WHAT WOULD POCAHONTAS THINK NOW?
Women and Cultural Persistence

By Clara Sue Kidwell

In a classic case of sexual stereotyping, Joseph Gilfillan, an Episcopalian missionary, described the Chippewa Indians in Minnesota c. 1900—the tall, graceful male bounding through the forest, unburdened except for his bow and arrow, while behind him plodded the "short, stodgy, rotund" female, bearing a tremendous burden on her back, atop of which rode a small papoose. In Gilfillan's mind, the woman's stature was exemplar of her destiny since women over generations had been squashed down by burden bearing.1

Although feminists might deny this equation of anatomy and destiny, the fact is that the female reproductive function is a crucial factor in determining a woman's social role in tribal societies. Women bear children who carry on the culture of the group. They also gather wild foods and thus acquire status in the economic terms of contemporary society.2

Scholars may analyze the roles of Indian women in academic paradigms, but the women themselves are lost in the babble of theories. One way to recover their identity is to examine the origin stories of Indian tribes. Women are the creators of the world. Their lives carry the meaning of the great human cycle of life, death, and rebirth, an ongoing process that Christianity forces into a linear paradigm of individual sin, guilt, death, and redemption.

When Indian tribes first encountered European colonists, women played a major role in contact. The results of that contact, the spread of European diseases, the introduction of livestock, of alcohol, were the beginning of historical change in a linear sense for Indian tribes. In the southeast, the "Lady of Cofitachequi" greeted Hernando de Soto in 1540 in what is now the state of Georgia. She gave him her own string of pearls—as a sign of good will, as a sign of welcome, as a sign of appeasement, as a way of encouraging him to move on? There are no words from the lady herself about her motives and intentions.3

It is significant that it was a woman who represented her province. Matrilineal descent was common among Southeastern tribes. Although women generally influenced events indirectly rather than through public rule, they were powerful members of their societies.

The equation of femininity and power is best expressed in the story of the origin of corn among the Creeks in Oklahoma. A woman fed her family every day with a delicious food, but she would not reveal its source. One day her two sons decided to follow her as she went to get the food. They discovered that she was rubbing skin from
her body and shaping it into grains. Horrified, they confronted her and accused her of being a witch. She told them that since they had discovered her secret, they must kill her, drag her body around the ground, and then bury her. They did so, and the next Year they found corn growing from her grave and where her body had touched the earth. This story has layers of meaning. It connects birth and death, femininity and fecundity, land and women. Things must die so that other things might live. This theme of women dying to produce corn is widespread among agricultural tribes. It emphasizes the power of women and their place in their own societies.

While Indian and European men negotiated treaties, traded, and waged war, Indian women lived with European men, translated for them, and bore their children. They gave their consorts a special entree into their communities. They were the major mediators of cultural meaning between two worlds. As the roles of Indian men changed in response to changing subsistence patterns, the roles of women persisted, largely misinterpreted by European male observers. Their functions as child bearers and contributors to subsistence were not threatening to white society and were less affected than those of Indian men. In situations of contact, women often became the custodians of traditional cultural values.

A certain historical mythology has grown up around Indian women that often obscures those values. Instead, women’s actions are seen through the veil of European assumptions about women’s roles and motivations. Even today, in American history books, Pocahontas continues to lay down her body if not her life to save John Smith and assure the survival of the Jamestown colony. Sacagawea stands, pointing west, the leader of the Lewis and Clark expedition.

History has stereotyped Indian women as the hot-blooded Indian princess, à la Pocahontas, or the stolid drudge that Gilfillan described. Pocahontas and Sacagawea become heroines because their actions ultimately benefited the advancement of American society. Explicitly, their actions contributed to the loss of Indian land and destructive changes in Indian culture. Implicitly, however, their motives arose from their own cultural values. How, if at all, can we read their histories in their own terms?

Historians themselves have begun to question whether it is possible to understand the intentions of the author of any historical document, given that cultures change over time. The motivations of a seventeenth century European adventurer such as John Smith may be as difficult for a modern scholar to comprehend as the intentions of a young Algonquian girl of that same era.

Pocahontas, daughter of Powhatan, and John Smith become familiar figures to practically every school child in the country. Within the stereotype of Indian women, Pocahontas acts out of passion for the brave white hero, Smith. But what “really” happened? The story originates with Smith himself, in his General History, published in 1624. This account included many rather florid details of events that he had presented in much briefer and earlier books that he had published. He was taken captive after killing two members of Powhatan’s confederacy. He was brought before the chief, a great feast was held, and then he was forced to lay his head on a large rock where one of Powhatan’s men prepared to crush it with his club. Pocahontas at that point sprang forward, got Smith’s “head in her armes, and laid her owne upon his to save him from death.”
Why? Most readers would probably interpret her act as inspired by passion, the beautiful Indian maiden smitten with the bold white hero. Seeing the danger to his life, and having developed a crush on him, she must rescue him from her father’s vengeful action. Smith described her as a “girl child about twelve or thirteen years old,” and given the behavior of most American adolescents, the motive of passion would be understandable.

