

Contact Information

For additional subscription or submission information, contact the Indigenous Nations Studies Program at the University of Kansas.

Mailing Address:

Indigenous Nations Studies Program
RE: INS Journal
The University of Kansas
215 Fraser Hall
Lawrence, KS 66045
e-mail: insp@ukans.edu

Telephone/Fax:

785-864-2660 (t)
785-864-3750 (f)

Web Page:

<http://www.ukans.edu/~insp>

A NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

This issue of the journal was made possible with the assistance of Viv Ibbett, Willow Getting, Janna Knittel, Michael Stewart, and Paula Courtney in addition to the Editor, Associate Editor, and Book Review Editor. Thank you.

Internalizing Native American History: Comprehending Cherokee and Muscogulge Identities

Dixie Ray Haggard

Article Abstract

Too often, what passes as Native American history does not provide the indigenous perspective, but rather focuses on Indian-white relations. This essay argues for a theoretical and methodological approach that requires the reconstruction of past indigenous societies to be used as models to interpret history from the native point of view. The example used here involves the reconstruction of Cherokee and Muscogulge societies by examining the center of their socio-political systems, the clan. By discussing the historiography of material written about their clan systems and how this material can be used to develop Cherokee and Muscogulge perspectives, this discourse demonstrates the insights that can be learned by internalizing Native American history.

Native American history is one of the most challenging fields associated with United States history about which to research and write. One reason for the unsettled nature of Native American history lies within the fact that Native American history consists of multiple histories rather than a singular history, and any attempts to singularize them fail to provide an adequate understanding of native actions in historical events. Secondly, the linear sources of traditional history (government documents, diaries, newspapers, etc.) inhibit the interpretation of these Indian nation groups that generally view life and history in a circular or

cyclical perspective. In the field of ethnohistory, scholars currently employ a wide range of interdisciplinary methods, research tools, and theories to study the complexity of multiple Native American histories that represent the cultures of over five hundred different nations in North America. The most successful ethnohistoric technique for describing these individual indigenous nations' histories involves the application of these tools, methodologies, and theories braided or interwoven with oral histories and indigenous language studies to reconstruct tribal cultures, worldviews, and social structures. These reconstructions then are used to interpret historical events from the tribal point of view, and thus provide a native voice in their histories.¹ In essence, the study of Native Americans first needs to be localized and tribally specific before social reconstructions can be attempted and the native voice revealed. The way scholars have approached the history of native groups in the Southeast United States provides a clear example of the need to implement this process. Therefore, a close examination of how to reconstruct the indigenous societies in this region will provide a specific illustration of how this method can be applied to Native American history as a whole.

A considerable number of scholars have written histories that at least partially dealt with the indigenous peoples of the Southeastern United States, but rather than examining actual native history, most early efforts tended to discuss the history of relations between these Native American groups and European Americans since the early fifteenth century. Those scholars who attempted a historical assessment of indigenous events and activities over time used a model for explanation that centered on the perceived, rapid acculturation of these people to the European-American concept of civilization, and thus, these histories also focused on Indian-white relations. Finally as the discipline of ethnohistory fully emerged after World War II, scholars attempted to discover internal, indigenous explanations for Native American history in the region, but many fell short of providing an authentic native voice. The enormous presence of this "civilization" paradigm caused most interdisciplinary scholars to reassess the process of assimilation. Again, this approach resulted in a history of Indian-white relations rather than a true native history with a native voice.

Since five groups in the Southeast (Cherokees, Chickasaws, Choctaws, Creeks or Muskogees, and Seminoles) seemed to imitate European-American cultural traits so much more quickly and successfully than others east of the Mississippi River, many scholars used the moniker of "The Five Civilized Tribes" to describe them. In assigning this designation to these people, these writers failed to recognize that many of the traits that were assumed to have been learned from European Americans were in fact indigenous in nature and only reflected European-American attributes superficially. In essence, historians that adhered to the "civilization" paradigm failed to ascertain the true nature of indigenous culture and perpetuated this mythology with a logic that was teleological at best.

This essay focuses on the Cherokees and the Muscogulge (Creeks or Muskogees, Northern Seminoles and Miccosukees). Both groups shared a similar

history of encounters with the same European American groups, and they both had direct antecedents from the Late Mississippian societies of the South Appalachian cultural province.² As defined in this essay, the South Appalachian cultural province consists of the area containing the southern end of the Appalachian Mountains eastward to the Atlantic Coast and southward to the Gulf of Mexico within portions of eastern Tennessee and Alabama, northern Florida, the western part of North Carolina, and the whole of South Carolina and Georgia.³ The historic ethnogenesis of these two groups occurred as a direct result of the Spanish *entradas* in the sixteenth century, and the introduction of virgin soil epidemics. The onslaught of these diseases caused the Late Mississippian societies to reorganize their chiefdoms into the entities that became known in the early colonial period as the Cherokees and the Muscogulges. This process continued, especially for the Muscogulges, throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as European involvement in the region increased.

The focus of this study on the Cherokees and Muscogulges accomplishes the prerequisite of localization and tribal specialization. Additionally, their differing historical trajectories after contact provide points for comparative analysis to assess Cherokee and Muscogulge adaptation to external pressures and levels of cultural persistence. Reviewing the available literature written about these two groups reveals that little literature exists that effectively uses accurate social reconstructions to interpret Cherokee and Muscogulge history. Thus, neither the historical account of the region nor of the tribes themselves produced the Cherokee or the Muscogulge voice, but it will be demonstrated here that enough material to develop valid models of these societies does exist. For the Cherokees and the Muscogulges, these models must center on the clan systems of these groups, because the entire society revolved around clan membership. Ultimately, it will be proven here that the methodologies and the tools do exist to discover the Cherokee and Muscogulge historical voices.

In the first half of the twentieth century, a majority of the popular studies about Cherokees and Muscogulges written for the general public discussed these tribes almost exclusively from the Anglo-American perspective. Therefore, little information concerning the social make-up of these societies was included. Some of these overviews included *The Cherokee Nation of Indians* (1887) by Charles C. Royce, *Red Patriots: The Story of the Seminoles* (1898) by Charles F. Coe, *History of the Cherokee Indians* (1921) by Emmet Starr, *Old Frontiers: The Story of the Cherokee Indians from the Earliest Times to the Date of Their Removal to the West, 1838* (1938) by John P. Brown, *The Cherokee Nation* (1946) by Marion L. Starkey, *The Story of Florida's Seminole Indians* (1956) by Wilfred T. Neill, and *The Seminoles* (1957) by Edwin C. McReynolds, *The Creek People* (1973) by Donald E. Green. Most of this work focused on the political history of Indian-white relations although those books concerned with the Seminoles provided some limited information concerning ethnology.⁴

Some of the earliest works about these tribes focused purely upon Cherokee or Muscogulge trade relations with European Americans in the region. Some

of the more important works concerned with this aspect include Herbert E. Bolton's *Spanish Resistance to the Carolina Traders in Western Georgia (1680-1704)* (1953), Mary U. Rothrock's *Carolina Traders Among the Overhill Cherokees, 1690-1760* (1929), Douglas L. Rights' *The Trading Path to the Indians* (1931), and Franklin W. Neil's *Virginia and the Cherokee Indian Trade, 1673-1752* (1932) and *Virginia and the Cherokee Indian Trade, 1753-1775* (1933).⁵

By far the area of investigation that received the most attention by early historians was the role natives played in the European rivalries of the region. The best of these studies was Verner W. Crane's *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732* (1929). Its primary focus centered on the intra-European rivalries and Indian-white relations after the first appearance of the English in the Carolinas. According to Crane, the development of an extensive Carolinian trade and alliance network in the region initiated colonial conflict, and the subsequent trader abuses contributed to the creation of the Creek Confederacy. This action led to the development of a Creek neutrality policy that shaped the balance of power in the region well into the eighteenth century.⁶ This portrays the Creek Confederacy's emergence as a reaction to the European presence rather than being driven by internal, socio-political factors.

