and the tribe sent Elias Boudinot to raise funds for the purchase of a press. The first of these was the Constitution, which begins, "We, the Cherokee people, constituting one of the sovereign and independent nations of the earth, and having

³ 17th Congress, 1st Session, no. 177, in *American State Papers* II, 259-60. After this, ASP I and ASP II will refer to the *American State Papers*, volume I and volume II, respectively.

complete jurisdiction over its territory to the exclusion of every other state, do ordain this constitution” (qtd. in Gabriel, 122). McLoughlin discusses the articles and provisions of this Constitution, particularly as it mediates between more progressive and more traditional interests in the Nation (1986: 396-401).

The State of Georgia was most immediately concerned about the Cherokee Constitution, because the state earnestly desired the land promised in the 1802 Compact. Georgia’s answer, stated in a legislative session in December 1827, was that the Cherokee were “tenants at will,” and that Georgia would lawfully take possession of Cherokee lands, extending her laws over those lands (Gabriel 123). Georgia’s claim that the Indians were “tenants at will” recalls the language of Tennessee earlier. In fact, not only did Georgia chastise the General Government for not acting sooner to fulfill the Compact of 1802, the state claimed, “The lands in question *belong* to Georgia. She *must* and *will* have them” (McLoughlin, 1986: 411-12). The conflict had been joined as a political challenge ostensibly between equally “civilized” powers, both of which claimed sovereignty in a written record, a means recognizable to other civilized nations. It would only intensify from this point forward, and it was to play out most dramatically in the tribe’s use of a national press that it set out to establish.

2. GUIDING QUESTIONS AND APPROACHES

This paper hinges on several questions regarding Cherokee printing within its historical context. How did the *Cherokee Phoenix* fit within its social and political climate? What were the purposes and goals to which the press was directed, and how successful was the *Phoenix* in becoming the voice of its people? How did five men, Elias Boudinot, Samuel A. Worcester, Isaac Harris, John F. Wheeler, and John Candy, interact to produce this political tool for the Cherokee Nation? These questions emerged from initial research, and guided the writing of this paper.

The method used to trace the purpose of the press and how it fits within its social, historical, and political climate will be to cast the story of the beginnings of Cherokee printing within the lives of its principal actors, starting with the editor and translator who raised money for and attended the practical details of ordering the press and types. Next will follow a brief examination of a selection of editorials, illustrative of the newspaper's response to its politicized environment. The most important of these responses is the *Cherokee Phoenix*'s reporting the tribe's struggle for sovereignty against the pressures of the United States and the State of Georgia. This struggle reaches a critical point in two Supreme Court trials specifically addressing the power of the Cherokees to govern their own lands.

The Supreme Court decisions are discussed as evidence of the rhetorical structure employed by the Cherokees in their struggle against their American neighbors. The

refusal of the tribal leadership to allow their editor to open the Removal debate in the columns of the national paper, even after the Supreme Court's decisions, reinforces the political aims of the *Cherokee Phoenix* as a tool of resistance. This resistance broke down in the face of overwhelming pressure of the United States to force the tribe from its homelands.

When reestablished in the West, the Cherokee press would require different aims. The Indian printer, John Candy, is particularly deserving of further study for his role in this process. Candy's known imprints are recounted, along with available biographical information. This paper ends with suggestions for further research, based in part on the current direction of scholarship, and in part on gaps in the scholarly body of work concerning Cherokee printing and Cherokee-language texts.

The research contributing to this paper follows a pattern fitting a topic not treated in detail recently. Like most papers, this one began with secondary sources, which pointed toward more original or authoritative sources. Though most of the sources are from the field of history, this topic has a wide variety of coverage, from rhetoric to education.

Primarily, technical details concerning Cherokee print are available from Cullen Joe Holland's *Cherokee Indian Newspapers, 1828-1906: The Tribal Voice of a People in Transition*. There are additional technical details contained in letters between Samuel Worcester and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, but these are difficult to find, and depending on the quality of the microfilm available, difficult to read. Paul Kutsche's bibliographic reference source, *A Guide to Cherokee Documents in the*

Northeastern United States (1986), proved invaluable in helping locate them. There remain many technical details unrecovered in these letters.

Some of the more authoritative sources, Althea Bass's *Cherokee Messenger*, about Samuel A. Worcester, and Ralph Henry Gabriel's *Elias Boudinot, Cherokee and His America*, for instance, are dated, and betray an inherent elitism that current research finds suspect. The limitations in these sources must be dealt with, though, because these sources have not been superseded in authority in recent scholarship, and they point toward key primary resources.

Direct research from primary sources like the *Cherokee Phoenix*, the *Missionary Herald*, and the Papers of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions is most helpful, but difficult because these resources are only available on microfilm, coverage is not complete, and some of the images are not clearly legible, though they are preserved. Fortunately, many of the editorials have been reproduced, as in Theda Perdue's *Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot* (1983), or the Kilpatricks' *New Echota Letters: Contributions of Samuel A. Worcester to the Cherokee Phoenix* (1968). And in the absence of access to actual imprints, bibliographies like James Constantine Pilling's *Bibliography of the Iroquoian Languages* (1888), his *Bibliography of the Muskogean Languages* (1889), and Lester Hargrett's *Oklahoma Imprints, 1835-1890* (1951), provide valuable research.

Further study hinges on delving deeper into the primary sources remaining, and reexamining the older authoritative sources. Needless to say, this paper can be only an introduction, an essay into describing the political forces shaping the production of Cherokee print in that moment.

3. PRODUCING THE CHEROKEE PHOENIX

Elias Boudinot, Editor of the *Cherokee Phoenix*

Elias Boudinot was the man the tribe had charged with soliciting donations to purchase that press, and he set out for a speaking tour in late spring of 1826. Boudinot was a good choice for the job; he was educated and articulate. Theda Perdue's *Cherokee Editor* provides a short biography of Elias Boudinot that sheds light on his role within the national press, although there are minor differences between her account and that in Ralph Henry Gabriel's *Elias Boudinot, Cherokee and His America*.

Perdue believes Boudinot was born about 1804 at Oothcaloga, a town in northwestern Georgia near present-day Calhoun (3). His name in youth was Gallegina, “Buck,” and he was the oldest son of Oo-watie and Susanna Reese. Gallegina's father enrolled him in the school at the Moravian mission at Spring Place in 1811 (5). Among the other Cherokee children present were his cousins John and Nancy Ridge, children of his uncle Major Ridge (Oo-watie's brother) (5-6).

A graduate of the school when he was about 15 years old, Gallegina was sent to the Foreign Mission School in Cornwall, Connecticut, sponsored by the American Board (Gabriel 30). He traveled with Elias Cornelius and Jeremiah Evarts of the American Board from his home in Georgia to the American Board's Foreign Mission School in Cornwall, Connecticut, but stopped along the way at Monticello to meet Thomas Jefferson and at Montpelier to meet James Madison. After another stop, in Washington, Watie met Dr. Elias Boudinot in Burlington, New Jersey. The doctor, president of the American Bible Society, was famous as a “writer, poet, and statesman who is probably

best-known for his election to a one-year term as President of the United States under the Articles of Confederation, his role as director of the U.S. Mint for many years, and his fight for [African-American] rights in New Jersey” (“Elias Boudinot: a North Georgia Notable”). Impressed by the Cherokee, Boudinot promised financial support; Gallegina changed his name in honor of the doctor.

Four years of study at the Foreign Mission School saw his conversion to Christianity and developing desire to help his tribe upon his return. Other Cherokees would also attend the Foreign Mission School, including his cousin John Ridge and another soon-to-be-famous young man, David Brown, a Cherokee who helped make the first translations of the New Testament into that language (Perdue, 1983: 6-7).

Boudinot's excellence in school is proved in part by the publication of some of his letters in the *Religious Remembrancer* and the *Missionary Herald*, and also by his acceptance to study at Andover Theological Seminary (7). Boudinot's fellow student from Cornwall, David Brown, also studied at Andover, and left before Boudinot, who was forced to return to the Cherokee Nation because of poor health (8). Perdue believes that Boudinot's conversion to evangelical Christianity would shape particular aspects of his career, including his “assum[ing] responsibility for the welfare of his people,” especially their Christian “civilization” (9). One of the principal means of Boudinot's providing for the welfare of his people would be to provide them with the scriptures that they may also convert to Christianity. Translation into Cherokee was necessary, and it would be as translator that Boudinot would become best acquainted with Samuel Worcester.

Boudinot's education helped make him the best choice for the pivotal roles of fundraiser and editor. In order to solicit donations, he traveled to many cities and towns,

including Charleston, New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, delivering addresses aimed at the common humanity of Indians and whites and telling the story of Sequoyah's invention (Perdue, 1983: 12-14). As part of his appeal, Boudinot had to show Cherokee "progress," so in 1826, Boudinot published *An Address to the Whites*, which was based on his address in Philadelphia in May, and which "contained an accounting of the material wealth accumulated by the Cherokees...[as] signs of civilization" (Fields 182; Perdue 14, "Address to the Whites" 65-83). Figuring material wealth as a sign of progress or civilization shows a fairly high degree of acculturation, as might be expected from Boudinot's level of education and social standing. Boudinot's degree of acculturation was a product of that mixed, somewhat unstable time; it certainly plays into Marxist critiques of Boudinot's fundraising efforts and writings, since he was part of an educated upper class.

In addition to material wealth, Boudinot also argues three points as proof of Cherokee progress toward civilization: first, the creation of the syllabary; second, the "translation of the New Testament into Cherokee;" and third, the "organization of a Government" (74). The second point recognizes the American equation of Christianity and civilization, and by the third, Boudinot refers to a form of government that the whites would acknowledge. My reason for pointing out Boudinot's proof here is to stress the interconnection between the rise of literacy and the rise of government, which is evidence of a Cherokee nationalism. The link with nationalism is important for this critique of Cherokee print.

Stephen Brandon discusses Boudinot's rhetorical strategies for this address, as well as for other solicitations and his use of the *Cherokee Phoenix*. Brandon writes that

Boudinot “used his fundraising lecture—just as he was later to use the Cherokee press—as a platform from which he attempted nothing less than to bring his audience to a new conception of what it meant to be a Native American and Cherokee” (6). Taking advantage of a cognitive dissonance between white expectations and his own appearance and abilities gave Boudinot persuasive power, but in order to do this, he had to establish a double move: balancing a position of inferiority as solicitor with the position of equal in civilization. In writing of Boudinot’s appeals for book donations to establish a National library, Brandon notes, “Once again, Boudinot transforms solicitation—a rhetorical situation that could easily suggest need and inferiority—into a platform from which to argue that, in terms of ‘civilization,’ the Native American differs from the European only in degree” (11). The doubleness of the rhetorical strategy may create sympathy when the white audience is willing to indulge the Cherokees, but does allow that same audience the position of power to recognize only “need and inferiority” when it is to their advantage.

In walking this solicitation tightrope, Boudinot did raise some of the money required for the press, though the original purchase was subsidized by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (the American Board), which had operated mission stations and schools in the Nation since 1817. His trip done, Boudinot returned to Hightower, where he was employed as a schoolmaster for a time during 1826 to 1827; he also spent some time during those years employed as the clerk of the National Council (Perdue 15).

As clerk of the National Council, Boudinot signed many of the resolutions related to the creation of the *Phoenix*, starting with the one appointing him to solicit funds for the purchase of the press and types (Foster 39-40). Elias Boudinot also signed resolutions

that chartered the building of the printing office (November 2, 1826), and that named the newspaper the *Cherokee Phoenix* (October 18, 1826). Other resolutions bearing Boudinot's signature appointed Isaac Harris "principal Printer for the Cherokee Nation," with an annual salary of \$400, and authorized Harris to hire a journeyman printer for an annual salary of \$300. Additionally, these resolutions authorized the hire of an editor for \$300 (November 4, 1826) (Foster 39-44).

Boudinot was the logical choice for the tribe for its editor. When first offered the editor's chair, though, Boudinot refused, because the Council had proposed to pay the white printer more than it would pay the editor. Samuel Worcester, with whom Boudinot was already working on translations, convinced the American Board to make up the difference in pay, and Boudinot accepted the position (Perdue 15). After that time, he moved to New Echota, in order to begin his duties as the editor for the *Cherokee Phoenix*.