A second motive might have been compassion, although that is less likely. She came from a cultural tradition in which the torture of captives was common, indeed, expected. The captive had a chance to display the bravery expected of warriors, and members of the capturing tribe, men, women and children, participated in the torture.10

The most likely motive, considering the status and power of women among coastal Algonquian tribes, was that she was exercising a prerogative of women to choose captives for adoption into the tribe. As the daughter of a chief, a girl emerging into womanhood, in a highly public forum, Pocahontas probably used the occasion to demonstrate for the first time her power as a woman by “adopting” John Smith.11 Although the historical account usually ends with this dramatic rescue, and the relieved reader assumes that Pocahontas subsequently married Smith, the story must be read further. John Smith did not remain with the Powhatans but returned to Jamestown, and Pocahontas continued to visit the colony. An Englishman with a particularly vivid imagination described her as cartwheeling naked through the town square with the “ship’s boys.” Another account had her and a group of young women dancing before Smith, dressed only in paint and feathers. If her relations with the colony were cast in sexual terms, she also continued to bring food and supplies to the colonists, in defiance of her father’s edicts.12 John Smith, the object of her supposed passion, could not understand her motivation, questioning whether it was her father’s policy, the Christian God, or “her extraordinarie affection for our nation” (and perhaps, implicitly, for himself) that made her act as she did. If the adoption theory holds, then Pocahontas was carrying out her continuing obligation to the man she had made her own, and to his extended family, the Jamestown colonists.13

She did not, however, marry Smith. She was finally married to John Rolfe, an English tobacco planter, for reasons that can be read benignly as an encouragement of cultural melding through intermarriage, or more cynically as a form of hostage taking to assure Powhatan’s continued peaceful relationship with the English. Rolfe himself described the marriage as inspired love, not lust, as a properly restrained Englishman should do. Powhatan consented to the marriage, as an Indian father should do.14

Pocahontas and John Smith (who never married) encountered each other for the last time in England, where she was living with Rolfe as his wife. Their conversation shows their relationship not as one of passion, but of kinship. Pocahontas declared that she would consider herself Smith’s daughter now that she was in his land, as he had declared himself the son of Powhatan when he had entered her father’s land. In her land, she had power over his life because he was a stranger, and she took responsibility for him. In England, she was the stranger, and she must establish a kinship relation with Smith as a daughter. She thus offered her life to Smith’s care, as
she had taken care of him. She was the wife of a white man, and a woman whose life had changed rapidly in a very short time; but despite her marriage and contact with white society, she still viewed her relationship with Smith in very Indian terms, as one of kinship and responsibility. His responsibility, if indeed he ever accepted it, was short. Pocahontas died as she began a voyage back to Virginia, leaving behind her son by John Rolfe and an enduring myth of American history.\(^{15}\)

The story of Dona Marina, La Malinche, is more problematic in history because she actively aided Hernando Cortez in his conquest of the Aztec empire, and she bore him a son. Her acts take on a symbolic significance of female treachery; the mestizo population of Mexico descends, symbolically, from this first mixing of Indian and European blood. Malinche is mother to, and betrayer of, contemporary Mexico.

What were her motives? She was a woman who had been given away or sold into slavery by her own people in the province of Oluta. She passed into the hands of merchants in Xicalango, who in turn sold her to Tabascan people, who ultimately presented her to Cortez as a captive, one of twenty women they gave him along with other tribute as he marched toward the Aztec capitol of Tenochtitlan to subdue it.

La Malinche was evidently of high rank in Aztec society, but for whatever reasons, she became a form of property. She also had certain invaluable skills. She spoke Nahuatl, the language of the Aztecs, and also a dialect of Mayan, one that had also been learned by Jeronimo de Aguilar, a Spaniard who had been abandoned in the Yucatan by a previous exploring expedition. Aguilar spoke Mayan and Spanish, dona Marina spoke Mayan and Nahuatl, and in a triadic relationship, Marina communicated to Aguilar in Mayan, and he in turn spoke Spanish to Cortez.

Translating is one matter, but Dona Marina took a more active role in advising Cortez on how to deal with various communities that had come under the military domination of the Aztec empire. Their discontent led to alliances with Cortez that ultimately resulted in the fall of the Aztec empire. Marina informed Cortez of a plot against his life by the Cholulans. Did she indeed deliberately betray her people and contribute finally to the European conquest of the Indians of the New World?