Another important book that examined the southern frontier was John R. Alden's *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier, 1754-1775* (1944). This monograph emphasized the role of the British Indian superintendent on the Southern frontier, but neglected native perspectives. This institutional study clarified the attitude of the British toward the natives, and along with Crane's study, it laid the framework for the limited interpretations of others who tried to present the native perspective in an imperial context. Two other studies of this nature were *Anglo-French Rivalry in the Cherokee Country, 1754-1757* (1925) and *The Wataugans and the Cherokee Indians in 1776* (1931) by Philip M. Hamer.⁷

After World War II, ethnohistory emerged as a discipline that provided a methodology to research the native perspective in history. It merged traditional history with social science theories, tools, and methods to help reconstruct the nature of native societies. Additionally, in the last fifteen to twenty years, the braiding of indigenous oral traditions and oral histories with ethnohistorical methodologies led to even more successful reconstructions. Angie Debo's *And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes* (1940) signaled the direction Native American history took after the war, and proved to be a harbinger for the development of the ethnohistoric discipline. Debo used traditional historical methods as well as the work of anthropologists, and she fused this information together to create a narrative with native people at the center. After the war, others followed her lead by using the interdisciplinary approach to place native people at the focal point of narratives concerned with Native American history.⁸

Some of the most important works that used the ethnohistorical approach to write about the Cherokees and Muscogulges in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries include David Corkran's *The Cherokee Frontier: Conflict and*

Survival, 1740-62 (1962), *The Creek Frontier, 1540-1783* (1967) and *The Carolina Indian Frontier*; (1970), John Phillip Reid's *A Law of Blood: the Primitive Law of the Cherokee Nation* (1970) and *A Better Kind of Hatchet: Law, Trade, and Diplomacy in the Cherokee Nation during the Early Years of European Contact* (1975); Theda Perdue's *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society, 1540-1866* (1979); J. Leitch Wright's *The Only Land they Knew: The Tragic Story of the American Indians in the Old South* (1981); Michael D. Green's *The Politics of Indian Removal: Creek Government and Society in Crisis* (1982); James H. Merrell's *The Indian's New World: Catawba and their Neighbors from Contact through the Era of Removal* (1989); Thomas Hatley's *The Dividing Paths: Cherokees and South Carolinians through the Era of Revolution* (1993); Kathryn E. Holland Braund's *Deerskins & Duffels: The Creek Indian Trade with Anglo-America, 1685-1815* (1993); and Claudio Suant's *A New Order of Things: Property, Power, and the Transformation of the Creek Indians, 1733-1816* (1999). All of these monographs did a better job of centering native history than the previous generation of historians, but most either failed to break away from the dependence upon discussing Indian-white relations within the "civilization" paradigm or only examined the inner workings of the mixed-blood (mestizo) element of these societies.⁹

For example, David Corkran's three monographs all effectively demonstrated how the Cherokees and Muscogulges interacted with the colonial powers in the Southeast, but he failed to illuminate the complete inner workings of these societies that explained their motivations adequately. His work therefore falls into the category of Indian-white relations rather than true Native American history. Reid's two books placed the Cherokees at the center of his narrative and even discussed important elements of their society such as the clan system, but he forced his interpretation into Western or Anglo-American categories to demonstrate the development of acculturation in Cherokee society. Therefore, his efforts also fall well within the "civilization" paradigm.¹⁰

Theda Perdue's book on slavery among the Cherokees focused primarily upon mixed-blood elites within Cherokee society, and this elites' relationship with Anglo-America. By discussing the development of slavery among these Cherokees, Perdue did not really examine the internal history of a majority of the Cherokees, and thus provided a detailed analysis of only a small, but important, segment of Cherokee society. In similar fashions, Kathryn E. Holland Braund and Claudio Saunt covered the same ground with their publications on the Creeks. Both actually focus on the development of mixed-blood, or mestizo, influence among the Creeks, and the mestizo acculturation to Anglo-American culture. Both works provide valuable insight into the world of the mixed-blood Creeks, but they lacked the correct methodology to detail the history for the majority of Creek society during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Braund analyzed the extensive and shifting patterns of trade between the Creeks and the southern British colonies, and although she did discuss the impact of the clan system on these trade patterns, she did not provide a complete social reconstruc-

tion. Thus, her work remained within the overall boundaries of Indian-white relations. Building upon the foundation laid by Braund, Saunt demonstrated how mestizos expanded their influence within Creek society through manipulation of the deerskin trade and relations with Anglo Americans, the British, and the Spanish, but he did not take the next step to merge ethnographic information with this discussion of mestizos to provide a history of the Creek people as a whole. All three of the authors contributed significantly to the understanding of these tribes through their analysis of their mixed-blood segments, and now it remains for others to build upon the groundwork laid by them.¹¹ Other ethnohistorians have added to this framework, but have not moved into the realm of tribal, social reconstruction.

As mentioned earlier, three ethnohistorians that have contributed significantly to the study of the Muscogulges and the Cherokees are J. Leitch Wright, James Merrell, and Thomas Hatley. As for J. Leitch Wright's monograph, it provided an excellent overview of the southern tribes, but it failed to be tribally specific. Additionally, his attention to the relationships between natives and African Americans, although important, did not allow for effective social reconstruction. James Merrell's book was also limited by a focus on Indian-white relations, but he did move beyond this problem to demonstrate tribal adaptations that helped them survive as native people. Thomas Hatley's book proved important because he partially used gender to describe the relationship between the Cherokees and South Carolina during the eighteenth century. However, he also focused primarily upon Indian-white relations. Because of this point, Hatley failed to provide an effective reconstruction of Cherokee society, and therefore, he did not present the native view.

Most of the above-mentioned historians failed to break away from the dependence upon discussing Indian-white relations within the "civilization" paradigm. Although most of these writers used some form of the ethnohistorical approach, they failed to present the native perspective, because they did not effectively reconstruct Cherokee or Muscogulge society. This failure occurred despite the fact that the ethnographic information needed to reconstruct these societies has been available for the better part of this century.

So few historians understood the indigenous culture of the Cherokees and Muscogulges because they lacked a firm mental grasp of the socio-political structure of these societies. During the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the cornerstone of the native cultural framework was the clan system. Exegesis of how scholars have written about these clan systems, how they derived their data about these structures, and how they conceptualized their interpretations about Southeastern indigenous societies demonstrate how and why most historians have failed to correctly portray native adaptations to the European-American presence in the region or effectively assess tribal, cultural persistence. This examination of literature on the Cherokee and Muscogulge clan systems must first begin with a clear and concise definition of a clan and its function.

For these two groups, a clan consisted of extended, fictive and real relation-

ships between a group of families that claimed matrilineal descent from the same, distant ancestor. Whether or not an actual blood relationship existed, members of a clan treated each other as brothers and sisters. Sections of these clans often existed in other villages, and clan members in those places were also considered relation. Each clan protected its members through use of the "blood feud" which operated on the basis of guaranteed revenge to right injustices imposed upon clan members by outsiders. Clan membership also designated positions in community government and roles played in religious ceremonies. Taking all of these factors into consideration, it becomes apparent why an understanding of the clan systems of these tribes is important to be able to interpret their history as a people. Unfortunately, few historians have done this despite often knowing of the clan systems' existence.

Although few historians have placed the study of Cherokee and Muscogulge clan systems at the center of their historical analyses, it was not due to a lack of available information. The literature that contains information on these tribes can be broken down into three, temporal categories that can also be defined according to the nature of the material within each category. The first category consists of primary material created from the time of first contact in the sixteenth century until the removal of the tribes from the Southeast. This category can be further subdivided into two groupings: 1) those sources that were published during this period such as historical narratives, memoirs, or travel accounts, and 2) those sources not published during this time frame including collections of government documents, personal papers, and diaries. The second category ranges from approximately 1840 to 1960 and includes the work of paraprofessional and professional ethnologists/anthropologists. Finally, the last category consists of work done since the late 1950s. Interdisciplinary in nature, it attempts to explain the natives' interpretations of their histories.

A number of informants who had intimate contact with Cherokee and Muscogulge societies published narratives of their experiences during the eighteenth century. Some of the most prominent of these published primary sources include Henry Timberlake's *Memoirs, 1756-1765* (1765), James Adair's *The History of the American Indians* (1775), Bernard Romans' *A Concise Natural History of East and West Florida* (1775), William Bartram's *Travels through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida, The Cherokee Country, The Extensive Territories of the Muscogulges, or Creek Confederacy, and the Country of the Chactaws* [sic] (1791), and Louis LeClerc de Milfort's *Memoir or A Cursory Glance at My Different Travels and My Sojourn in the Creek Nation* (1802). These publications provide valuable insight as to how these native societies functioned and they supply a historical context for interpreting the role of clans within these societies. Mistakenly, they rarely give more than minimal information concerning the clan systems in question, or if they do supply detailed information, they focus only on a small segment of the system or misinterpret the intent of native action. Additionally, some of these informants had specific agendas that they hoped to accomplish with the publication of their

experiences. One example of this incident was James Adair's attempt to prove that Native Americans were the descendants of the "Lost Tribes of Israel." Therefore, his observations must be verified through comparisons with other contemporary sources before being used.¹²

Beyond the material published during the eighteenth century, a wealth of material exists that was created by observers without the intent of having the general public as an audience. These sources include collections of personal papers, government documents, and diaries that were later published during the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. Many of these sources provide a wealth of information on these clan systems without as much intentional manipulation of the historical content, but these informants were still just as likely to misinterpret the evidence or misrepresent information depending upon the nature of their actual audience.