Samuel Austin Worcester, Missionary and Translator

While Elias Boudinot was engaged in his speaking tour, Samuel Austin Worcester was preparing to move to New Echota. Worcester had arrived at Brainerd Mission in the Cherokee Nation in October of 1825, with his wife Ann Orr Worcester (Bass 15).

Nephew of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Worcester, Corresponding Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Samuel Austin had grown up in Vermont, and graduated from Andover Theological Seminary, the same school Boudinot attended (19). Brainerd was the most famous of the American Board's posts in Cherokee territory, though not the only one. The Board had operated missions in the Nation since 1817, and one of its outposts was the school at Hightower where Boudinot taught.

The American Board, and the boards from other denominations, regarded missions among the Indian tribes as foreign missions. William G. McLoughlin describes why: “After all, the Indians spoke a different language, they had a different culture, they governed themselves by their own political system, and they dealt with the United States of America only through treaties” (1981: 46). Worcester’s appointment as missionary was one for which he had wished and trained since beginning work in the offices of the American Board after his graduation from Andover in 1823. He was known for his linguistic skills, and knew about previous work translating the Bible and other religious materials into Cherokee (Bass 16). Worcester would work for the rest of his life among this tribe, translating most of the books of the Bible and many other materials into the Cherokee language.

Among the earliest letters he wrote on his missionary trip, Worcester addressed David Brown, at Willstown, requesting accounts of Sequoyah and the syllabary, and news of Elias Boudinot, from whom he would learn Cherokee, and on whom he would depend for help in translation.⁴ The Board were already familiar with the syllabary, but preferred trying to use Pickering’s alphabet to transcribe various Indian languages. Worcester saw the value of Sequoyah’s syllabary immediately, and began to help translate various accounts, letters, the New Testament, hymns, and religious tracts into Cherokee (Walker and Sarbaugh 71-72). He picked up work already begun by David Brown, the Cherokee who was Boudinot’s former classmate and who had worked with Pickering (37). Worcester’s first priority was learning the language from Boudinot, so that he could begin translation and help begin production of religious texts in Cherokee.

⁴ Papers of the ABCFM 1.01, v.5, Aug. 31, 1825, 371; see Kutsche 20.

Worcester helped establish the *Cherokee Phoenix* by arranging for the purchase of the press and ordering the type from Boston (Woodward 144). Letters between the American Board and Worcester detail the arrangements of the Board in procuring a press and preparing it for shipment. Worcester had prepared the drawings of the Cherokee characters and mailed them to the Corresponding Secretary, appended to one of his letters.⁵ Other letters followed, in which he clarified the forms of the syllabic characters and issues related to casting the type.⁶ Even with the iterative exchange concerning the shapes of the Cherokee characters, the foundry made some changes. In *Cherokee Indian Newspapers*, Cullen Joe Holland writes:

In casting the Cherokee type, the Boston foundry had simplified some letters and changed a few others in order to make them distinct from other symbols. The hand-written syllabary presented characters with numerous small thin-line marks and sweeping strokes that would have been difficult to duplicate in type. (46-47)

After the details were worked out, the American Board sent a satisfactory set of types to the Cherokee Nation in December 1827.

Worcester had also sent the Board a translation of first five verses of Genesis in the syllabary, which the Board published in the *Missionary Herald* of December 1827, stating above their text that it “is printed from the fount of types lately cast for the Cherokee government” (Vol XXIII No. 12, p 382). In issues for May and October 1828, after shipping the types to New Echota, the *Herald* ran some articles using Cherokee characters, suggesting that they too purchased a set of Cherokee types (Holland 44-45).⁷ The missionaries’ close work with Elias Boudinot in establishing the press and contributing to the *Cherokee Phoenix* did not go unnoticed; indeed it would become

⁵ 22 December 1825, Papers of the ABCFM 18.3.1 vol. 5 pt. 2, no. 229

⁶ See, for instance, a letter dated 2 September 1826, Papers of the ABCFM 18.3.1 vol. 5 pt. 2, no. 232.

⁷ Vol. XXIV No. 5, p 162; Vol. XXIV No. 10, pp 331-32

important for the tribe that Boudinot defend his editorship from charges that Worcester was the real author of editorials, and ran the paper.

By this time, the story of Cherokee printing has become primarily the story of several other people, the ones who produced texts, and the environment in which they produced them. These people include the previously-described Samuel A. Worcester and Elias Boudinot, and the first printers for the Nation: Isaac Harris, the first engaged printer, John F. Wheeler, originally a journeyman printer who was retained, and John Candy, the Cherokee apprentice who continued printing with the tribe after removal. Isaac Harris was its first-named printer, dismissed from duty at the end of 1828 and largely forgotten. John F. Wheeler not only stayed for most of the tribe's printing in the East, but also continued with his work with the tribe after Removal, becoming the first printer in Indian Territory, bridging the gap between printing at New Echota and Park Hill. John Candy, like Wheeler, printed in Cherokee before and after Removal, but Candy stayed with the tribe even after Wheeler moved to Arkansas to open his own shop in 1846. Worcester and Boudinot are deservedly recognized; indeed the study of Cherokee printing is impossible without giving them their due. The printers, on the other hand, have faded from historical view, and one of the points of this paper is that their roles in production helps make the story complete.

The printing of the Cherokee language is a necessary reference, especially in the age of the modern nation-state. The Cherokees realized their national and a multinational audience only after they were able to correspond, in their own language, with tribe members spread across various U.S. states and Mexico. Modern students of the syllabary use the printed edition as a guide, and modern students of Cherokee rely on print's

standardization and proof of the Cherokees' entrance into a comparable, and comparably complex, civilized method for debate and news. It is print, also, that will provide the focus of tribal ambivalence.

Isaac Harris and the First Edition

Isaac Harris's life is little known. Primarily, clues to his life must come from within documents focused on other people. John F. Wheeler tells some facts concerning Harris in "The Cherokees: Recollections of a Life of Fifty Years Among Them," his serialized article, published in six numbers from October 1886 to March 1887, by the *Indian Record*. Harris was the first printer engaged by the tribe, a white man from near Jasper, Tennessee, who entered the Nation seeking this appointment. After securing his employment, Harris traveled to Huntsville, Alabama, to procure Wheeler as his assistant, because the two had worked together there on the *Southern Advocate*.⁸ Harris and Wheeler arrived at New Echota around December 23, 1827, and began to study the syllabary while they awaited the arrival of the press, type, and other materials. Their apprentice, a "half-blood" Cherokee named John Candy, also aided their study of the language. Wheeler wrote of Candy that he "was of great help to me in giving words where they were not plainly written" (No. I). Wheeler believed Harris had a more difficult time than he learning the Cherokee characters, and wrote that Harris "abandoned the learning of the alphabet" (No. I). After that, setting Cherokee type fell to Wheeler. Problems with the language were not the only difficulty Harris was to encounter; a variety of problems would eventually lead to Harris's dismissal.

⁸ Wheeler, October 1886. This was No. I of the six-part article. Future references will be made to the number of the article.

Among the first of his difficulties, Isaac Harris began his job with some ill will from his editor, Boudinot, who had objected to the Council's agreement to pay the white printer \$400, while the editor only earned \$300. Worcester had helped to solve the problem by convincing the American Board to finance the other \$100 to make the salaries equivalent. In return, the press would also publish some materials for the American Board. Second, when the press and type arrived, the printers discovered that there was no paper; Harris took a wagon to a paper mill at Knoxville, Tennessee, to gather separately molded sheets on which to begin their venture (No. I). A third difficulty was the need for stands, a bank, and cases for the type, which had been cast by Baker and Greene of Boston. The English and Cherokee fonts were both a small pica, according to Worcester's directions.⁹ Since this was the first set of Cherokee type, it required the invention of new furniture. This problem Wheeler solved, by constructing a case measuring three by three and one-half feet, with the six vowels nearest to hand (Littlefield 266). The cases contained more than 100 boxes each (266).

Printer John Wheeler did much to help solve some of the problems he and Harris faced beginning this new venture. Wheeler describes their new press as "a small royal type," which he had not seen before, and writes that the it was "of cast-iron, with spiral springs to hold up the platen" (Wheeler, No. I). Jeremiah Evarts of the American Board described it as a "union press," and continues that the press "seems simple in its structure—easily set up—& not likely to get out of repair" (Bass 79). Wheeler also notes that the American Board dispatched its Secretary, Mr. Greene, to help set up the press on its arrival (No. I).

⁹ Wheeler No. I; Papers of the ABCFM 18.3.1 vol. 5 pt. 2, September 2, 1826, item 232

Despite these problems, these five men were able to produce their first edition within one month of getting all their supplies. Dated February 21, 1828, the inaugural *Cherokee Phoenix* listed Elias Boudinot as editor and Isaac H. Harris as printer. The paper was to run weekly, printed on super royal paper in four columns¹⁰. In his *Cherokee Indian Newspapers*, Cullen Joe Holland specifies additional technical details:

The *Phoenix* columns were 13 pica ems in width and 17 ½ inches in length. Much of the matter in English was set in Long Primer, or 10 point type. Nonpareil, 6 point, and Brevier, 8 point type, also were used for editor's notes, the local news column and comment, and advertisements. (49)

The editor's and principal printer's names appear on the heading, and they underwent changes in position, size, and typeface during the first two years of publication (Holland 59-60).

Also in that first edition, Samuel Worcester published an article explaining the syllabary, and noting, "the number of characters is 85. The original number was 86, one of which has since been omitted, as being too little distinct in the sound represented..." (Kilpatrick and Kilpatrick 5-6). He mentions his role in arranging the characters in a certain order; this was the same order Wheeler used to construct the cases for the Cherokee type (No. I). Worcester also praised the speed with which speakers of Cherokee learn to read and write in their native language and the facility of the system to its written role (Kilpatrick and Kilpatrick 5-7).

Print necessarily enforces some standardization of language, and its control is apparent here. Also, since the printed characters represent syllables, there were differences in pronunciation among Cherokee dialects that got muted because of print's standardization. McLoughlin writes that the tribe had at least three dialects that white

¹⁰ Appendix Two shows the front page from the *Cherokee Phoenix*, Vol. I No. 4, dated March 13, 1828.

settlers recognized in the first century of close contact (1986: 11). And in one of his editorials, “Cherokee Language: Answers to Professor Rafinesque’s Questions,” Samuel A. Worcester refers to three dialects, but says concerning the third dialect that he does not know “whether it is now distinguished” (20 August 1828; qtd. in Kilpatrick and Kilpatrick, 25). Worcester’s answer to a reader’s question about Cherokee dialects concentrates on the two dialects prominent in the tribe at the time, noting that the dialects exchange liquids (L and R) and that “the difference in other respects is considerable” (Kilpatrick and Kilpatrick 25-26). He does not specify those other differences, but this alone is evidence that the relationship between Cherokee printed and spoken language bears further study.

The Phoenix

Approved by the tribal council in 1826, the *Cherokee Phoenix* published its first issue on February 21, 1828. The *Phoenix* served the nation by informing its citizens of the laws and public documents of the tribe, Cherokee manners and customs, including education, religion, and arts, and the principal news of the day (“Samuel Worcester”). In *New Echota: Birthplace of the American Press*, Hugh R. Awtrey describes the paper as “strongly educational,” and gives an idea of the variety of its contents:

There were carefully chosen articles on farming and a series on natural history. Descriptions of Calcutta rubbed columnar elbows with excerpts from *Robinson Crusoe*, Washington Irving’s *Traits of Indian Character*, and translations of *The Parable of the Prodigal Son*...a poetry corner, lost and found column, and notices (printed bilingually) from husbands who foreswore responsibility for their wives’ debts. (9)

This variety of clearly “civilized” subject matter was clearly calculated to show the white subscribers that the Cherokee Nation was civilized, too. The paper also served to educate

its white audience, who subscribed from places as far away as Philadelphia, New York, and even London, Paris, and Germany, about the tribe's perspective on the issues they faced (Murphy and Murphy, 27). The paper maintained agents in New York, Boston, Richmond, Beaufort, South Carolina, and Statesville, Tennessee, and exchanged items with over 30 other papers (Murphy and Murphy, 27; Brandon 15). Brandon writes that soliciting these white subscribers and "exploiting an extensive network of exchanges" were two means Elias Boudinot used to "amplify the paper's influence" (14).

Elias Boudinot's editorials addressed a variety of issues relevant to the Cherokee people, and readers were served with a telling introduction in the very first edition of the paper. At the beginning of the editorial, Boudinot asks the readers' indulgence, and for them to "keep out of view all failings and deficiencies of the Editor," and launches almost immediately into soliciting support for the tribe's cause from "the Christian, the Patriot, and the Philanthropist" (February 18, 1828; qtd. in Perdue, *Cherokee Editor*, 91). This editorial lays out the general principles that the editor had in mind to guide the paper. These principles devoted the paper to "national purposes," including printing the public documents of the nation, and to "matters relating to the welfare and condition of the Cherokees as a people" (92).

Another principle which Boudinot established for the paper was that he would consider it "a *free paper*, with, however, proper and usual restrictions" (92, emphasis original). While the editor explicitly stated his wishes to avoid articles that were "too intemperate and too personal," sectarian or doctrinal religious issues, and the politics and affairs of "the surrounding states," including the Presidential election, he did declare his intention to "invariably and faithfully state the feelings of the majority of our people"

concerning the controversy with Georgia and the federal government (he calls this the General Government) on removal (92-93). Related to this issue, Boudinot intends to report on the advancements that the Cherokees were and would continue to make in their civilizing process, and specifies that this improvement can be made, he writes, “*in their present location*” (emphasis original, 94). The editorial closes with a final request for patronage and prayers for the “Phoenix like” rising of all tribes (94-95).

The first year of the *Cherokee Phoenix* coincided with a host of important events in the history of the tribe and its struggle to maintain its identity and homeland. One of the most important was the finding of gold in northern Georgia; it was this gold that increased the urgency of the state to acquire Cherokee land. To do so, Georgians sped the pace of Cherokee land cessions and passed various laws in their state that were intended to nullify Cherokee tribal sovereignty and to throw Cherokee lands open to a land lottery (Woodward 158-59). Georgia laws passed in 1828 extending the state’s legal authority over white people residing within Cherokee territory claimed by Georgia, nullifying any laws passed by the Cherokee Nation, and claiming the state’s legal authority would extend over Cherokees after June 1, 1830 (Wheeler, No. III; Macenczak 42-43).

Another determining event of the year was the election of Andrew Jackson as President of the United States. This is the same man who had fought with the Cherokees against the Creeks a decade before; who had signed the treaty of 1817 along with Joseph McMinn, the governor of Tennessee; and who had, in early 1821, written a letter to Congress expressing his concern over any recognition of Indian sovereignty within the United States’ territorial borders. He urges “that the absurdity in politics may cease, of

an independent sovereign nation holding treaties with people living within its territorial limits, acknowledging its sovereignty and laws, and who, although not citizens, cannot be viewed as aliens, but as the real subjects of the United States” (ASP II, 503). In this same letter, Jackson insists that Congress establish the “happy precedent” of “legislating for, rather than treating with, the Indians” (503). President Jackson’s first annual message to Congress reaffirmed his stance on the Indian Question: “He commented that the newly written Cherokee Constitution and government were direct attempts to establish an independent state within an already existing sovereignty. Jackson stressed the unconstitutionality of this action.” (Macenczak 42). President Jackson clearly felt that for the Cherokee to remain as a political entity within the borders of the United States threatened the sovereignty established by the Constitution of that country. To Jackson, the Cherokees must remove or dissolve, and both of these positions were denounced in the editorials of the *Phoenix*.

Since the tribe predicted Jackson’s winning the presidency in November, the Cherokees elected John Ross principal chief one month before in preparation (Woodward 154, 156). Ross had fought with Jackson in the Creek campaign and had held various posts in the Cherokee nation. He was also wealthy and well educated. It did not hurt Ross’s standing with the diplomats in Washington that he was one-eighth Cherokee, consequently very light-skinned with blue eyes, and “had reared his children like white aristocrats” (157). Considering this high post, it is an interesting fact that Ross did not speak Cherokee; he only knew English (Monteith 60). Ross’s language limitations had not stopped him from allying himself with other Cherokees in power, including Charles Hicks, the second principal chief (and his father-in-law), and Path Killer, the principal

chief (60). Despite the potential ambivalence portrayed by this language limitation, Ross worked for what he felt was best for his people, and his work would bring him into conflict with Boudinot's attempts for the same.

The elections of Jackson and Ross were reported, as were other political events with a bearing on the tribe. Not only did the editor address overtly political actions, but also their underlying causes. Often, Boudinot's editorials within the *Phoenix* addressed concerns related to how whites perceived the Cherokees. Among them were intemperance, the civilization of the tribe, and charges that white men helped the Cherokees frame their Constitution.

One of the editorials speaking to prejudices against the civilization of the tribe ran in the issue of March 13, 1828. Boudinot discusses the "novel opinion" of civilizing a tribe after they have been removed, on the grounds that the Indians are incapable of being civilized while surrounded by whites. He asks for proof of the plan to work, and points out the discrepancy of removing a group of people "from a land of civil and religious means, to a perfect wilderness, *in order to be civilized*" (emphasis original; qtd. in Perdue, *Cherokee Editor*, 95-96). Boudinot's stand, as it continued to be for the next four years, was that the Cherokees must remain in a body politic in their present location in order best to become civilized.

Two other articles within the first year address how white readers perceived Cherokees and their potential for civilization. On March 20, 1828, Boudinot discusses charge by Mr. Wilde of Georgia in the House of Representatives that white men helped in framing of Cherokee Constitution and laws. The editor writes that he supposes the charge is leveled toward the missionaries, and that not only are their governing bodies

specifically instructing their missionaries not to participate in politics, that the Cherokee Nation "will not, by any means, permit them to have any thing to do with their public affairs" (96-97). Concerning the topic of "Indian Emigration," Boudinot calculated the sum necessary on May 14, 1828, and asked whether that sum could be put to "a better use," including books and publishing, schools and colleges. If this attempt at civilizing does not work, the editor concludes, "we will then agree to move" (99-100).

Within a year, Harris was relieved of his duties. Sources disagree on the reason. Some say that Boudinot's resentment over wages was never truly resolved and others blame religious denominational strife (Harris was Methodist, while Boudinot and Worcester were Presbyterian). Most sources maintain that Harris was spreading rumors to the effect that Worcester was the true editor of the *Phoenix*. And, some sources neglect to mention Harris's role with the newspaper at all, focusing only on Wheeler to the exclusion of both Harris and Candy.

Harris's firing came right after a somewhat-heated exchange of letters concerning the true editorship of the paper. After a disagreement with a Methodist minister, Rev. Scales, Boudinot learned that Scales accused Worcester of the "managing" the *Phoenix*. The accusation, published by the *Holston Messenger*, "a Methodist Magazine printed in Knoxville, Tennessee," stated that the *Cherokee Phoenix* "is mostly under the influence of a Northern Missionary" (qtd. in Kilpatrick and Kilpatrick, 38-39). Worcester and Boudinot responded to this charge November 12, 1828; both strongly defended Boudinot's leadership of the press. The editor's letter ends "It has already been stated to the public that the Phoenix was under Cherokee influence. It never has been, nor was it intended to be, under the influence of any Missionary or White man" (39). Boudinot's

passionate tone suggests the importance of having his readers believe that the *Cherokee Phoenix* was truly Cherokee.

Even if Harris was not involved in this disagreement, Kilpatrick and Kilpatrick make reference to a letter that he supposedly wrote to Col. Thomas McKenney, chief of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, claiming Worcester's involvement exceeded its bounds (34). Boudinot wrote that Harris "has occasioned [him] a great deal of vexation" by "secretly circulating falsehoods, one of which is that the *Cherokee Phoenix* is under the influence of Mr. Worcester, and has gone so far as to lodge charges in the War Department" (Gabriel 113-14). (The Bureau of Indian Affairs was within the War Department.) Reproduced in part in Bass's *Cherokee Messenger* is Jeremiah Evarts's letter to Worcester stating the American Board's answer to McKenney, including their sending him Worcester's "disclaimer" in the *Phoenix* (128-30).

Harris did not go peacefully. The editor asked for his printer's resignation effective January 1, 1829, but Harris angrily refused to leave except by force. Boudinot felt compelled to obtain an order from the Assistant Principal Chief to have the Marshal remove Harris. At this time, Boudinot writes, Harris threatened him, Worcester, Chief Ross, and others (Gabriel 114). This disagreement and neglect show, in part, the need for further research concerning Cherokee printing. All of these problems are issues with which Cherokee printing had to contend: money problems, inter-denominational strife, and, most importantly, charges that white people were really the editors guiding Indian printing.

John F. Wheeler and Continued Resistance

By the beginning of 1829, John F. Wheeler was the printer of the *Cherokee Phoenix*, and he would continue to work with the Nation for almost two more decades. Wheeler and John Candy also provide a graphic example of the interconnections among this small group of people: both were married to sisters of Elias Boudinot, Wheeler to Nancy Watie on April 23, 1829, and Candy to Mary Ann Watie in March 1832.¹¹

In 1829, the *Phoenix* added to its title, becoming *The Cherokee Phoenix and Indian Advocate*, in recognition that issues Cherokees faced were similar to issues other tribes faced (Worthy). And the primary, most difficult issue, continued to be Removal, although unscrupulous white frontiersmen provided much other editorial material. Boudinot's editorials continued to address the grievances that the tribe suffered at the hands of the Georgians and in the popular opinions of some whites. He wrote with the intention of showing his tribe was civilized, in part because the arguments for removal often were couched in terms of civilization versus savagery, and in part in order to create rhetorical space from which to force white acknowledgement.

Several editorials illustrate Boudinot's stance on the rising state of "civilization" among the Cherokee. On January 21, 1829, he wrote an editorial describing the past, "savage" life of Cherokees, about which Boudinot says he knows not, since he was "born under an era of reformation" (Perdue, *Cherokee Editor*, 102-03). The article seems calculated to dispel prejudices against the Cherokees by claiming "a new order of things" has replaced the old.

¹¹ See Dale and Litton, 32; Littlefield 267; Holland 107.

On the following week, January 28, 1829, his editorial argues against the saying that God has ordained the extinction of the Cherokees. Boudinot recalls Washington's treaty of 1791, the beginning of US aid, and says that this aim of civilization is being accomplished. He also refutes the claim that God intends destruction of the people by discussing the missionaries' work among the tribe. (103-105). Boudinot writes of the state of Georgia's "infringing upon their rights—by disorganizing them and circumscribing their limits" (105). His answer is this: "While he possesses a national character, there is hope for the Indian" (105). The antithesis of this national character includes taking away the Indian's rights, "divest[ing] him of the last spark of national pride, and introduc[ing] him to a new order of things, [and] invest[ing] him with oppressive laws" (105). He ends with the hope that the federal government will defend the tribe against Georgia's depredations, but cautions that, if not, Cherokees could not trust any promise made to the tribe, "either here or beyond the Mississippi" (106). While his editorial shows Boudinot's continuing hope for the survival of the tribe as a body politic, it also foreshadows the events that the "General Government" would do.

Since part of any civilization is institutionalized education, Boudinot also wrote in favor of the establishment of a national academy. On February 18, 1829, he urged support for education and the establishment of a national academy, because it is education that leads to civilization: "for what else distinguishes them from their brethren? What but a larger share of information makes them more respected" (106-07)? Editorials like this seem calculated to build white support for continuing efforts for the civilization of the tribe "where they are," as Boudinot encouraged.

The year 1830 brought increasing pressure for Cherokee Removal, though. During that year, Georgia claimed to extend its laws over the Cherokee lands within its chartered limits. Gold was one of the primary reasons driving Georgians into the Cherokee Nation. That year also, Congress ratified an Indian Removal bill, which, although the tribe resisted as long as possible, would ultimately effect its aim.

The gold discovered in Cherokee territory in 1828 caused ever-increasing encroachment by unscrupulous whites. On April 7, 1830, Boudinot wrote about these “INTRUDERS.” The US Agent had warned white intruders away from the gold mines in Cherokee territory, but did not obtain Georgia arrest warrants for them (required because under Georgia law). Because of this failure, Boudinot is sure that the intruders will return, and rapidly increase in number (113). In the meantime, these whites were squatting illegally in the Cherokee Nation, and were committing crimes against some of the members of the tribe, most often theft and assault. Boudinot believed that appraisers authorized by the US government were encouraging whites to invade Cherokee territory, and he calls this “*oppression, systematic oppression*” (emphasis original, 114).