Some of the more important works published at a later date include John Bartram's *Diary of a Journey through the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida from July 1, 1756 to April 10, 1766* (1942), William Gerard DeBraham's *DeBraham's Report of the General Survey in the Southern District of North America* (1971), Charles Woodmason's *The Carolina Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution: The Journal and Other Writings of Charles Woodmason, Anglican Itinerant* (1953), and the United States' Indian agent, Benjamin Hawkins' *Letters, Journals and Writings of Benjamin Hawkins, 1796-1816* (1980). There also exist collections of first-hand accounts edited by modern historians. These include Newton Mereness' *Travels in the American Colonies*, (1916), Samuel Cole Williams' *Early Travels in the Tennessee Country, 1540-1800* (1928), and his *Dawn of the Tennessee Valley and Tennessee History* (1937), and Reuben Gold Thwaites' *Early Western Travels, 1748-1846* (1966).¹³ As valuable as these primary sources proved to be, the development of professional ethnographies was even more so.

In the mid-nineteenth century, scholars began to contemplate the historical development of human society. As a result, these scholars published a series of monographs that explored the concept of primitive society. Many of these early "social" anthropologists began to develop a unilinear interpretation for the evolutionary development of human society. This approach assumed that all societies moved through the same direct process of development in stages from primitive society to modern society. Furthermore, these scholars began to search for examples of the various stages of social development among the indigenous societies of the world. One of these individuals was Lewis Henry Morgan.¹⁴

Lewis Henry Morgan was a lawyer by trade, but for several reasons he came to be interested in the evolution of human society. Morgan was something of an armchair anthropologist until he decided to study the Iroquois who inhabited his home state of New York. One of the unique aspects of their society that he found interesting was the nature of their kinship structures. Specifically, Morgan discovered that their matrilineal clan system formed the basic outline for their governmental organization, the Iroquois League of the Five Nations. He discerned that each clan in each tribe of the Five Nations (Mohawk, Onondaga,

Oneida, Cayuga, and Seneca) held a set number of seats in the Grand Council of the Five Nations. The Grand Council served as the body that set policy for the league as a whole. Thus, each clan maintained a direct voice in the decisions of the League. According to Morgan, the League of Five Nations created fictive kinship ties between each of the nations by dividing their clans into two exogamous moieties. Each member of a moiety viewed other members as brothers just as clan members viewed each other as brothers. In this fashion, an Iroquois could find fictive, family/clan members in any tribe whom they could rely upon for aid, comfort, and security. The exogamy of the moieties guaranteed marriage ties that worked with clan ties to help unify and strengthen the League.¹⁵

Eventually, Morgan began to move beyond the study of Iroquois kinship and investigate the kinship systems of other Native American groups. He found that most of them had similar classification systems for relatives. As a result, he began to formulate a theory for the evolution of primitive society into modern society. He contended that all Native Americans had the same origin and that all human societies went through the clan and moiety stage of development in their progression toward modern society. Morgan theorized that all societies moved from a matrilineal to a patrilineal clan form of organization before abandoning clans for the nuclear family. Ultimately, he proposed a fifteen-stage model for the development of the family/society that later influenced the writings of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.¹⁶

Morgan's influence upon the study of tribes of the Southeast and Native Americans in general was significant, because others began to research and write ethnology that included assessments of kinship structures. Additionally, he helped set the basic paradigm that used the study of Native American kinship systems as the method to discover examples of the evolutionary stages of human societal development and to prove the validity of the unilinear track of progression. Furthermore, by sending out questionnaires to missionaries and professional ethnographers, he was able to collect some information on the clan systems of the Cherokees and Muscogulges.¹⁷

Morgan claimed that the Cherokees originally had ten matrilineal clans, but by the mid-nineteenth century, he reduced this number to eight: Wolf, Red Paint, Long Prairie, Deaf (bird), Holly, Deer, Blue, and Long Hair. He believed that the Creek Confederacy consisted of the Muskogee, Hitchiti, Yuchi, Alabamas, Coosa, and Natchez with each group having a clan system in place. The Muskogee had twenty-two matrilineal clans with four of the clans having lost their names. The eighteen clans whose names, according to Morgan, persisted into the mid-nineteenth century were the Wolf, Bear, Skunk, Alligator, Deer, Bird, Tiger, Wind, Toad, Mole, Fox, Raccoon, Fish, Corn, Potato, Hickory Nut, Salt, and Wild Cat. Since Morgan assumed that all Native American tribes had the same system, he did not investigate the socio-political systems of any other tribes the way he did the Iroquois and Ojibway. Thus, Morgan depended upon the superficial evidence provided by various informants to validate his theories. This led him to ignore specific differences in the way Native American tribes

were organized. Specifically, this limited his information on the Cherokee and Muscogulge to a few generalized statements and a listing of their clans. These listings eventually proved to be partially in error, and ultimately along with his theories, became discredited and discarded.¹⁸

At the turn of the century, Franz Boas, a German ethnographer, came to the United States and launched a scathing critique of Morgan's brand of social evolutionism. Boas did not believe that a universal line of development for human societies existed, and any similarities between groups of societies resulted from cultural borrowing. He proposed that the history of a people determined their social development. This social history included not only the inner workings of the society in question through time but also the past physical and, more importantly, human environments with which they had contact. Therefore, the historical trajectory of each society was unique unto itself and would never be replicated by another group. After becoming a professor at Columbia University in 1899, Boas began training a new generation of anthropologists that eventually changed the direction of American anthropology. One of his most productive students was John R. Swanton. Swanton eventually began to work with the United States Bureau of American Ethnology and some of his most important work centered on the indigenous people of the Southeast.¹⁹

John R. Swanton, James Mooney, and Frank G. Speck were the first professional ethnologists to focus specifically on the tribes of the Southeast. They performed extensive fieldwork in Oklahoma and North Carolina during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and they usually made their findings available through publications with the United States Bureau of Ethnology. Swanton was the first to extensively explore the clan system of the Muscogulge and to successfully merge historical data with his fieldwork to derive a more complete awareness of their social structure. His most important work includes *Early History of the Creek Indians and their Neighbors* (1922), *Social Organization and Social Usages of the Indians of the Creek Confederacy* (1928), *Religious Beliefs and Medical Practices of the Creek Indians* (1928), *Aboriginal Culture of the Southeast* (1928), *Myths and Tales of the Southeastern Indians* (1929), and *The Indians of the Southeastern United States* (1946). Swanton performed most of his fieldwork among the Creek Nation in Oklahoma between September, 1911, and May, 1912 with several briefer excursions over the next couple of years afterward. He supplemented this material with historical data derived from James Adair, Benjamin Hawkins, and William Bartram, among other writings he found in archival material around the country.²⁰

With this information, Swanton published articles on the history, belief systems, subsistence systems, social organization, rituals, and recreation of the Muscogulge. Unfortunately, he did not discuss his assessments of their society within an historical context. His histories consisted mostly of attempts to reconstruct prehistory from indigenous migration legends as well as a history of Muscogulge-European American relations. His precontact history has since proven inaccurate, primarily because little consequential archaeology had been

completed by the time Swanton did his work. In his histories, he mentioned the socio-political systems of the Muscogulge, but only as a description of it and a comparison of it with other groups in the Southeast. Swanton also discussed this system with reference to the discrepancies among the groups that made up the Muscogulges. He did not place the clan system in a historical context by demonstrating its influence on Muscogulge history or its alterations through time due to the changing circumstances of the Muscogulges. As a result, Swanton's analysis of Muscogulge socio-political systems in his histories, like all other, contemporary ethnographies, was completely synchronic in nature.²¹