This oppression took the form of an Indian Removal bill, also. Ross as the leader of the Nation and the *Cherokee Phoenix* as its voice combined to combat the removal bill that Jackson had announced on December 8, 1829. Congress ratified the bill the following May (Woodward, 159). Meanwhile, the *Phoenix* stepped up its opposition, and distributed its writings to the papers with which it exchanged. Woodward writes, “Editorials in *The Cherokee Phoenix* on Jackson’s new law and the Indian question were recopied in publications all over the United States” (161).

The passage of this bill was preceded by a report providing some of the government's reasons for removal, presented by the Committee on Indian Affairs to the House of Representatives (H. Doc. 227, 21st Cong., 1st Sess., 1830). Boudinot refuted this report in his editorial of 21 April 1830. One of his points of contention is that the Committee claims the Indians face starvation because they depend on hunting, and game is scarce. While Boudinot readily acknowledges the scarcity of game, it poses no threat, he writes, because members of the tribe do not depend on the hunt for survival, but only hunt just as much as their white neighbors (Perdue 114-15). This and the next two points, the prejudice that "an Indian cannot work" and the rate of alcoholism and its attendant crimes, Boudinot uses as arguments to show that the Cherokees are just as civilized, and even more so, than the whites who live around them (115). In this argument, Boudinot must maintain that there is no difference between Cherokee and white, in order to claim legal protection against those who would force the tribe from its land. He invites comparison and observation by anyone who wishes to see the true condition of his tribe, and he responds to the Committee's want of "statistical and accurate information" with an offer of the 1824 Cherokee Census and the 1810 Census ordered by the United States agent Return J. Meigs (117).

The House passed the Removal Bill, and Boudinot expected the Senate to pass it too, when he penned his editorial for 15 May 1830. In it, he encourages his readers to be "*firm and united*," and gather their hope in the third branch of the government, the "*tribunal* where our injured rights may be defended and protected" (Perdue 118). He says the Cherokees "will *demand* justice, and before we give up and allow ourselves despondency we will, if we can, have the solemn adjudication of a tribunal, whose

province is to interpret the treaties, *the supreme law of the land*' (118). This hope allows ironic foresight: when the Supreme Court proved ineffectual, Boudinot did give himself up to despondency.

The following year, 1831, focused more on the legal status and standing of Cherokees and the Cherokee Nation. Boudinot's editorials often referred to the legal rights of the Nation and its members, as well as the white people living within its boundaries. Most notable among this group were the missionaries, who would eventually mount one of the two Supreme Court cases challenging the constitutionality of Georgia's actions.

One example of an editorial dealing with the legal power of the tribe comes early in the year. On 8 January 1831, Boudinot gave an account of the trial and hanging of George Tassel, a Cherokee who was accused of the murder of another Cherokee within the boundaries of the Nation. The Sheriff of Hall County, Georgia, arrested Tassel, transported him out of the Cherokee Nation into the adjacent Georgia county, and jailed him while he awaited trial (Perdue 120-21). Not even a subsequent writ of error by Chief Justice John Marshall stopped the Georgians from hanging Tassel after they found him guilty. While the immediate issue for the tribe was its sovereignty, Boudinot realized that Cherokee political power relative to the United States also fit within the larger question of nullification, or states' rights. The editor threatens that "the Union is but a tottering fabric, which will soon fall and crumble into atoms" if the federal government could not assert its power over the individual states (121).

In March 1831, the Georgia Guard arrested Samuel Worcester, Elizur Butler, the printer John Wheeler, and several other white men because they had not sworn an oath of

allegiance to the state of Georgia or obtained a written permission from the state's governor to be in Cherokee Territory (McLoughlin, 1981: 58). The men were marched over 100 miles and kept in chains. They were offered their freedom in exchange for agreeing not to violate the laws of Georgia. Seven of the men, including Wheeler, agreed; Worcester and Butler did not (61-62).¹² The judge in the case freed the missionaries on the grounds that they were agents of the government—Worcester doubly so because of his appointment as the postmaster. Soon after, Georgia authorities received word that despite government sanction of civilization programs involving missionaries, the United States did not regard those missionaries as agents of the government. Samuel Worcester also received word that he was relieved of his postmaster's duties (Luebke 131). The stage was set for the missionaries to be rearrested.

In addition to reporting on the arrests of the missionaries, the *Cherokee Phoenix* also published editorials denouncing the oath of allegiance and Worcester's dismissal from the postmaster's office. Elias Boudinot ran the accounts of the arrest in the *Cherokee Phoenix* issue for March 19, 1831, and published the missionaries' letters from jail on July 30, 1831 (Luebke 130; Kilpatrick and Kilpatrick 95-103). Samuel Worcester detailed the missionaries' being chained to horses by the necks and together at the ankles, forced to march hours beneath the cursing guards (96-97). He also described their plain jail cell, where they were unchained and kept, and their subsequent release via a writ of habeas corpus (101). The court they attended in Lawrenceville freed them pending their appearance before the Superior Court (102). Only nominally was this affair finished. Samuel Worcester would be involved in another court case on behalf of the sovereignty

¹² For Wheeler's account of his arrest, see "The Cherokees: Recollections of a Life of Fifty Years Among Them," Nos. IV and V.

of the Cherokee Nation. In the mean time, the Georgia Guard roamed the Cherokee Nation within the limits claimed by the state, instituting what John F. Wheeler called a “reign of terror” (No. V).

Once again, old rumors circulated. Lewis Turner Griffith and John Erwin Talmadge discuss the recurring charge that white men were really the force behind the paper, the same issue Boudinot dealt with from Harris (33-34). They specify, “Captain Nelson of the invading Georgia Guard suggested...that the missionaries had written the *Phoenix* editorials. These, however, seemed to lose none of their quality after Boudinot’s allies were led away in chains” (34). Griffith and Talmadge find proof of Boudinot’s eloquence adequate defense against these charges.

That same Captain Nelson of the Georgia Guard threatened the *Phoenix* editor, charging him with libel. After being asked specifically what was false, Nelson apparently gave in answer “only generalities” (Perdue, 1983: 133-35). Boudinot writes that he was summoned, threatened with beating, and not allowed to apologize or make right any errors of fact. “I found,” he writes, “there was a determination to consider me a libeler without making a single specification, and that the rod was to bring me to my senses without allowing me the privilege of making reparation...” (133). Unable to redress his accuser, Boudinot closes the article by asking whether a white man would have been treated the same way, and if so, how would his readers have felt (135)?

Trouble seemed to compound for the Cherokee Nation that year: the United States suspended payment on its annuities. The *Phoenix* was largely dependent on the annuity for its existence, so Boudinot went on a fund-raising trip in December 1831. His brother Stand Watie was acting editor in his absence (Luebke 135). Watie included a

letter from Boudinot in the issue dated December 21. In it, Boudinot describes a general disaffection in the white population:

The people appear to be more indifferent than I expected to find them; and it is not at all improbable that, if it were not for the leading men, another demagogue who cannot obtain the votes of the people but by promising Indian land, the Cherokees would be permitted to remain peaceably on the soil of their fathers, and the authority of the Supreme Court would not be contemned. (Perdue *Cherokee Editor*, 144)

Seemingly disheartened, the editor understands that the “integrity of the Union is at stake,” and while, the Union might hold, his people probably would not. After this trip, Boudinot began to weigh more seriously the idea that Removal might provide the tribe a means of surviving together.

Cherokee Nation v. Georgia

Perhaps the most important current event chronicled in the *Phoenix* for the year 1831 was *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, a case that “was a request by the Cherokee Nation for an injunction against the state of Georgia for its many violations of Cherokee sovereignty” (Woodward 165). The Cherokees’ lawyer, William Wirt, argued that the Cherokee nation was “an independent nation and therefore could not be subjected to Georgia laws” (165). The fact that this decision was tried in a U.S. court shows already that the balance of power was completely out of Cherokee reach. The tribe from this time forward would have to depend on the Americans.

Chief Justice John Marshall reached his decision in 1831, wherein the U.S. Supreme Court held that Indian tribes are not foreign nations but “domestic dependent” nations (166). Indians become, as one title affirms, “our Indian wards,” officially recognized now by the third branch of the American government (Manypenny). A

“ward” is defined either as a minor or incompetent person placed under the care or protection of a guardian or court, or as someone being under guard or in custody of another. Neither is palatable. Indeed, Churchill describes Marshall’s decision as the proof that “indigenous Nations were always sovereign enough to validate U.S. territorial ambitions through treaties of cession, never sovereign enough to decline them” (37). Well before this, Chief John Ross, in a letter, had written “Our national existence is suspended on the faith & honor of the U. States, alone” (“Letter to Albert Gallatin, February 27, 1826;” qtd. in Perdue and Green, 43). He goes on to write “Within the orbit of the U. States move the States & within these we move in a little circle, dependent on the great center” (ibid, 43). Postcolonial theory refers to this great center as a “metropole.” The United States held commanding political power over the tribe that it would soon exile.

Another way of evaluating the power relationships in the case is in rhetorical study. In *America’s Authors: Creating the Citizen in Nineteenth-Century America*, Sarah Hallman Pelmas examines the Supreme Court’s reading of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and how these readings affected the justices’ decisions in *The Cherokee Nation v. the State of Georgia*. Pelmas asserts that the Court’s reading of “the terms ‘citizen’ and ‘person’” establish that “the plaintiff has no real standing before the Court” (57). The plaintiff’s lack of status before the Court force the justices to rule on procedural grounds only, unable to attend the real issue: the constitutionality of Georgia’s actions. The results, writes Pelmas, “affect the plaintiffs’ identities as citizens and people” (57). The Cherokee claims, in their suit against Georgia, rested upon the same ambivalence noted above: that they are “in fact,

autonomous”—that is, a separate nation, able to engage in treaty/negotiations only with the federal government and not one of the states—and that they are “wards under the ‘fostering care’ of the United States” (70). This is the same rhetorical stance on which the *Cherokee Phoenix* stood, and the same one Pelmas extracts from the Cherokee Nations’ Memorials presented to Congress during the debates over the Removal Act (see pp 67-74).

Pelmas concedes that the two positions of autonomy and dependence are “not necessarily mutually exclusive,” but recognizes in them a “narrative instability that allows the Supreme Court to choose one narrative over the other” (70). Having the power of choice, the United States chose the position of power. The suit asks the Supreme Court to grant “an injunction against the state of Georgia, on the grounds that they [the Cherokee Nation] were an independent state,” consistent with their previous stands (76). Pelmas clarifies the ambivalence inherent in the Cherokee claim:

Because they have in fact started to shift their society toward the Christianized, agricultural, educated, republican system recognizable by the United States, however, they have also put themselves in the position of trying to play their avowed independence against their imitation of American society, and their stated desire to be brought further into “civilization.” (77)

The justices’ decisions must be made in the space between this independence and admitted lack of power. Chief Marshall’s judgment that the Cherokee are “domestic dependent nations” indicates a choice in available narratives excludes their suit, and makes them permanently liminal (80). Of the three other included opinions, two concurred and one dissented. The two concurring opinions gave reasons for why the Cherokee could not be a foreign state; the dissenting opinion asked the question when the status of the Cherokees changed from “its original and clearly foreign nature” (88). All

concurring opinions deny the Cherokee Nation the legal recognition to state their case as equals in the eyes of the Court: “In other words, the Cherokee are permanently fixed as within the linguistic and political bounds of the United States’ self-conception” (Pelmas 82). Justice Johnson’s dissent seems, to Pelmas, to recognize the ability for ““domestic dependent nations’ can also be sovereign states,” but his recognition of the ambivalent Cherokee stand could not change the decision of the Court (90). The Cherokees were therefore fixed in the position of dependence, their ambivalent rhetorical stance broken down.

Worcester v. the State of Georgia

The Cherokee Nation got another chance that Georgia’s actions might be overturned when the Rev. Samuel A. Worcester brought suit against that state the following year, in 1832. Worcester, Rev. Elizur Butler, and several other white men (including the printer John F. Wheeler) were arrested for residing in Cherokee territory within Georgia’s boundaries without having a license issued by Georgia Governor Lumpkin or having signed an oath of allegiance to that state. The first two men had been convicted and sentenced to four years’ hard labor, and they refused the governor’s offer of pardon in exchange for their taking the oath. The others agreed to move beyond the limits of the territory claimed by Georgia.