Because Swanton's ethnography was synchronic, he did not provide a theoretical framework on which to organize or assess the usage of this material. For the most part, he tended to list "traits" with the inference that each "trait" had the same significance in Muscogulge society as every other one. Despite these flaws, his work did provide an important contribution to the understanding of Muscogulge society and its clan system. He systematically described the clan system's organization and its importance to the political, social, and religious life of the Muscogulges. Swanton listed more than fifty clans for the Muscogulges. This large number resulted from the continual adoption of smaller tribal entities throughout the colonial period. Swanton showed that within each town, or *tvlofv*, the clans were divided into two moieties, red and white. These clans were organized into nine phratries with a phratry being the creation of a fictive relationship of several clans to each other. The phratry system allowed a person to find "family" in *tvlofv* that did not have that person's clan. Swanton directly attributed the development of the phratry system to the need to create fictive relations with each new group affiliated with the Muscogulges. This was the only assessment of change that Swanton made in his ethnographies. Phratries were an extension of the clan system rather than separate from it. These phratries were also incorporated into the moiety system, but sometimes they seemed to switch sides in some towns. Finally, all of the *tvlofv* were divided into red and white towns so the moiety system facilitated inter-town relation.²²

According to Swanton, the clan and moiety systems worked together to help decide what role individuals played in *tvlofv* decisions and religious ceremonies, who attained leadership roles, and possibly what responsibilities the individual played in warfare. Obviously, some of these roles changed over time, but Swanton does not provide evidence that they did. These results are probably due to his merging of material collected from several different time periods.²³

Swanton's associate at the Bureau of American Ethnology, James Mooney, assumed the task of writing the first ethnographies on the Cherokees. Mooney did most of his fieldwork in North Carolina rather than Oklahoma, because he felt that this group retained more of the traditional culture of the Cherokee. Most of Mooney's fieldwork was done in the late nineteenth century, and as a result, he published his material several decades before Swanton. Mooney's work also failed to address change over time, and like Swanton, he separated his ethnography from his historical narrative. Again, this resulted in a simple listing

of cultural traits with no theoretical interpretation provided.²⁴

Unlike the Muscogulges, Mooney found a more organized clan system among the Cherokees. Mooney stated that the Cherokee had seven clans, but did not mention a moiety system or phratry system. He demonstrated that at one time in the early colonial period they had fourteen clans, but these merged to form seven sometime before 1700. Importantly, all seven clans were present in every Cherokee village, and this eliminated the need for a phratry system. The Cherokees probably did not develop a phratry system because they did not absorb as many different, distinct ethnic groups as the Muscogulges did, and thus they had no need to develop this fictive extension of the clan system. Additionally, there was no need for a moiety system because each Cherokee village had complete clan representation within it. Therefore, they did not need the moiety system to unify them and eliminate potential strife between villages. Later, in the late 1950s, Fred Gearing began to explore this issue among others and published his findings in *Priest and Warriors: Social Structure for Cherokee Politics in the 18th Century* (1964).²⁵

Fred Gearing provided historians with the most important source for ethnographic interpretation of Cherokee society when he wrote *Priest and Warriors*, and he used the structural functionalist approach to write his ethnographies. Structural functionalism is one of the dominant, social science theories that has guided the ethnographic investigation of human society throughout the twentieth century. A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and Bronislaw Malinowski founded this school of thought. It focused ethnographic study upon discerning the structures that constitute a particular society, and how these structures functioned together to allow this society to operate efficiently and perpetuate itself. Unfortunately one major flaw contained within this theoretical and methodological approach, as practiced by Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown, and their students, was that it portrayed human societies as synchronic in nature. In essence, it did not explain how societies changed over time. However, Gearing was part of the first generation that developed a method for incorporating a mechanism for explaining change within the structural functional approach. This new method came to be known as differentiation (although Gearing did not use this term). It implied that over time the individual structures of a society became specialized so that only certain, specially trained persons performed the duties of those structures. Thus, societies became more complex and interdependent through the process of specialization.²⁶

Gearing focused his study on the roles that men fulfilled within Cherokee society and partially contrasted the Cherokee men's world with that of women. He discovered that Cherokee society contained several socio-political structures, and that individual men functioned at different levels of responsibility depending upon their age, abilities, and most importantly their clan affiliation. Gearing found that traditional Cherokee society was not significantly differentiated, but the pressures of dealing with European Americans began to push various elements of Cherokee society towards differentiation during the eighteenth cen-

tury. In essence, the Cherokees used traditional structures in new ways to adapt to their changing environment. Additionally, Gearing linked the clan system and its marriage rules to the maintenance of Cherokee identity. Ultimately, Gearing demonstrated that the clan was the cornerstone of Cherokee society, but he failed to provide enough data concerning Cherokee women to adequately complete a description of their clan system. Theda Perdu recently filled this void with her insightful book, *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change, 1700-1835*. The combination of the works of Gearing and Perdu would provide ethnohistorians with a solid foundation to explore gender relations as well as gender roles within the clan system.²⁷

Another scholar who focused on the differentiation of Cherokee society was Duane Champagne. He addressed this issue in his monograph, *Social Order and Political Change: Constitutional Governments Among the Cherokee, the Choctaw, the Chickasaw, and the Creek* (1992). A sociologist by training, Champagne hoped to demonstrate how and why the tribes of the Southeast developed constitutional governments. Specifically, he wanted to explain why these groups did this at different points in history, because they seemed to share a similar ethnological background. Ultimately as his discussion related to the Cherokees and Muscogulges, he concluded that the Cherokees had differentiated, or separated, a political structure away from the other elements of their society such as the social (clan) and religious structures sooner than did the Muscogulges and the other southeastern tribes. This led directly to the Cherokee creation of a written, constitutional government long before the other three groups did. The Muscogulges were the last to complete the constitutional process, because they were the last to differentiate their political structure from their other structures. Although this theory sounds interesting, Champagne did not provide enough evidence to demonstrate that the Cherokee actually differentiated their political structure from the clan system during the eighteenth century. In actuality, he contradicts himself several times as to when and how much the clan and political structures of the Cherokees became differentiated, and therefore, his effort to demonstrate the validity of differentiation theory proved to be of limited value to ethnohistorians and their reconstruction of the Cherokees and other southeastern tribes.²⁸

A prominent anthropologist, Raymond Fogelson, has worked on other aspects of Cherokee life in reconstructing the Cherokee world view. He has produced numerous articles about Cherokee culture, and three of them relate directly to the development of an understanding of Cherokee society through the reconstruction of their clan system. These articles include "Cherokee Notions of Power" (1977), "Who were the Ani-Kutani? An Excursion into Cherokee Historical Thought" (1984), and "On the 'Petticoat Government' of the Eighteenth-Century Cherokee" (1990). Fogelson uses the cognitive approach to interpret ethnology. In other words, he attempts to reconstruct the mental understanding that the Cherokees had about the world they inhabited. His work on spiritual power illustrates a method to interpret how the clan system perpetuated

and maintained a balance of power within the Cherokee universe. In other writings, Fogelson addressed significant aspects of the clan system. They discussed the role of women within the clans, and inter-clan relations. As a whole, Fogelson's efforts have expanded our comprehension of the Cherokee clans and their primacy within their socio-political system.²⁹

An additional work that provided significant information about the Cherokee clan system was William Gilbert's *Eastern Cherokee Social Organization* (1937). Gilbert spent several years during the early twentieth century studying the clan system of the Cherokees still residing in North Carolina. His analysis demonstrated the vitality of the clan system that had persisted into the twentieth century with some alteration but still in place. This study provided a significant amount of information to cross check Mooney's findings along with the historic, primary accounts, and has proven valuable in validating much of the available ethnographic data.³⁰

William Winn has recently produced an important if not well-known reconstruction of Lower Creek society with his book *The Old Beloved Path: Daily Life Among the Indians of the Chattahoochee River Valley* (1992). He has created an excellent model of these people that includes an attempt to incorporate the clan system. The only problem with this monograph is the failure to use this model to interpret historical events, but this does not diminish its value to Native American history.³¹

J. Leitch Wright's last publication reintroduced the value of the clan system in interpreting Muscogulge history. This book, *Creeks and Seminoles: The Destruction and Regeneration of the Muscogulge People* (1986), failed to extend the examination of the system throughout the narrative to interpret historical events. Despite this flaw, Wright did add to the debate concerning the role of the moiety system in Muscogulge society. Wright claimed that during the eighteenth century as the red/white moiety system died out it was replaced by an ethnic moiety system based on Muskogee speakers and non-Muskogee speakers. He believed that the development of this new system led to the Red Stick War that divided the Muscogulges in 1814 and the creation of the Seminoles in Florida.³²

Two works that contradicted Wright on this point and shed new light on Seminole social structures were Brent Weisman's *Like Beads on a String: A Culture History of the Seminole Indians in Northern Peninsular Florida* (1989) and Patricia Wickman's *The Tree that Bends: Discourse, Power, and the Survival of the Maskoki People* (1999). Both of these works linked oral traditions and oral histories together with traditional historical methods to create their narratives. Both authors contradicted the established literature, including Wright's, that stated that the Seminoles developed out of Creeks that moved into Florida after its native populations were wiped out. Both claimed that significant numbers of Florida natives existed at the time some Creeks moved into the region, and the two merged to create a new identity. They used the development of different socio-political structures among the Seminoles from that of the Creeks

as evidence to prove this point. Although the majority of scholars have not yet accepted this concept, it has remained an issue that warrants further examination.³³

Other important works that provide valuable insight into Muscogulge society include Joel W. Martin's *Sacred Revolt: The Muskogees' Struggle for a New World* (1991) and Marvin T. Smith's *Coosa: The Rise and Fall of a Southeastern Mississippian Chiefdom* (2000). Martin's work provides the religious background for Muscogulge history during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and thus brings us closer to understanding the Muscogulge world view. Furthermore, Smith's contribution connects the Creek world of the eighteenth century with its Mississippian legacy. Smith traces the history of the Creek town of Coosa from its heyday as a dominant Mississippian chiefdom in the sixteenth century to its participation in Muscogulge history in the late eighteenth century. Therefore, he furnishes valuable information about Muscogulge history and society that could be used to interpret their history from their perspective.³⁴

Another anthropologist who has contributed a significant amount of material to the understanding of Southeastern Native Americans, and more specifically the Muscogulges, is Charles Hudson. With works such as *The Southeastern Indians* (1976); *The Genesis of Georgia's Indians* (1984); *An Unknown South: Spanish Explorers and Southeastern Chiefdoms* (1987); *Some Thoughts on the Early Social History of the Cherokees* (1986); *The Juan Pardo Expedition: Explorations of the Carolinas and Tennessee, 1566-1568* (1990); *The Hernando de Soto Expedition, 1539-1628* (1994); and *Knights of Spain, Warriors of the Sun: Hernando de Soto and the South's Ancient Chiefdoms* (1997), he has added significantly to the current knowledge of the culture of the Cherokees and the Muscogulges, and he has led a host of anthropologists and archaeologists in exploring the origins of these groups in the distant past. By providing information on the Mississippian chiefdoms from which the Cherokee and Muscogulges developed, these scholars have laid the base for further understanding of the nature of Cherokee and Muscogulge societies.³⁵

Obviously, enough information exists to reconstruct Cherokee and Muscogulge societies in the eighteenth century, but that is only the first step. Next, these reconstructions must be used to interpret indigenous history from the internal point of view rather than from the outside. One example of how this can be accomplished is through an examination of the Cherokee War with the British from 1759 to 1761. Previous scholars have placed the blame for the war on the Cherokees' desire for blood lust revenge and have claimed that it concluded in a defeat and chastisement for the Cherokees by the British. However when this war is interpreted from the Cherokees' point of view through the use of socio-political reconstruction, it invalidates previous assessments for the war's causation and conclusion.

In August of 1758, in the midst of the Seven Years War, an avoidable and exceedingly unfortunate event occurred on the Virginia frontier. While search-

ing for French allied Indians, a detachment of Virginia rangers stumbled upon a band of Cherokee warriors returning home from fighting the French in the Ohio Valley. Initially, the rangers stopped the war party and ascertained that they were Cherokee, allies of the British. For racist and deceitful purposes, the rangers set up an ambush for these same Cherokees later that day. They killed and scalped several of the warriors with only a few escapees from the attack to eventually inform the tribe of this act of treachery.³⁶

Regardless of the specific reasons for its occurrence and unfortunately for the southern colonies and the Cherokees, this incident initiated a chain of events that led to open warfare between the two former allies.³⁷ Cherokee participation in the escalation of hostilities with the southern, British colonies stemmed directly from their established cultural and socio-political institutions. These structures need to be understood in order to comprehend how and why the Cherokees waged war on the colonists.

Each Cherokee village had a binary governmental structure which blended religious and civil matters together. This system consisted of a red, or war structure and a white, or peace structure. The peace organization consisted of a high priest, a primary assistant, a great speaker, and seven counselors. Each of these individuals was fifty or more years of age.³⁸ All of the positions within the white organization assumed their status by demonstrating the possession of *ulanigv* or personal, spiritual power and through membership in specific clans. To the Cherokee, personal power was not solely benevolent or nocuous. The intent of the user decided its application. The Cherokees' universe was filled with power, and as a result, it guided their behavior. The Cherokees believed that different levels of power existed. Power could be depleted through abuse, or completely lost through confrontation with more powerful individuals. It could be retained and accumulated but needed "periodic renewal." The Cherokees performed special ceremonies to guarantee this renewal process as a group and individually. Those that attained old age at least partially confirmed that they possessed *ulanigv*. Thus, this belief helps explain the traditional Cherokee tendency to defer to elders.³⁹ This spiritual power coexisted and intertwined itself with the political, military, or economic prowess of the individual. Ultimately, as seen by the Cherokees, these visible acquisitions testified to the possession of *ulanigv* just as the attainment of age proved a person to be powerful. As a result, positions in the white and red structures demonstrated past success. In this fashion for the Cherokees, matters of the metaphysics were just as important in decision making as those of the physical. Therefore, the war and peace structures represented the cumulative power or *ulanigv* of Cherokee towns and maintained the nation's position in the balance they saw in the world. Ultimately, the leaders of Cherokee communities assumed the responsibility for performing the appropriate ceremonies to maintain and improve the Cherokees' place in the physical and metaphysical worlds.

The peace organization's responsibilities included perpetuating Cherokee religious ceremonies and mediating civil disputes, but it had no coercive powers

over members of their towns. Each Cherokee maintained a degree of independence, and within certain parameters, individuals did as they wished. Ostracism served as the primary method of enforcing most social customs and mores. Town government did not delve into matters of violence within the tribe. This sphere was the domain of the clan system. In the end, peace leaders led through the art of persuasion and through the use of their esoteric, ceremonial knowledge.

The most dangerous threat to any group's existence is internal discord or violence. The greatest source for intratribal unity was the Cherokees' clan system. They used a clan system that relied upon blood revenge to ensure that there would be no open warfare within the tribe. Each town contained members of each of the seven tribal clans. Each Cherokee was a member of one of these clans. The Cherokee were matrilineal, and as such, membership was inherited through the mother. When clansmen within a town coordinated their efforts, they became a distinct entity called a clan section. Each clan section through its leaders represented the manifestation of the clans' collective *ulanigv*. Clan sections served three important functions: 1) the organization by which land was formerly controlled, 2) the regulation of marriage, and 3) the resolution of aggression between villagers.⁴⁰

In aggression resolution, intentional murder required the death of the offender or one of his clansmen by a member of the deceased's clan. With lesser crimes, opposing clans arbitrated the issue. The clan itself settled matters within the clan unit without intervention from the outside. If a problem erupted between members of different towns, the respective clan sections resolved the issue without the incident becoming a village-versus-village confrontation. Since each town contained members of each clan within it, these ties ensured peaceful coexistence between the towns and helped the tribe to respond to common needs. A common history and culture also eliminated strife between villages.⁴¹

With the clan structure, the Cherokees implemented the law of the blood feud. Two basic concepts lie at the foundation of this law. The first states that a society's purpose is to unite for wars of offence and defense. The second premise is that a bond of blood is the strongest bond of all.⁴² Within their tribe, the Cherokees demanded some sort of compensation for injury or loss of life to address the loss of *ulanigv* by the clan. The clans took the responsibility of exercising control over their members when problems arose between two members of the tribe, but the clans had no method to restrain the actions of members against those outside the tribe. At the same time, the clans demanded revenge when harm was inflicted on members by outside groups. As a result, the clan structure proved to be a significant factor in causing the outbreak of war in 1759.

The initial killing of the Cherokee warriors by the Virginians created a demand for revenge by the clans of the deceased. As a result, members of the tribe launched a series of raids on the South Carolina frontier. The blood law did not specifically require that the actual murderers be killed. It only demanded that someone related to the killers be put to death. Therefore, in the Cherokees'

view, a South Carolinian could serve as an adequate replacement for a far away Virginian. Since most of those Cherokees killed came from the Lower towns closest to South Carolina, the rest of the tribe had no obligation to participate, but they did desire to minimize the consequences of Cherokee retaliation against the colonists.