Pelmas presents this case in contradistinction to *The Cherokee Nation v. the State of Georgia* in order to show that, since the linguistic/rhetorical acrobatics of the other case were absent, Chief Justice John Marshall had the opportunity to answer the real question of the constitutionality of Georgia’s actions (92-97). Specifically, for starters, the plaintiff was clearly a citizen, while the Cherokee clearly were not; next, Marshall

shows that at issue is the jurisdiction of one state versus the federal government (94). Pelmas imagines the question before Marshall: “can Georgia exercise its jurisdiction over territory previously negotiated at a federal level” (95)? The question of jurisdiction does not include the Cherokee; their status has been nullified. The question before the court becomes whether the state of Georgia can nullify the treating rights of the federal government. The Court’s inscription of an identity as “domestic dependent nation” meant that the Cherokee Nation would never be able to negotiate on favorable terms with the United States, even though the tribe seemed to have “won” that case when Marshall declared Georgia’s extension of jurisdiction unconstitutional.

President Jackson’s famous response “John Marshall has made his decision; now, let him enforce it” shows that the Chief Executive would not allow the question of states’ rights deprive him of the Indian Removal that he intended to include the Cherokees. The tribe’s ambivalent rhetorical stance, though now upheld in a court of law, was proven to have no political power. The Cherokee were going to lose in the long run.

While the court case was going on, the tribe made great use of its newspaper. Woodward says of it that it was “Considered by the Cherokee council to be very nearly as important to the Nation as legal counsel, the *Phoenix* illuminated the ‘Indian Question’...” (167). The newspaper was sent to a host of white American newspapers, including printing centers like New Orleans, New York, Washington, Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore (168). While waiting the Chief Justice’s ruling, Boudinot had gone on the road again to solicit funds, as the trials and withholding of American payments to the tribe had placed the Cherokees in financial straits (168). Ridge accompanied Boudinot; this trip would make a change leading to their deaths.

4. THE END OF PRINTING IN THE EAST, AND ITS BEGINNING IN THE WEST Events Leading to the Treaty at New Echota

It was at this time that Boudinot, his cousin John Ridge, his uncle Major Ridge, and some other prominent tribal leaders became convinced that Removal was inevitable. Perdue believes Boudinot finally changed his mind because of “the federal government’s refusal to enforce a decision of the Supreme Court” (1983: 25). Boudinot resigned his editorial post in August 1832, citing in a letter to Chief Ross that “he could no longer conduct the paper if denied the privilege of discussing those important matters” (Woodward 172). Boudinot had to step down, not only because of pressure by Ross that he follow the Cherokee tradition of withdrawing in the event of a disagreement, but also because he failed to meet the two aims of the paper. The August 11, 1832 edition of the Phoenix carried both Boudinot’s letter of resignation and John Ross’s acceptance of that resignation. They are worth quoting in depth because of how they address Boudinot’s repudiation of the stated aims of the national press. Elias Boudinot’s letter of resignation reads, in part:

Two of the great objects which the nation had in view in supporting the paper were, the defense of our rights and the proper representation of our grievances to the people of the United States.—In regard to the former, we can add nothing..., especially after the decision of the Supreme Court, which has forever closed the question of our conventional rights. In regard to the latter,...[t]he public is as fully apprised, as we can ever expect it to be, of our grievances. It knows our troubles, and yet never was it more silent than at present. (qtd. in Luebke, 140)

The first object for the national paper, Boudinot reminds the readers, is to attain and maintain a national unity in order to defend Cherokee rights. He believes now that those rights could never be realized by the United States, and his desire to convince his people

of the need to remove was unacceptable to the leadership of the Nation. His letter continues, “I do not know whether I could satisfy my own views and the views of the authorities of the nation at the same time.”

The second aim of the Cherokee press was to attract support for Cherokee rights from the white audience surrounding the nation. Boudinot’s discouragement is keenest in his statement of how that support failed to materialize following the travesty of justice he saw taking place after Jackson’s refusal to support the Supreme Court and the State of Georgia’s actions. McLoughlin writes that Jackson refused to take no for an answer (1981: 51). That same year, the Supreme Court had officially recognized Cherokee sovereignty in the case of *Worcester v. Georgia*, but it was too late (Perdue and Green 19). The Chief Executive remained pointedly silent concerning the enforcement of the ruling (Woodward 171). The State of Georgia also ignored the Supreme Court, going ahead with the land lottery it had signed into law two years previously, unleashing a flood of white settlers who began displacing the Cherokee (Perdue and Green 18).

Chief John Ross’s acceptance of Boudinot’s resignation was in that same issue, and his response affirms the need for the national paper to reinforce a tribal unity:

The views of the public authorities should continue and ever be in accordance with the will of the people; and the views of the Editor of the National paper be the same. The toleration of diversified views to the columns of such a paper would not fail to create fermentation and confusion among our citizens and, in the end prove injurious to the welfare of the Nation. The love of our country and people demands unity of sentiment and action for the good of all. (*Cherokee Phoenix* 11 August 1832; qtd. in Luebke 141)

After the resignation of Elias Boudinot, Elijah Hicks assumed the chair. Also an accomplished choice for editor, Hicks had served the Nation as Clerk of the Cherokee and President of the National Committee (Phillips and Phillips 497). Elijah Hicks was

also Chief Ross's brother-in-law; he had married Margaret Ross in 1823 (Phillips and Phillips 348).

The four years that Boudinot was editor of the *Cherokee Phoenix* the tribe did have a voice, although the paper's focus seemed gradually to shift toward white America, away from the tribe it was supposed to be uniting. Stephen Brandon provides a list of reasons why the newspaper focused on its white readers: only 16% of the articles were printed in Cherokee; there was a reduced subscription rate for Cherokee-only readers; the publication information, datelines, and volume and issue numbers were in English. This list continues, viewing at article detail: English versions always preceded Cherokee versions for bilingual articles; Cherokee articles usually had English titles; and literary reprints were drawn from the Bible and "white, English-speaking authors and poets" (17). Brandon's points merit consideration, as well as the editor's and printer's claims that translating and setting Cherokee type were time-consuming and laborious. Quite possibly, Boudinot did slight his Cherokee readers—that level of national feeling he was supposed to be building—intentionally or not.

While it is also possible that Boudinot shifted his focus to include the English readers within the Cherokee nation, he did, in any case, consistently reduce the space allotted to Cherokee language articles. His successor Hicks did too, even keeping previous Cherokee articles in place, merely adding to them and reprinting for several issues at a time. Cullen Joe Holland reads this shift away from Cherokee language articles in light of a remark Boudinot made in one of his editorials. By 1831, after months of dwindling column inches devoted to Cherokee language materials, Boudinot wrote, "It is only through the medium of our exchange papers we can expect to be extensively heard, and our grievances made known to the people of the United States" (August 12, 1831, qtd. in Holland, pp 83-84). Holland interprets this

comment as a definitive shift in attention toward the white American audience: “Now it appeared that Boudinot’s chief aim was to be heard by the audience outside the Cherokee Nation” (84).

After the change in editor, though, and the increasing turmoil within the Cherokee territory, publication of the newspaper became more sporadic. In the spring of 1833, production was ceased for nine weeks, owing, Hicks explained, to a lack of mail (Holland 98). Hicks also began to face a lack of material that he could not blame on mail problems. He ran articles and ads repeatedly—even publishing articles from the *Encyclopedia Americana* did not give the paper enough material for printing (98). Financial problems plagued the *Phoenix*, and the paper was named in a libel suit in Georgia. Hicks published seven issues in May 1834, and in the last one, May 31, announced that he “planned to take a few weeks to collect subscriptions and to improve his health” (100). The *Phoenix* was not published again. The press, though, still turned out religious tracts, some of which were published by Boudinot and Worcester, who had been pardoned and released in March 1833 (100).

In 1835, the tribe’s political star and its print organ both faded. The former *Phoenix* editor, Elias Boudinot, hosted other Treaty Party leaders in March in order to begin work on a Removal Treaty (180). In September of that same year, the *Cherokee Phoenix* press was seized by Boudinot’s brother Stand Watie and members of the Georgia Guard, who ground some of the type into the clay underfoot (Woodward 185; Worthy). Although at first he disagreed with the Indian Removal Act (passed 1830), Boudinot had gradually changed his mind, swayed, perhaps, by John Ridge, and certainly after his trip to Washington in 1831 (Woodward 168-69).

Here is where the degree of acculturation becomes problematic. Boudinot and many of the leaders of the tribe were men of mixed blood, and their education and wealth were signs of their acculturation—even those men, including Chief Ross, who would fight Removal. Chief Ross’s role in treaty negotiations is often ignored at this point, but the truth is that he went to Washington to discuss treating with the United States early in 1835. My concern here is, to what degree could either group of men truthfully represent their nation?

Letters from Elias Boudinot in February 1835, and from John Ridge in March 1835 discuss their perception of Ross’s treaty negotiations (Dale and Litton, 10-14). Boudinot wrote to his brother Stand Watie that Ross made “several propositions” which were rejected, including taking payment by the United States for the land and moving out of the boundaries of the country (11). Within this letter, Boudinot does not question Ross’s leadership of the people, although he does question whether Ross’s decision will be the right one for the tribe. As he contemplates Ross’s request for money and the possibilities for where the tribe might move, Boudinot asks, “Where will Ross take them to” (11)? His speculation ends, though, with his belief that the Cherokees might “have now some prospects of a speedy termination to our perplexities,” and that negotiations might “yet succeed in saving a majority of our people” (11). Boudinot’s distrust of Ross does not change his mission to serve what he believed was in the best interest of the Cherokee tribe.

In a letter to his father Major Ridge, John Ridge wrote of “the hard struggles [he] had to make against John Ross & his party” (Dale and Litton 12). Apparently, Ross told Congress at first that the Cherokee would choose to become citizens rather than remove,

and, after Ridge contradicted this idea, he succeeded in getting the outline of a treaty that he wished to be “sent home for the ratification of the people” (12). This treaty Ridge described favorably as liberal, and equal in treatment for poor and rich members of the tribe. He also pointed out that the federal government would pay \$4.5 million for land and improvements in the East, add to the land available to the Cherokees in the West, include an annuity, pay subsistence and transportation, and allow the tribe self-governance (12-13). In expectation of rejoining the Old Settlers, two of the delegates were dispatched to Chief John Jolly, and the Western Cherokee were asked to send four delegates East (13).

John Ridge’s letter also expressed his rivalry with John Ross fairly explicitly. Ridge felt concerned that Ross “was going to act falsely to his people & sell the Nation either by getting Reservations of land or taking the whole in money on pretense of going out of the limits of the U. States” (12). Ridge thought Ross “tried hard to cheat” the Cherokees, and he anticipated that Ross would stir up the people against this proposed treaty with lies (13).

The Ridge Party agreed with terms on March 14, 1835, and brought the treaty back to the Nation for approval by the Cherokee Council. In October 1835, the Council convened at Red Clay, Tennessee (because of the Georgia laws prohibiting their meeting at New Echota), and rejected the treaty (Macenczak 80). Rev. Schermerhorn called for another treaty meeting to be held in December, but Ross refused to recognize his authority, since he had no official commission from the President (Gabriel 146). Early in November, Ross had planned to start for Washington again; the Georgia Guard took Chief Ross from his home and held him in Georgia until November 20 (80). He was

released after that date without any charges. Schermerhorn publicized the treaty meeting for December widely, and notified the Cherokees that all those who did not attend would be considered as supporting the treaty (81).

Elias Boudinot hosted the Treaty Party in his home in December, and consequently signed his death warrant when, on December 29, 1835, he signed the New Echota Treaty that ceded Cherokee lands to the U.S. and agreed to the Removal (Woodward 175). Fewer than 400 members of the tribe signed this document, but President Jackson considered it binding. Jackson sent it to Congress, where it was ratified by one vote in May 1836, after a series of bitter debates. The President signed it into law May 23, 1836 (Macenczak 81). At this time, a two-year date for Removal was set for May 1838 (Woodward193).

Chief Ross rallied the Cherokee Nation to protest the Treaty, submitting as evidence 16,000 signatures on a petition (Bass 171). President Jackson refused to heed him, which meant, in effect, that the Ridge faction had ceded all Cherokee lands in the east. Governor Gilmer of Georgia sent Ross a letter asking how he would meet the “law of necessity, or, if you please, the harsh and unyielding will of superior power” that was preparing to force the Cherokees from their lands (Gabriel 166-67). A few of the tribe began to move westward.