Prior to the outbreak of warfare in 1759, the white structure had preeminence over the red structure because the peace organization installed and could depose war leaders. Yet despite the superior position of the white structure, once a need for warfare became apparent, the war organization directed the actions of the town until the crisis passed. The red structure consisted of a war leader known as the "Great Warrior," a second in command, seven war counselors, a War Woman: to decide the fate of war captives among other activities, a War Priest to perform the necessary war ceremonies, three war scouts, and assorted other minor officials. In general, most of the war leaders came from the wolf clan.⁴³

Rank within the war structure demonstrated the relevant acquisition of *ulanigv* and knowledge concerning the appropriate war ceremonies. These positions had a semi-permanent status in each town, but not all leaders or warriors participated in each campaign. Since Cherokee society had no coercive power, any male had the choice of whether or not he wanted to participate at any time. Additionally while participating in a campaign, a warrior could choose to leave an expedition at any point for any reason without a loss of honor. Due to this situation, the town war organization duplicated the official structure for each campaign or raid according to who desired to participate. For example, if the Great Warrior did not want to partake in a specific campaign, someone took his place according to their rank in the red structure. The same was true for all of the positions in the system. Usually those who did engage in any particular campaign did so to advance their position within the war system or because of obligations to the clan blood law. Participation in war ceremonies and warfare itself guaranteed the attainment of *ulanigv* from the enemy for the individual, the clan, and the village as a whole.⁴⁴

In addition to coordinating the conduct of warfare, the red organization was the instrument for negotiating with groups outside the Cherokee tribe. In 1759, after the Lower Towns' raids on the South Carolina back country, Cherokee villages throughout the nation sent leaders to Charleston. They hoped to negotiate with the governor of the colony, William Henry Lyttleton, to prevent an escalation of hostilities. An exceedingly ambitious man, Lyttleton decided to publicly teach the Cherokee a lesson. He led an army of fourteen hundred militia into their territory, and in the process, desired to win additional favor with the British crown. In an act of diplomatic treachery, Lyttleton took the Cherokee peace delegation hostage as he set out for Fort Prince George, which was located among the Cherokee Lower Towns.⁴⁵ Upon arriving at Fort Prince George, the governor placed his captives in the fort's stockade. Moreover, he demanded that the Cherokees turn over the warriors who had participated in the backcountry

raids. The Cherokees could not and would not honor this requirement. There was no tribal organization which could enforce this action, and coercion was contrary to the fundamental behavior of their society. As far as they were concerned, the warriors acted out of obligation to the blood law and were guilty of no crime.⁴⁶

After much negotiation, several of the more prominent hostages were released when two of the warriors who had participated in the backcountry raids voluntarily surrendered. Probably the two hoped to obtain the release of clansmen. Additionally, Lyttleton promised to release the remaining twenty-two hostages when the same number of Cherokees guilty of killing Carolinians surrendered to the commander at Fort Prince George. The governor then disbanded his army and returned to Charleston.⁴⁷

Although the Cherokee leaders present acquiesced to this compromise, they never intended to implement it. They knew the warriors would not submit to what amounted to a death sentence. Additionally, any Cherokee that physically captured and turned over one of these individuals to the British faced retribution by that warrior's clan. Faced with no other option, the Cherokees immediately began surreptitiously to devise a method for freeing the remaining captives. This action led directly to the ambush of fourteen soldiers of Fort Prince George including the commander of the fortification. In retaliation, the rest of the garrison butchered the remaining captives. This initiated resumption and an intensification of the conflict.⁴⁸

For two reasons, the killing of the hostages caused the entire Cherokee tribe to engage in hostilities with the British. The most obvious causation entailed the blood law, which required an act of revenge by the individual clan sections of each victim's town. With these individuals representing a majority of the towns, a large percentage of the nation became entangled in the affair. The second cause involved the loss of the combined *ulanigv* of the leaders killed. The Cherokees believed this power could be regained through the performance of the proper war ceremonies and the death of British military leaders. Thus, their desire for war increased.

Because a majority of the tribe became obligated to take revenge, the Cherokees instituted the town war structure on a tribal level and launched a series of devastating raids on the Carolina frontier and laid siege to Fort Loudoun located among the Overhill towns in Tennessee. In response to Cherokee resumption of hostilities, the British launched four expeditions into Cherokee territory over the next two years. Two began in Virginia with militia units, but they never engaged the Cherokees. The two most important campaigns originated in South Carolina with British regular troops marching into the Lower and Middle towns.

The Cherokees recognized four different types of warfare. Each form of conflict had its own rituals or ceremonies. The four categories of war included a revenge war, a challenge war, a defensive war if towns came under attack, and an offensive war for attacking an enemy discovered in Cherokee territory. The hostilities that began in 1759 started as a revenge war. The action of British

regular troops burning villages and fields within the Lower and Middle towns caused the Cherokees to respond with a defensive approach to stop the depredations. Finally, the assault on Fort Loudoun exemplified the fourth style of a strike against opponents in their territory and eventually fulfilled the need for revenge originated by the death of the hostages.⁴⁹

On August 9, 1760, the troops at Fort Loudoun capitulated to the Cherokees, ending a siege that began in February of that same year. The commander surrendered the fort on the condition that the Cherokees give the troops safe conduct to Fort Prince George and provide the troops with venison along the way. The next day as the troops tried to proceed on their way, the Cherokees ambuscaded them. The Cherokees killed four officers, twenty-three privates, and three women while the others were taken captive.⁵⁰

Although the Cherokees traditionally did not engage in siege warfare, this particular situation demanded that something be done. According to their customary, ritualistic approach to warfare, the presence of the hostile installation in their territory required action be taken against it. Also, the garrison was the easiest target to acquire blood revenge and replenish *ulanigvgy*. For these two reasons, the Cherokees adopted new military methods to cope with this situation. The success of these new tactics and strategies resulted from an intimate understanding of the British colonial approach to warfare. They were fully aware that none of the colonies would be able to relieve the fort and therefore made the taking and killing of a portion of the garrison the focus of their war efforts. The Cherokees viewed the death of twenty-seven members of the Fort Loudoun garrison as satisfying the call for blood revenge and replenishing the lost *ulanigvgy* of the tribe. For all intents and purposes, the Cherokees saw no further need for warfare and began to negotiate an end to the war. On the other hand, the British still sought to teach the Cherokees a lesson. Therefore, they continued the war.

Eventually, the British destroyed more Cherokee towns and received more casualties without actually defeating the Cherokees in the field or inflicting significant fatalities among the Cherokee warriors. As a result, after a peace settlement in 1761, the British felt that they won because they inflicted more physical damage by destroying a score of Cherokee towns. On the other hand, the Cherokees believed they won the war because they performed the appropriate war ceremonies and inflicted enough death upon the British to compensate for the loss of the initial captives. Because the war ceremonies had been successfully performed and the British suffered more fatalities than the tribe, the Cherokees improved their position within the balance of the physical and metaphysical world by not only regaining the lost *ulanigvgy*, but also by acquiring additional power. Thus the surviving leaders of the Cherokees became more powerful than they had been prior to the outbreak of the war.

Clearly, the need to understand the internal dynamics of native societies has been demonstrated by the example of the Cherokees in their war with the British from 1759 to 1761. Without an adequate reconstruction of Cherokee society

and their worldview, previous scholars claimed that the outcome of the conflict resulted in the chastisement of the Cherokees by the British. Obviously from the Cherokees' point of view, this was not the case. Additionally, their reason for fighting in the first place becomes more comprehensible and logical as opposed to previous attempts to define it as merely a savage desire for bloodlust revenge.

Upon review of the historiography concerning the Cherokees and Muscogulges, it becomes apparent that most of the historical work done before World War II did not attempt to interpret Cherokee and Muscogulge actions and motivations as they related to historical events, and thus resulted in little more than the discussion of Indian-white relations. The historians of this time period were content to relegate Native Americans to the role of passive bystanders in the historical events that surrounded them. Finally, with the evolution of ethnohistory after World War II, scholars attempted to center historical narratives within the realm of the native viewpoint, but this effort was often not successful. Although ethnohistorians have provided some new insights into the content and form of Cherokee and Muscogulge societies, many have ultimately produced narratives that focused almost entirely upon Indian-white relations within the "civilization" paradigm. They fell into this trap because they did not use localization and tribal specification to focus their efforts to discern the primary elements of Cherokee and Muscogulge societies. Therefore, they have ignored the centrality of the clan system and have not attempted to accurately reconstruct Cherokee and/or Muscogulge society. This reconstruction is vital in providing a baseline from which an internal, native view of history can be written. Additionally, few historians have used the available oral histories and traditions of the Cherokees and Muscogulges to aid in the interpretation of their history. As a result, by ignoring the available ethnographic information, most historians have failed to write a true, indigenous history of the Cherokees or Muscogulges.

Notes

1. Donald L. Fixico, "Introduction," *Rethinking American Indian History*, ed., Donald L. Fixico (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997), 3; Donald L. Fixico, "Methodologies in Reconstructing Native American History," *Rethinking American Indian History*, Donald L. Fixico (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997), 119; and Devon A. Mihesuah, "Introduction," *Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians*, ed., Devon A. Mihesuah (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 1-3.

2. J. Leitch Wright, Jr., *Creeks and Seminoles: The Destruction and Regeneration of the Muscogulge People*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), xiv. The term Muscogulge is here used to describe those groups that came to commonly be called the Creeks and Seminoles during the eighteenth century. This identification also includes all the smaller groups that many consider to have been absorbed or assimilated into these two entities. Therefore, Muscogulge refers to every native group in the Southeast below Kentucky and Virginia that was not or did not eventually become known as Catawba, Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Meherrin, Nottaway, or Tuscarora in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

3. Gordon R. Willey and Phillip Phillips, *Method and Theory in American Archaeology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), 47-48; David J. Hally, "An Overview of Lamar Culture," *Ocmulgee Archaeology, 1936-1986*, ed. David J. Hally, (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994), 144; Although some archaeologists do not define eastern Tennessee and northern Florida as part of this regional culture variant for the Late Mississippian period, their inclusion is based upon similarities of material culture, ecological adaptation, social behavior, and ties to the precontact cultures and historic groups (Cherokees and Muscogulges) inhabiting the South Appalachian cultural region during the Late Mississippian and historic periods.
4. Charles C. Royce, "The Cherokee Nation of Indians: A Narrative of their Official Relations with the Colonial and Federal Governments," Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of Ethnology, *Fifth Annual Report, 1883-84* (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1887); Charles H. Coe, *Red Patriots: The Story of the Seminoles* (Cincinnati: Editor Publishing Company, 1898); Emmet Starr, *History of the Cherokee Indians and Their Legends and Folk Lore* (Oklahoma City: Warden Company, 1921); John P. Brown, *Old Frontiers: The Story of the Cherokee Indians from the Earliest Times to the Date of Their Removal to the West, 1838* (Kingsport, TN: Southern Publishers, Inc., 1938); Marion L. Starkey, *The Cherokee Nation* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1946); Wilfred T. Neill, *The Story of Florida's Seminole Indians* (St. Petersburg: Great Outbooks, 1956); Edwin C. McReynolds, *The Seminoles* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1957); and Donald E. Green, *The Creek People* (Phoenix: Indian Tribal Series, 1973).
5. Herbert E. Bolton, "Spanish Resistance to the Carolina Traders in Western Georgia (1680-1704)," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* Vol. 9 (1925): 115-130; Mary U. Rothrock, "Carolina Traders Among the Overhill Cherokees, 1690-1760," *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications* Vol. 1 (1929): 3-18; Douglas L. Rights, "The Trading Path to the Indians," *North Carolina Historical Review* Vol. 3 (1931): 403-426; Franklin W. Neil, "Virginia and the Cherokee Indian Trade, 1673-1752," *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications* Vol. 3 (1932): 3-21; and Franklin W. Neil, "Virginia and the Cherokee Indian Trade, 1753-1775," *East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications* Vol. 5 (1933): 22-38.
6. Verner W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1929).
7. John R. Alden, *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier, 1754-1755* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1944); Philip M. Hamer, "Anglo-French Rivalry in the Cherokee Country, 1754-57," *North Carolina Historical Review* Vol. 2 (1925): 303-322; and Philip M. Hamer, "The Wataugans and the Cherokee Indians in 1776," *East Tennessee Historical Society Publications* Vol. 3 (1931): 108-126.
8. Terry P. Wilson, *Teaching American Indian History, Diversity within American*, series eds., Nell Irvin Painter and Antonio-Ríos Bustamante (Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association, 1993), 15-28; and Angie Debo, *And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1940).
9. David H. Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier: Conflict and Survival, 1740-62* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962); David H. Corkran, *The Creek Frontier, 1540-1783* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967); David H. Corkran, *The Carolina Indian Frontier, Tricentennial Booklet No. 6* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970); John Philip Reid, *A Better Kind of Hatchet: Law, Trade, and Diplomacy in the Cherokee Nation During the Early Years of European Contact* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1975); John Philip Reid, *A Law of Blood: The Primitive Law of the Cherokee Nation* (New York: New York University Press, 1970); Theda Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society, 1540-1866* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1979); J. Leitch Wright, *The Only Land They Knew: The Tragic Story of the American Indians in the Old South* (New York: Free Press, 1989); Michael D. Green, *The Politics of Indian Removal: Creek Government and Society in Crisis* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982); James H. Merrell, *The Indians' New World: Catawba and their Neighbors from Early Contact through the Era of Removal* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1989); Thomas Hatley, *The Dividing Paths: Cherokees and South Carolinians Through the Era of Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); Kathryn E. Holland Braund, *Deerskins & Duffles: The Creek Indian Trade*

with *Anglo-America* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993); and Claudio Saunt, *A New Order of Things: Property, Power, and the Transformation of the Creek Indians, 1733-1816* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

10. Corkran, *Cherokee Frontier*; Reid, *Better Kind of Hatcher*; and Reid, *Law of Blood*.

11. Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society*, Braund, *Deerskins & Duffels*, and Saunt, *A New Order of Things*.

12. Henry Timberlake, *Lieutenant Henry Timberlake's Memoirs, 1756-1765* (Marietta, GA: Continental Book Company, 1948); James Adair, *Adair's History of the American Indians*, ed., Samuel Cole Williams (Johnson City, TN: Watauga Press, 1930; reprint, New York: Argonaut Press, 1966); Bernard Romans, *A Concise Natural History of East and West Florida* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1962); William Bartram, "Travels in Georgia and Florida, 1773-1774: A Report to Doctor John Fothergill," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 33 (1943): 121-242; and Louis LeClerc de Milfort, *Memoirs; or, A Cursory Glance at My Different Travels and My Sojourn in the Creek Nation* (Chicago: Lakeside Press, 1956, reprinted, Savannah, GA: Beehive Press, 1972).

13. John Bartram, "A Diary of a Journey Through the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida from July 1, 1765, to April 10, 1766," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* Vol. 33 (1942): 2-20; William F. De Braham, *Report of the General Survey in the Southern District of North America*, ed., Louis De Vorse (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1971); Charles Woodmason, *The Carolina Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution: The Journal and Other Writings of Charles Woodmason, Anglican Itinerant*, ed., Richard J. Hooker (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953); Benjamin Hawkins *Letters, Journals and Writings of Benjamin Hawkins*, 2 vols., ed. C. L. Grant (Savannah, GA: Beehive Press, 1980); Samuel Cole Williams, *Dawn of Tennessee Valley and Tennessee History* (Johnson City, TN: The Watauga Press, 1937); Newton Mereness, *Travels in the American Colonies* (New York: The National Society of the Colonial Dames of America and the Macmillan Company, 1916); and Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., *Early Western Travels, 1748-1846; A Series of Annotated Reprints of Some of the Best and Rarest Contemporary Volumes of Travel, Descriptive of the Aborigines and Social and Economic Conditions in the Middle and Far West, During the Period of Early American Settlement*, Vols. 1, 32, and 33 (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1966).

14. Adam Kuper, *The Invention of Primitive Society: Transformations of an Illusion* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 1-5.

15. Lewis H. Morgan, *League of the Iroquois* (New York: Corinth Books, 1962), 78-110; Lewis H. Morgan, "Laws of Descent of the Iroquois," *Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, Vol. 11 (1858): 132-148, reprint in *An Iroquois Source Book*, Vol. 1, *Political and Social Organization*, ed., Elisabeth Tooker (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1985); Lewis H. Morgan, "Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity," *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge*, Vol. 17 (1871): 150-169; and Lewis H. Morgan, *Ancient Society*, ed., Leslie A. White, (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964), 60-133.