Inevitably, the question for this first Cherokee press is, was it truly a voice for its people? After all, they were forced out of Georgia; their press was ineffectual in its efforts for them to stay, so they were silenced. But Robin Patric Clair is right, that “Silencing is not a totalizing concept: Within each practice of oppressive silence is a possibility of voice” (324). In a sense, the Cherokees were silenced because they were

forced to remove despite their protests. In a sense, Boudinot's editorials and Worcester's articles silenced the more traditional voice of the tribe. Voice and silence exist together, as Clair demonstrates in "Organizing Silence: Silence as Voice and Voice as Silence in the Narrative Exploration of the Treaty of New Echota." In order to be heard by surrounding whites as "civilized," the *Phoenix* had to participate in "a medium privileged by the dominant white society" (330). In order to act as voice, the tribe had to silence some part of itself. Though the tribe had spoken, it could not match the political power of its neighbor. Losing the argument does not mean the tribe had no voice. This argument lost, the Cherokees would have to construct different purposes for their tribal press when they reestablished printing in their new homes.

The Removal and Restoration of Cherokee Printing in the West

The tribe had to work through distrust, poverty, disease, and internal political strife from the time the main body of the tribe arrived in 1838 until the United States brokered a Treaty in 1846 (Woodward 235-36). Prominent events, in addition to the reestablishment of Cherokee printing, included the murders in 1839 of Elias Boudinot, Major Ridge, and John Ridge, for ceding land without the agreement of the tribe, and the involvement of Sequoyah in resolving disputes between Eastern and Western Cherokees who were trying to merge their governments (226-28).

Samuel Worcester, who had come west in 1835, began printing in Cherokee again. Worcester had established himself at Union Mission, and the American Board had furnished him with another press. He was joined that fall by Wheeler, and they were soon reunited with Candy and Boudinot (Littlefield 270). The group printed using a Tufts Standing Press, larger than the one in New Echota had been. The Board had

shipped the new press, along with Cherokee and English types, paper, and other materials from Boston by way of steamer (271).

There were, of course, problems to work out, including the sinking of the steamer (Bass 185, 187-88). Most materials were recovered, though. Perhaps the most vexing problem was once again, bad casting of Cherokee type. He wrote a letter to Mr. Greene, in the Boston office of the American Board relating his disappointment: “I think the artist who made the alterations in the Cherokee type, which I requested last year, cannot be the same with the one who formed the original matrices, nor equally skillful in imitation” (187). One character in particular was “so unlike the pattern which I sent, that I am led to suppose the pattern must have been defaced” (187). The printers altered another character to fill in, and Worcester requested additional Cherokee fonts (188). Soon, the press was ready for full operation, although Worcester would soon have to relocate, since he only received permission to set up the press temporarily at Union Station (184).

The Board hoped to expand this press into an “Indian Press” that would be used in printing for other tribes (Bass 179-80). Indeed the first book published from this press—and the first in what is now Oklahoma—was a Creek language primer, *Istutsi in naktsokv*, *Or the Child’s Book*, by the Reverend John Fleming, an American Board missionary to the Creeks (Hargrett 2-3). A broadside of the Cherokee syllabary and a leaflet entitled *A Child’s Book* may have preceded *Istutsi in naktsokv*, but these items have not survived (1-2). Biblical selections, Cherokee hymns, and a Cherokee almanac followed quickly, along with books in Osage and Choctaw, using the Pickering alphabet.

Worcester moved his family and mission to Park Hill in 1836, leaving the press in the care of Wheeler while they prepared a new facility (Hargrett 7). In June 1837, the press was relocated to Park Hill, which became focal point for arriving Cherokees. In 1838, Boudinot and Ross both arrived, and both began to build houses at Park Hill. Boudinot worked for a time with Worcester, translating scriptures and hymns into Cherokee as before, but the arriving members of the tribe protested vehemently. While Worcester deplored Boudinot's part in a "fraudulent and wicked transaction," he still stood by his partner of thirteen years (Gabriel 176). In a letter of June 14, 1838, Samuel Worcester wrote about Boudinot's unpopularity jeopardizing his employment at the press. He recounts the permissions he obtained for Boudinot to work there, including a letter from western chief John Jolly, but the pressure continued to mount (Bass 218).

On June 22, 1839, violence erupted. Major Ridge, John Ridge, and Elias Boudinot were murdered for the unauthorized sale of Cherokee lands, unleashing a six year intratribal struggle. Boudinot's brother Stand Watie was warned and escaped. Wheeler and his family (Mrs. Wheeler was Boudinot and Watie's sister) fled to Missouri, and then moved to Arkansas, where they would eventually settle for good (Littlefield 273-74). Many other members of the Ridge faction also moved to Arkansas (273). The Cherokee tribe was still divided, now not only between former easterners and the westerners, but between Ross and Ridge factions. It would take six years for the Cherokees to come together again, and one of the means was the reestablishment of a tribal printing press.

In October 1843, Chief John Ross purchased a new press and types. The Cherokee nation authorized its second national press on October 25, 1843, and soon

began its second newspaper, *The Cherokee Advocate* (Murphy and Murphy 34). The first issue was printed on September 26, 1844, under the editorship of William P. Ross, a nephew of Chief Ross (Woodward 246). John Candy was one of the printers. The prospectus gave the paper's objectives as "the diffusion of important news among the Cherokee people, advancement of their welfare, and defense of their rights" (Murphy and Murphy 34). Tribal troubles were not over, but the tribe had reestablished printing as one of the hallmarks of the Cherokee Nation's civilization.

John Candy, Cherokee Printer

John Candy's life is little known, despite his importance in establishing and reestablishing Cherokee printing. In *Oklahoma Imprints*, Lester Hargrett provides a brief biographical sketch of him. In it, he writes that Candy was born about 1806 in Georgia, and that, "The mixed blood John Walker Candy had been an apprentice and later a full-fledged printer at the *Cherokee Phoenix* office at New Echota in Georgia" (12). Candy's name appeared on the masthead of the Phoenix by March 5, 1831, as printer, and continued after that (Holland 64). Hargrett believes that Candy emigrated to Indian Territory in late 1835 "and was employed by Worcester as a translator and printer at the Union Mission Press" and then, when the press was moved to Park Hill, Candy continued printing there until 1847 (Hargrett 12). In 1839, John Candy served the Western Cherokee as clerk of the national council, and after the tribes joined officially, Candy worked at the *Advocate* office in Tahlequah (the new capital) to print the compiled laws of the united Cherokee Nation (12). Also in 1852, Candy and another Cherokee former apprentice from New Echota, Mark Tyger, were elected to Tahlequah's first town council. In 1855, Candy worked at the Baptist Mission Press, engaged in printing a

Muskogee hymn book (12, 59). John Candy died in 1868 near Webbers Falls, Cherokee Nation (12).

From the beginning, the tribe wanted to have one of its own as a printer. In fact, the National Council passed two resolutions calling for it. The first one was dated October 19, 1826, and read, “And in order to have a native printer, it shall be the duty of the Editor to procure, if possible, a Cherokee apprentice, whose clothes and board shall be paid out of the proceeds of the Cherokee Phoenix” (Foster 47). On November 19, 1828, the National Council passed another resolution, calling for the same:

Be it further resolved, That the Editor shall select another Cherokee youth of good qualities and capacity, who will agree, with the consent of his parents or guardians, to serve as an apprentice to the printing business, and for a length of time so as to enable said apprentice to become master of the art of Printing, and that the said apprentice shall be clothed and boarded in the same manner as is provided by law for the apprentice now in service, at the public expense. (Foster 51)

John Candy finished his apprenticeship in the New Echota offices about the same time that Wheeler was arrested. Candy’s name appeared first on the *Cherokee Phoenix* masthead as printer on March 5, 1831, two weeks before Wheeler was arrested, and continued until Boudinot resigned his editorial post the following summer (Holland 64-65). When Elijah Hicks assumed the editor’s chair in September of 1832, Candy’s name disappeared from the masthead, only to return for a short time that same October (97). In January 1833, the editor’s cousin Carrington W. Hicks became printer for a stint of several weeks (97).

Candy’s name began to appear on imprints in New Echota in 1833. For imprints in 1833, see items 233 and 234, “The Acts of the Apostles” and “Cherokee Hymns,” in Larwood (215-16); Pillling’s *Bibliography of the Iroquoian Languages* credits Candy for

printing the third edition of the Cherokee Hymns at New Echota in 1832, and Candy and Wheeler for printing the fourth edition in 1833 (1888: 172). Tracing his imprints provides no clear picture of his life, but does indicate his location. The first time Candy appears in the printed record after moving west is in 1836 (Hargrett 4). Worcester had written the American Board that he had employed John Candy as translator for the Cherokee Almanac (Bass 193). Candy reappears as printer in 1840, and he was to continue printing at the Park Hill Mission Press off and on through 1847.

Most of the documents John Candy printed were in Cherokee, but not all, and he printed a wide variety of subject matter. Cherokee titles by him include translations of hymnbooks, scriptures, temperance tracts, and doctrinal statements. The Cherokee Hymns' sixth and seventh editions were printed at Park Hill by Candy in 1841 and 1844, respectively (Pilling, 1888: 172-73). He printed the second edition of the Acts of the Apostles in 1842, the second edition of the gospel of John in 1841, and with Edwin Archer the third edition of John in 1847 (173). Candy printed the third and fourth editions of a gospel of Matthew in 1840 and 1844; the epistles of John (two editions) and the epistles of Paul were printed in 1840, 1843, and 1844 (172; 62-63). Other printed materials Candy set included the Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church (1842), the second edition of the Evils of Intoxicating Liquor (1844), and a Cherokee Primer in 1846 (55; 63-64; 42). Candy even printed *Bob the Sailor Boy* (1847) and, with Archer, the *Dairyman's Daughter* (1847) (14; 53). The last imprint bearing Candy's name appears from the Baptist Mission Press; it was the 1855 Muscogee Hymn Book by Rev. Daniel B. Asbury (Pilling, 1889: 3).

While his name appears on the imprints from the Mission Presses, John Candy is important also for his role in an official tribal press. When in 1844 the Nation launched its second national newspaper, the *Cherokee Advocate*, the Chief's nephew William Porter Ross was its editor, and John Candy was its printer. Candy evidently continued to be caught up in the disagreements between the Rosses and the Treaty party, though, because in a letter to Stand Watie dated April 10, 1846, he writes of the great number of murders and how lackadaisical the people have begun to be about the reports of murders (Dale and Litton, 32-33). His closing hints powerfully at his true feelings: "The question may be asked—Who first began the troubles in the Cherokee Nation? The answer is obvious. We know it well" (13). Candy had previously written of a disagreement between himself and Ross in the perception of a man accused of killing and cutting several others; Ross "Can't see him in any other light than a *decent & clean* man, all facts to the contrary notwithstanding" (12).

For a period of about three years, Candy printed both at Park Hill and Tahlequah. A letter dated August 27, 1846, from one of his brothers-in-law to another, mentions not only his moving from one place to the other, but also a family tragedy: "Mr. Candy's youngest child died not long since. He [Mr. Candy] is now working at Park Hill" (Dale and Litton 50-51).

In addition to working in his native language, John Candy printed in the Creek and Choctaw languages. His first effort, in 1840, was a production of the Constitution and laws of the Choctaws (Pilling, *Muskhogan Languages*, 97). In 1841, 1843, and 1844, he printed translations of the epistles of John and James, and the first three chapters of the Revelation of John (97, 100). Candy also printed Choctaw almanacs in 1842 and

1843, and two different books of Muskoke (or Muskokee) Hymns, in 1845 and 1847 (14; 54). John Candy and Edwin Archer collaborated on a Translation of the Introduction to the Shorter Catechism into the Creek Language in 1846, and, in 1847, the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly of Divines Translated into the Choctaw Language (54; 83). Candy and Wheeler worked together to print the Child's Book on the Soul and a variety of other religious tracts by Loring S. Williams in 1845 (93-94). After an absence of imprints bearing his name, Candy printed the Rev. Daniel B. Asbury's Muscogee Hymn Book in 1855 (3). This is the last imprint I have seen credited to John Candy. Hargrett wrote that Candy died in 1868 near Webbers Falls.

John Candy is the little-known bridge between the beginning of Cherokee printing in the east and its recommencement in the west. I believe he was the first Native American to print in his own language; this is reason enough to encourage further research on Candy. What Holland called the "Voice of New Echota" was reestablished, after a ten-year hiatus, while the tribe regrouped and began a healing process. John Candy played an integral part in this process, and deserves scholarly attention for it.

5. WHAT WE CAN KNOW NOW AND WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW

As Carmeleta Monteith writes, the Cherokee “achieved the closest approximation to nationhood of any tribe east of the Mississippi River” (57). The Cherokees accomplished this feat with a central government, based on a written constitution, and established with the same executive, legislative, and judicial structure as that of the United States (57). Among the organs of government was the national press, the one used to print the *Cherokee Phoenix*. The identification between early Cherokee print history and tribal identity from 1791 to 1846 is undeniable. I have come to the conclusion that the Cherokee syllabary is an important marker of cultural identity, one that signals an indigenous political stance that could not withstand the might of the United States. There are areas of further scholarship to which this paper points. They include questions concerning literacy in Cherokee, the ambivalence within the Cherokees’ attitudes toward the syllabary and their rhetorical stance in its use, and the place of the syllabary within Cherokee culture.

Questions on Literacy in Cherokee

McLoughlin and Conser’s statistical analysis of the Federal Cherokee Census of 1835 sheds light on the rapid growth of Cherokee literacy, especially as it relates to literacy in English. McLoughlin and Conser present their findings with an important definition of acculturation: “it is used here to mean the acquisition of new skills—economic, handicraft, or linguistic” (685). While careful to assert that they will not

distinguish between forced or active acculturation, the writers' definition importantly places the linguistic marker of acculturation on a level equivalent with the markers that provide material wealth, control over the means of production. It was the quickly-accruing material wealth that Boudinot would use as evidence of the tribe's civilization in his 1826 *Address to the Whites* to raise money to purchase the press; it was material wealth in land and gold that Georgians wanted in the 1820s and 1830s, contributing directly to the Removal Crisis.

McLoughlin and Conser find unexpected correlations between full-bloods and literacy in Cherokee, and they suggest that the United States refused to acknowledge the correlations between full-bloods and the resistance to Removal. Literacy rates for western Cherokee are not part of this analysis, but the details provided by examining the eastern band's literacy rates shed some light on the members of the tribe living through the Removal Crisis. Of a nation of 16,542 in 1835, 1,070 were readers in English, and 3,914 were readers in Cherokee (Tables 1 and 3, 681-82). The authors state that a little over half of the families (50.85%) within the Nation had "at least one reader of Cherokee" (692). Walker and Sarbaugh estimate that, because of the family and town structure, "virtually every non-literate Cherokee had access to Cherokee readers in his own settlement, if not in his own household" (72). Reproductions of part of the table of "Distribution of Households of Each Family Type By Wealth, Skills, and Literacy (By Percentage)" provide a more remarkable graphic explication:

	Fullbloods	Mixed Bloods	No Fullbloods
Readers of English or Cherokee	55.8	59.5	70.3
Readers of Cherokee	52.7	51.3	38.8
Readers of English	6.8	22.8	54.7
Readers of English and Cherokee	5.0	14.7	23.4

(From Table 13, p 694)

While literacy among Cherokee families lagged behind that of families with no fullbloods, the fact remains that over half of Cherokee families could read, and most of them were reading in a language that had only been demonstrated 14 years before, and only been in print for seven years. Seen this way, the Sequoyah syllabary must have been, not an agent of acculturation, but of cultural revitalization. Carmeleta Monteith puts it succinctly: “It appears that the Cherokee most interested in the syllabary were not the most interested in acculturation” (65). The syllabary provided a tool for a Cherokee nationalism, while English provided a practical means of communication with whites (and among the more acculturated members of the tribe).

The history of Cherokee literacy is a promising field of inquiry. Monteith mentions visits in 1838 and 1875 by Lanman and McCarthy, respectively, to the Eastern Cherokee in North Carolina. Lanman wrote that ““about three-fourths of the entire population can read in their own language”” although few could even speak English. McCarthy found ““nearly all could read and write their own language”” (67). McLoughlin and Conser’s analysis of the census was only for the year 1835, and only for the eastern Cherokee. Perhaps there exist clues to western Cherokee literacy, from 1821 on, that remain undiscovered.

In addition to the study Cherokee literacy is the need for analysis of Cherokee-language texts. The mass of documents written in the syllabary itself has not, apparently, received much criticism, or even much been collected. The syllabary is still alive and there are still documents available that we can read and study. Frederick and Kilpatrick lament the few that have been collected and preserved for study in their introduction to *The Shadow of Sequoyah* (1965), a volume wherein they translate various documents of everyday life that they have access to. These documents of everyday life, including and in addition to the religious documents Perdue mentions, are precisely the ones that merit our study. It is in the language of everyday life that the postcolonial people have their voice. In 1968, the Kilpatricks published *New Echota Letters*, which focuses attention on the contributions of Samuel Worcester to the *Cherokee Phoenix*, but they declined to include any of the Cherokee texts; they collected only a selection of his English work. This is study that we can still undertake, study that is valuable.

Ambivalence in Cherokee Attitudes to and Use of the Syllabary

As part of the study of texts written in Cherokee, I suggest study of the rhetorical structures of those texts, with particular attention devoted to an ambivalence in them. Stephen Brandon and Sarah Hallman Pelmas point out ambivalence within the rhetorical structures adopted by the Cherokees in their speeches, letters, Memorials, and court cases, and I have suggested a similar ambivalence built into the *Cherokee Phoenix*. There remains, however, further scholarship to develop this area of criticism.

The ambivalent attitude that the Cherokee elite took toward the syllabary may have weakened its potential political power. The reason I believe that their attitude toward written Cherokee is ambivalent is that the tribal leaders did not make the effort to

displace English with Cherokee; they had become too acculturated and were trying to fight the European-American cultural pressure on its own terms: with American schooling, American style laws, business, and religion, carried out for the elite in English. One example of this is the relative speed with which tribal members accepted the syllabary versus the tribal elite, who lagged behind (Perdue, 1994: 120). Elias Boudinot pointed this out in his “Invention of a New Alphabet,” when he says that the first users of the syllabary were “the more obscure individuals of the Cherokees,” while the educated elite, whom he called “the most intelligent portion;” ignored Cherokee literacy until it had already begun to spread (Perdue, 1983: 58).

Further complicating the relationship, Perdue points out that there may have been a class conflict within the educated elite: tribal leaders were wealthy mixed-bloods who held increasing political power as the tribe nationalized, while education allowed, she said, a “rising middle class [who] resented the economic power of Chief Ross [and the other leaders]” (1983: 26). Perdue believes the signers of the New Echota Treaty were members of this new middle class. The rising middle and upper classes fought to represent a silent lower class majority, and I believe scholars should try to find answers in the gaps between the classes, and in the spaces between their printed words.

The Syllabary within Cherokee Culture

Theda Perdue and Joel W. Martin examine the role of the syllabary within the tribe during this time in terms of Cherokee cultural significance rather than explicitly political terms. In her essay, “The Sequoyah Syllabary and Cultural Revitalization,” Perdue confirms that “[t]he syllabary was without doubt a major factor in the early nineteenth-century political regeneration of the Cherokees,” but does not focus her

attention there (123). She analyzes the function of the Sequoyah syllabary and finds it to be a “cultural revitalization” that could not accomplish its purpose because it was relegated to the realm of the “spiritual” or religious (123-25). Perdue sees that “The Cherokees’ enthusiasm for the Sequoyah syllabary may reflect their need to fill a spiritual vacuum” (120). The spiritual aspect of a written Cherokee language, or its attendant “New forms of discourse and the extension of abstractions” did not necessarily conflict with traditional Cherokee values and beliefs, she writes; “in some cases the syllabary actually enhanced them” (123). Among Perdue’s proofs is the use of written Cherokee to record “traditional religious knowledge” (124). Perdue makes many valid points, but I would like to reconsider her conclusion in political terms: the “spiritual significance” (124) of the syllabary *is* political: the culturally significant outward actions involved in religious practice constitute political action, and the sense of community that written language can maintain was one of the political goals of establishing the *Cherokee Phoenix*.

Martin, in “Cultural Contact and Crises,” affirms that the syllabary offered the tribe the means to nurture a “significant cultural renewal” (237-39). He identifies Cherokee print as one of the tools the tribe members had at their disposal to maintain a “cultural underground” (231). While I appreciate his statement that the syllabary sets one of the “invaders’ tools” at “countercolonial purposes,” I urge scholars to consider also the class distinctions going on between the large membership of the tribe who were literate in Cherokee but not in English, and the educated elite that Martin admits served as “cultural intermediaries” as they gained in power and wealth (238, 232-33). On the basis of my understanding of Perdue and Martin, and in light of Ahmad, Dirlik, and other

Postcolonial theorists, I encourage further study of the class conflicts active within the context of the rise of Cherokee nationalism and the Cherokee syllabary.

Examination of the syllabary and its use within the contexts of literary criticism, ethnohistory, and social criticism for our own time is valuable ground for research as well, because Cherokee print has not disappeared. The Cherokee syllabary has continued in use, and many Cherokee are bilingual, not only in spoken language, but in written language as well. There are minor variations in written Cherokee, but the typeface is universally recognizable to those who are literate. The written word still provides Cherokees the opportunity to speak for themselves, to maintain a cultural boundary, even in the dawning of a future few could have foreseen. Some study is currently underway for current Cherokee usage and its possible relations to tribal and cultural identity. Margaret Clelland Bender's and Barbara Jean Brooks's recent dissertations, which fit with the Postcolonial notion of the cultural value of the indigenous language, and the close examination of its usage in political terms, are recent scholarship on the continuing use of Sequoyah's invention. *The Cherokee Advocate* is available on-line, and the Internet has made the Cherokee syllabary available to users around the world, for anyone can download Cherokee font and can read and write in Cherokee on his or her own computer.¹³

Conclusion

Further study must start with the importance of this syllabary: it was developed by a someone who had no Anglo-American schooling, disseminated quickly without the aid

¹³ The *Cherokee Advocate* is available at <http://www.cherokee.org/Phoenix/home.asp>. The Cherokee syllabary is available at <http://www.cherokee.org/Extras/downloads/font/CherokeeFont.htm>.

of Anglo-American institutions, and is not associated with acculturation. Sequoyah's syllabary is Cherokee, only Cherokee, and so maintains Cherokee social boundaries and ethnic identity (Walker and Sarbaugh 71). Spivak concluded in her article that the subaltern could not truly speak, and much of Postcolonial literary theory debates whether metropolitan audiences can truly understand Postcolonial literatures. Arnold Krupat, though, describes another possibility. He writes, "From the first moments of contact, Native people...have engaged in the production of 'hybrid documents' as a necessity or an opportunity to bring together two different languages for history by means of what I will call acts of intercultural translation" (132). In the space created by these acts of intercultural translation exists an opportunity for the subaltern to speak, and that's the space I believe the *Cherokee Phoenix* inhabits. The record of the *Cherokee Phoenix* offers itself as rich ground for debate, starting with the many disagreements about the facts surrounding the invention of the syllabary and its early print history, and the roles of men who are largely forgotten now. Cherokee print provides scholars with a material artifact of the social construction of Cherokee identity, and I believe an ambivalence toward Cherokee print mirrored an ambivalence in the Cherokee social self in the early 1800s. It's time for us to begin unraveling the complexities of that time and place to better understand in what ways the Cherokees spoke for themselves, or to unravel, as Bhabha puts it, the "complex strategies of cultural identification and discursive address that function in the name of 'the people' or 'the nation'" (140).