16. Kuper, *Invention of Primitive Society*, 42-75.

17. *Ibid.*

18. Lewis H. Morgan, *Ancient Society: Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization* (New York: Holt, 1877), 165-166 and 168-169; and Kuper, *Invention of Primitive Society*, 142-148.

19. Kuper, *Invention of Primitive Society*, 132-148.

20. Charles M. Hudson, "Introduction," *Ethnology of the Southeastern Indians: A Source Book*, ed. Charles M. Hudson (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1985), xi-xviii; John R. Swanton, *Early History of The Creek Indians and their Neighbors* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1922, reprint, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998); John R. Swanton, "Aboriginal Culture of the Southeast," "Religious Beliefs and Medical Practices of the Creek Indians," and "Social Organization and Social Usages of the Indians of the Creek Confederacy," *Forty-Second Annual Report of the American Bureau of Ethnology* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1928), 23-726; John R. Swanton, *Myths and Tales of the Southeastern Indians*, intro. George E. Lankford (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Bureau of American Ethnology, 1929,

reprint, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995); and John R. Swanton, *The Indians of the Southeastern United States* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1946, reprint, 1979).

21. Hudson, "Introduction," xiii-xiv; John R. Swanton, *Early History of the Creek Indians and their Neighbors* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998), Reprint of *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 73 (1922), and John R. Swanton, *The Indians of the Southeastern United States* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1979), Reprint of *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 137 (1946); and Nicholas Thomas, *Out of Time: History and Evolution in Anthropological Discourse*, 2nd ed., (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 18-19.

22. John R. Swanton, "Aboriginal Culture of the Southeast," "Religious Beliefs and Medical Practices of the Creek Indians," and "Social Organization and Social Usages of the Indians of the Creek Confederacy," 23-726; Swanton, *Early History*, 11-30; Swanton, *Indians*, 629-800; and Hudson, "Introduction," xi.

23. Swanton, "Aboriginal," "Religious," and "Social Organization," 23-726.

24. James Mooney, *James Mooney's History, Myths, and Sacred Formulas of the Cherokees*, intro. George Ellison, Reprint, (Asheville, NC: Historical Images of Bright Mountain Books, 1992).

25. Mooney, et al.; Fred Gearing, "Priests and Warriors: Social Structure for Cherokee Politics in the 18th Century," *American Anthropologist* Vol. 64 (1962): 1-124.

26. Fred Gearing, "Priests," 1-124; Anthony D. Smith, *The Concept of Social Change: A Critique of the Functionalist Theory of Social Change* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973); and Robert A. Nisbit, *Social Change and History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969).

27. Gearing, "Priests," 1-124; and Theda Perdue, *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change, 1700-1835* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998).

28. Duane Champagne, *Social Order and Political Change: Constitutional Governments Among the Cherokee, the Choctaw, the Chickasaw, and the Creek* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992).

29. Raymond D. Fogleson, "Cherokee Notions of Power," *The Anthropology of Power*, eds., Raymond D. Fogelson and Richard N. Adams (New York: Academic Press, 1977), 185-194; Raymond D. Fogelson, "Who were the Ani-Kutani? An Excursion into Cherokee Historical Thought," *Ethnohistory* Vol. 31 (1984): 255-263; and Raymond D. Fogelson, "On the 'Petticoat Government' of the Eighteenth-Century Cherokee," *Personality and the Cultural Construction of Society: Papers in Honor of Melford E. Spiro*, eds., David K. Jordan and Marc J. Swartz (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1990), 161-180.

30. William H. Gilbert, Jr., "Eastern Cherokee Social Organization," *Social Anthropology of North American Tribes: Essays in Social Organization, Law, and Religion*, eds., Fred Eggan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), 285-338.

31. William W. Winn, *The Old Beloved Path: Daily Life Among the Indians of the Chattahoochee River Valley*, (Columbus, GA: The Historic Chattahoochee Commission and the Columbus Museum, 1992).

32. Wright, *Creeks and Seminoles*, 1-40.

33. Wright, *Creeks and Seminoles*, 1-40; Brent Richards Weisman, *Like Beads on a String: A Culture History of the Seminole Indians in Northern Peninsular Florida* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1989); and Patricia R. Wickman, *The Tree that Bends: Discourse, Power, and the Survival of the Muskoki People* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999).

34. Joel W. Martin, *Sacred Revolt: the Muskogees' Struggle for a New World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1991); and Marvin T. Smith, *Coosa: The Rise and Fall of a Southeastern Mississippian Chiefdom* (Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, 2000).

35. Charles Hudson, *Southeastern Indians* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1976); "The Genesis of Georgia's Indians," *Forty Years of Diversity: Essays on Colonial Georgia*, eds., H. H. Jackson and Phinizy Spalding (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1984); "An Unknown South: Spanish Explorers and Southeastern Chiefdoms," *Visions and Revisions: Ethnohistoric Perspectives on Southern Cultures*, *Southern Anthropological Society Proceedings* 20 (1987): 6-24; "Some Thoughts on the Early Social History of the Cherokees," *The Conference on Cherokee Prehistory*, ed., David G. Moore (Swannanoa, N.C.: Warren Wilson College, 1986); *The Juan*

Pardo Expedition: Exploration of the Carolinas and Tennessee, 1566-68 (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1990); "The Hernando de Soto Expedition, 1539-1543," *The Forgotten Centuries: Indians and Europeans in the American South, 1521-1704*, eds., Charles Hudson and Carmen Chaves Tesser (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994); and *Knights of Spain, Warriors of the Sun: Hernando de Soto and the South's Ancient Chiefdoms* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997).

36. William P. Palmer, ed., *Calendar of Virginia State Papers and Other Manuscripts, 1652-1781*, vol. 1 (New York: Kraus Reprint Corporation, 1968), 254-257.

37. Washington to Dinwiddie, 4 November 1757, in George Washington, *The Papers of George Washington: Colonial Series*, vol. 4 (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1988), 44; Corkran, *Cherokee Frontier*, 129; Brown, *Old Frontiers*, 62.

38. Thomas E. Mails, *The Cherokee People: The Story of the Cherokees from the Earliest Origins to Contemporary Times* (New York: Marlowe & Company, 1996), 93-99.

39. Fogelson, "Cherokee Notions of Power," 185-188.

40. Gearing, 3-5, 21, and 82.

41. *Ibid.*, 20-22, and 82.

42. Johan M. G. Van der Dennen, "Ethnocentrism and In-Group/Out Group Differentiation: A Review and Interpretation of the Literature," in *The Sociobiology of Ethnocentrism: Evolutionary Dimensions of Xenophobia, Discrimination, Racism, and Nationalism*, Edited by Vernon Reynolds, Vincent Falger, and Ian Vine (London: Croom Helm, 1987), 1; and Robert A. LeVine and Donald T. Campbell, *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behavior* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1972), 11-21; and Reid, *Better Kind of Hatchet*, 1-13.

43. Janet and David G. Campbell, "The Wolf Clan," *Journal of Cherokee Studies*, Vol. 12 (Fall 1982), 85-91; and Mails, 99-115.

44. Campbell, 85-91; and Mails, 99-115.

45. *South-Carolina Gazette*, 13 October, and 1 November 1759; Lyttleton to Board of Trade, 23 October 1759, B.P.R.O.S.C.; Alexander Hewatt, "An Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Colonies of South Carolina and Georgia," in B. R. Carroll, ed., *Historical Collections of South Carolina; Embracing many Rare and Valuable Pamphlets, and other Documents, Relating to the History of that State, from its First Discovery to Independence, in the Year 1776*, vol. 1 (New York: AMS, 1973), 432-445. [Hewatt's original contains inaccuracies later corrected by Carroll. For this reason, the Carroll version is used here.]; Kinloch Bull, Jr., *The Oligarchs in Colonial and Revolutionary Charleston: Lieutenant Governor William Bull II and His Family* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 54-56.

46. Hewatt, 446-449.

47. *Ibid.*, 449-451.

48. Hatley, 139; and Hewatt, 451-454.

49. Williams, *Dawn of Tennessee . . . History*, 237-239; James Grant, "Journal of Lieutenant-Colonel James Grant, Commanding an Expedition Against the Cherokee Indians, June-July, 1761," *Florida Historical Society Quarterly*, vol. 12 (1933), 26-31; Bull to Board of Trade, 17 July 1761, in Great Britain, *Records in the British Public Records Office Relating to South Carolina*, (Microfilm in the Henderson Library, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, Georgia); Hewatt, 454; Mails, 93-99; and Corkran, 212.

50. DeBrahm, 102-104; Timberlake, 89; and Williams, 245-255.