WORKS CITED

- Ahmad, Aijaz. "Languages of Class, Ideologies of Immigration." *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. Chapter 2. London: Verso, 1992. 73-94.
- American State Papers*, Class 2: Indian Affairs. Ed. Walter Lowrie, Walter S. Franklin, and Matthew St. Clair Clarke. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Gales and Seaton, 1832, 1834.
- Bass, Althea. *Cherokee Messenger*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1936.
- Bender, Margaret Clelland. *Reading Culture: The Cherokee Syllabary and the Eastern Cherokees, 1993-1995*. Diss. U of Chicago, 1996. DAI 57, no. 05A, (1996): 2108.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "DissemiNation: Time, narrative and the margins of the modern nation." *The Location of Culture*. Chapter 8. London: Routledge, 1994. 139-70.
- Bird, Traveller. *Tell Them They Lie: The Sequoyah Myth*. Los Angeles: Westernlore Publishers, 1971.
- Brandon, Stephen. "to throw the mantle of civilization over all tribes": Elias Boudinot, Early Cherokee Print Culture, and the Rhetorics of Civilization. Thesis. University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1999.
- Brooks, Barbara Jean. *Language and Cultural Identity: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of the Symbolic Value in Oklahoma Cherokees*. Diss. Northwestern U, 1996. DAI 57, no. 11A (1996): 4713.
- Cherokee Phoenix and Indian Advocate*. Cherokee Nation. 26 September 2002. <<http://www.cherokee.org/Phoenix/home.asp>>
- Churchill, Ward. "The Tragedy and the Travesty." *Contemporary Native American Political Issues*. Ed. Troy R. Johnson. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 1999. 17-71.
- Clair, Robin Patric. "Organizing Silence: Silence as Voice and Voice as Silence in the Narrative Exploration of the Treaty of New Echota." *Western Journal of Communication*. 1997. 61(3): 315-337.

- Dale, Edward Everett, and Gaston Litton, eds. *Cherokee Cavaliers: Forty Years of Cherokee History as Told in the Correspondence of the Ridge-Watie-Boudinot Family*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1995.
- Dirlik, Arif. "The Past as Legacy and Project: Postcolonial Criticism in the Perspective of Indigenous Historicism." *Contemporary Native American Political Issues*. Ed. Troy R. Johnson. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 1999. 73-97.
- "Elias Boudinot: A North Georgia Notable." About North Georgia. 26 September 2002. <<http://ngeorgia.com/people/boudinot.html>>
- Fields, Elizabeth Arnett. "Between Two Cultures: Judge John Martin and the Struggle for Cherokee Sovereignty." *The Southern Colonial Backcountry: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Frontier Communities*. Ed. David Colin Crass, et al. Knoxville, TN: U of Tennessee P, 1998. 182-99.
- Foster, George E. *Literature of the Cherokees: Also Bibliography and the Story of their Genesis*. Ithaca, NY: Office of the Democrat; Muskogee, Indian Territory: Phoenix Publishing House, 1889.
- Frederick, Jack, and Anna Gritts Kilpatrick, eds., trans. *The Shadow of Sequoyah: Social Documents of the Cherokees, 1862-1964*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1965.
- Gabriel, Ralph Henry. *Elias Boudinot, Cherokee and His America*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1941.
- Griffith, Louis Turner, and John Erwin Talmadge. *Georgia Journalism 1763-1950*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1951.
- Hargrett, Lester. *Oklahoma Imprints 1835-1890*. The Bibliographical Society of America. New York: R.R. Bowker Company, 1951.
- "History of Sequoyah, and the Sequoyan Syllabary for the Cherokee Language." Cherokee Nation Release. February 23, 2001. 26 September 2002. <<http://www.cherokee.org/Extras/downloads/font/CherokeeFont.htm>>
- Hobson, Geary. "The Literature of Indian Oklahoma: A Brief History." *World Literature Today*. Summer 1990 64:3. 427-31. Academic Search Elite, 9 April 2001.
- Holland, Cullen Joe. *Cherokee Indian Newspapers, 1828-1906: The Tribal Voice of a People in Transition*. U of Minnesota, PhD. Diss. 1956.

- Kilpatrick, Jack Frederick and Anne Gritts Kilpatrick, eds. *New Echota Letters: Contributions of Samuel A. Worcester to the Cherokee Phoenix*. Dallas: Southern Methodist UP, 1968.
- Krupat, Arnold. "America's Histories." *American Literary History* Spring 1998 10(1): 124-46.
- Kutsche, Paul. *A Guide to Cherokee Documents in the Northeastern United States*. Native American Bibliography Series, No. 7. Methuen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1986.
- Larwood, James. *Georgia 1800-1900: A Series of Selections from the Georgiana Library of a Private Collection*. Series Ten: The Cherokee Indians of Georgia With Some Notice of The Timacuas and The Creeks. Atlanta: Atlanta Public Library, 1956.
- Littlefield, Mary Ann. "John Foster Wheeler of Forth Smith: Pioneer Printer and Publisher." *Arkansas Historical Quarterly*. 1985. 44(3): 260-283.
- Luebke, Barbara F. "Elias Boudinot and 'Indian Removal.'" *Outsiders in 19th-Century Press History: A Multicultural Perspective*. Frankie Hutton and Barbara Strauss, eds. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1995. 115-144.
- Macenczak, Kimberly P. *Educators to the Cherokees at New Echota, Georgia: A Study in Assimilation*. Diss. Atlanta: Georgia State U, 1991.
- Mankiller, Wilma, and Michael Wallis. *Mankiller: A Chief and Her People*. New York: St. Martins, 1993.
- Manypenny, George W. *Our Indian Wards*. 1880. New York: Da Capo Press, 1972.
- Martin, Joel W. "Cultural Contact and Crises in the Early Republic: Native American Religious Renewal, Resistance, and Accommodation." *Native Americans and the Early Republic*. Ed. Frederick E. Hoxie, Ronal Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1999. 226-58.
- McLoughlin, William G. "Cherokees and Methodists, 1824-1834." *Church History* 1981. 50(1): 44-63.
- McLoughlin, William G. *Cherokee Renascence in the New Republic*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1986.
- McLoughlin, William G. "The Missionary Dilemma." *Canadian Review of American Studies*. 1985. 16(4): 395-409.

- McLoughlin, William G. and Walter H. Conser, Jr. "The Cherokees in Transition: A Statistical Analysis of the Federal Cherokee Census of 1835." *The Journal of American History*. 1977. 64(3): 678-703.
- McLoughlin, William G. with Walter H. Conser, Jr. and Virginia Duffy McLoughlin. *The Cherokee Ghost Dance: Essays on the Southeastern Indians 1789-1861*. Macon, GA: Mercer UP, 1984.
- Missionary Herald*. Boston: American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1827-1834.
- Monteith, Carmeleta L. "Literacy among the Cherokee in the Early Nineteenth Century." *Journal of Cherokee Studies*. 1984. 9(2): 56-75.
- Moulton, Gary E., ed. *The Papers of Chief John Ross*. Vol. 1, 1807-1839. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1985.
- Murphy, James E. and Sharon M. Murphy. *Let My People Know: American Indian Journalism, 1828-1978*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1981.
- Pelmas, Sarah Hallman. *America's Authors: Creating the Citizen in Nineteenth-Century America*. PhD. diss. University of California at Berkeley. 1998.
- Perdue, Theda. "Rising from the Ashes: The Cherokee Phoenix as an Ethnohistorical Source." *Ethnohistory* 1977. 24(3): 207-18.
- Perdue, Theda. "The Sequoyah Syllabary and Cultural Revitalization." *Perspectives on the Southeast: Linguistics, Archaeology, and Ethnohistory*. Ed. Patricia B. Kwachka. Southern Anthropological Society Proceeding, No. 27. Mary W. Helms, series editor. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1994. 116-25.
- Perdue, Theda, ed. *Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot*. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1983.
- Perdue, Theda and Michael D. Green, eds. *The Cherokee Removal: A Brief History with Documents*. The Bedford Series in History and Culture. Boston: Bedford Books, 1995.
- Phillips Joyce B. and Paul Gary Phillips, eds. *The Brainerd Journal: A Mission to the Cherokees, 1817-1823*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1998.
- Pilling, James Constantine. *Bibliography of the Iroquoian Languages*. Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of Ethnology. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1888.

- Pilling, James Constantine. *Bibliography of the Muskogean Languages*. Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of Ethnology. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889.
- Riley, Sam G. "The Cherokee Phoenix: The Short, Unhappy Life of the First American Indian Newspaper." *Journalism Quarterly*. 1976. 53(4): 66-71.
- "Sequoyah (a.k.a. George Gist): A North Georgia Notable" About North Georgia. 26 September 2002. <<http://ngeorgia.com/people/sequoyah.html>>
- "Sequoyah's Talking Leaves." About North Georgia. 26 September 2002. <<http://ngeorgia.com/history/alphabet.html>>
- "Samuel Worcester." History. Cherokee Nation Cultural Resources Center. The Cherokee Nation. 26 September 2002. <<http://www.cherokee.org/Culture/HistoryPage.asp?ID=4>>
- Schlich, Kim, and Victor Schlich. "Talking Leaves." *American History*. 1995. 30:5. 38-41. Academic Search Elite, 9 April 2001.
- Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Ed. Cary Nelson and Larry Grossberg. Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1988. 271-313.
- Trienens, Roger J. *Pioneer Imprints from Fifty States*. Washington: Library of Congress, 1973.
- Walker, Willard. "The Roles of Samuel A. Worcester and Elias Boudinot in the Emergence of a Printed Cherokee Syllabic Literature." *International Journal of American Linguistics*. 1985 51(4): 610-12.
- Walker, Willard, and James Sarbaugh. "The Early History of the Cherokee Syllabary." *Ethnohistory* Winter 1993. 40(1): 70-94.
- Wheeler, John. "The Cherokees: Recollections of a Life of Fifty Years Among Them." *Indian Record*. Muskogee, OK. Published in VI parts; Vol. 1 No. 6-Vol. I No. 12; October 1886-March 1887.
- Woodward, Grace Steele. *The Cherokees*. The Civilization of the American Indian Series, Vol. 65. Norman, OK: U of Oklahoma P, 1963.
- Worthy, Larry. "The Cherokee Phoenix (and Indian Advocate)" About North Georgia. 11 April 2001. <<http://ngeorgia.com/history/phoenix.html>>

Appendix One: The Sequoyah Syllabary, from a lithograph prepared for the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Pilling, *Iroquoian Languages*, 72).

Cherokee Alphabet					
D _a	R _e	T _i	Ꭰ _o	Ꭱ _u	i _v
S _{ga} Ꭰ _{ka}	F _{ge}	Y _{gi}	A _{go}	J _{gu}	E _{gv}
V _{ha}	r _{he}	A _{hi}	H _{ho}	Γ _{hu}	Ꭰ _{hv}
W _{ta}	Ꭰ _{te}	F _{ti}	G _{to}	M _{tu}	A _{tv}
S _{ma}	O _{me}	H _{mi}	Ꭱ _{mo}	Y _{mu}	
Ꭰ _{na} t _{na} G _{nah}	A _{ne}	h _{ni}	Z _{no}	A _{nu}	Ꭰ _{nv}
T _{qua}	Ꭰ _{que}	P _{qui}	v _{quo}	Ꭰ _{qu}	E _{quv}
U _{sa} Ꭰ _s	A _{se}	b _{si}	F _{so}	S _{su}	R _{sv}
U _{sa} W _{ta}	S _{te} Ꭰ _{te}	J _{ti} J _{ti}	A _{to}	S _{tu}	Ꭰ _{tv}
Ꭰ _{ta} F _{ta}	L _{te}	C _{ti}	Ꭱ _{to}	Ꭱ _{tu}	P _{tv}
G _{ta}	V _{to}	h _{ti}	K _{to}	J _{tu}	C _{tsv}
G _{wa}	Ꭰ _{we}	Ꭰ _{ti}	Ꭱ _{wo}	J _{tu}	E _{wv}
Ꭰ _{ya}	B _{ye}	Ꭱ _{yi}	H _{yo}	G _{yu}	B _{yv}

Sounds represented by vowels.

<i>a</i> as <u>a</u> in <u>father</u> or short as <u>a</u> in <u>rival</u> <i>e</i> as <u>a</u> in <u>hate</u> or short as <u>e</u> in <u>met</u> <i>i</i> as <u>i</u> in <u>prize</u> or short as <u>i</u> in <u>pit</u>	<i>o</i> as <u>aw</u> in <u>law</u> or short as <u>e</u> in <u>not</u> <i>u</i> as <u>oo</u> in <u>foot</u> or short as <u>u</u> in <u>pull</u> <i>y</i> as <u>u</u> in <u>but</u> , nasalized.
---	---

Consonant Sounds.

g nearly as in English, but approaching to *k*. *d* nearly as in English but approaching to *t*. *h* *k* *l* *m* *n* *q* *s* *t* *w* *y*, as in English. Syllables beginning with *g*, except *s* have sometimes the power of *k*. *a* *s* *r* are sometimes sounded to, *u*, *tv*; and syllables written with *tl*, except *tl*, sometimes vary to *dl*.

[Iroquoian Languages.]

Drawn & lithographed for the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