Again, the story can be presented as that of a woman overcome by passion who betrays her own people for the sake of love. But obviously, human emotions aside, the story is much more complex as cultures come into contact. Marina had been sold as a slave, betrayed, in a sense, by her own people and alienated from them. She probably had no sense of place or loyalty to her captors. She had no innate loyalty to the Aztec empire since Moctezuma was perceived by his subjects as a cruel ruler. She obviously had reason to aid Cortez against Moctezuma.

Cortez used her in various ways, as translator, informer, mistress, and sexual pawn. He never married her himself but gave her in marriage successively to two of his subordinates, although she bore him a son during one of these marriages. She, in turn, can be seen as using Cortez to overthrow a harsh empire. As a woman alienated from her people through slavery, she had to act out of self-interest. She could not represent and uphold a social system that had cast her out. She did not betray her people as much as her people betrayed her.\(^{16}\)

Sacagawea stands as another mythic heroine in American history. She has been enshrined as the leader of westward expansion for the American nation. Her prowess
has become almost superhuman as she trudged along with the Lewis and Clark expedition, pointing the way, and, with an interesting reflection on Gilfillan’s stereotype, carrying her baby on her back.

The reality of her story is much less romantic than the myth. She was one of two (or perhaps three) Indian wives of Toussaint Charbonneau, a French voyageur who joined the Lewis and Clark expedition in Montana in 1805. Shoshone by birth, she had been captured by Minatarees in her youth, and Charbonneau acquired her and another woman from that tribe through purchase or barter. When she and Charbonneau joined the expedition, she carried their infant son on his cradleboard.

Contrary to popular opinion, she did not lead the expedition. She knew certain landmarks in the territory through which it passed, and she could sometimes tell Lewis and Clark what to expect ahead. To the Indian people that the expedition encountered, her presence was important. Since Indian tribes did not take women on war parties, she was a sign that the intentions of the expedition were peaceful.

One of her most important services was based not on knowledge but on her kinship with a band of the Shoshone that the expedition encountered. Her brother, Cameahwait, was their leader, and Sacagawea could interpret for Lewis and Clark. Recognizing his sister, Cameahwait and his people gave the expedition horses and led them part of the way over the mountains to the west.

Sacagawea was thus reunited briefly with her own people. Having traveled hundreds of miles through harsh terrain to familiar territory, she should have been joyfully reunited with long lost kin and lived happily ever after. But she didn’t. She went on with the expedition. Again, why?

Most of her relatives among the Shoshone had died. Forces of historical change were also changing the world that she might have known as a child. She had been torn from that world as a captive, and she had ultimately entered the white man’s world as the wife of one of them. She no longer had a place within the social structure of her own tribe, and indeed that structure was largely gone. If Charbonneau was an abusive husband, he and the expedition were now her life. She could not go back.

Although the story of Nancy Ward, Beloved Woman of the Cherokees, has not entered the mythology of American history, she was a crucial mediator between the Cherokee Indians of the Tennessee river valley and English colonists during the latter part of the eighteenth century. She fought beside her husband in a battle against the Creek Indians near the town of Taliwa in 1755, and when he was killed, she seized his rifle and continued the fight, and the Cherokees prevailed. Ward proved her bravery in a male-dominated world. It helped that she was connected by matrilineal family ties to important Cherokee leaders. She was grandniece of Old Hop, a respected elder, and niece of Attakullakulla, a skillful Cherokee diplomat and leader.

In recognition of her deeds, Nancy Ward was appointed to the major public office to which women could accede, Ghighau, or head Beloved Woman. The Cherokees, with their matrilineal kinship system, had institutionalized female leadership in the office of Ghighau, a status that paralleled that of the Beloved Men who served as councilors to village leaders.

The Cherokees divided their activities rather strictly along lines of war and peace, and that reflection was evident in the division of their towns into red and white, red
the towns of warriors, and white the towns of peace. When the nation was at war, as it often was against other tribes during the turbulent colonial period, leaders of red towns were transcendent. But the white towns, even during times of war, were sanctuaries where peace was inviolate.

Nancy Ward as Ghighau presided in the white town of Chota, and she was committed to preserving peaceful relations among the Cherokees, who were deeply divided over the nature of their relationships with and accommodation to white society. She exercised ceremonial and ritual powers and mediated relations between the Overhill Cherokees on the upper reaches of the Little Tennessee River, white settlers in the Watauga valley adjoining the river, and the British and later American governments.

Her second husband was an Irish trader, Brian Ward, and their daughter, Betsy, married Joseph Martin, the Virginia colony’s agent for Indian affairs. Their daughter Kate married Ellis Harlin, an English trader. Although Martin was the agent of a European government, he was drawn into the sphere of Cherokee matrilineal society as he married into a Cherokee family, and he found himself defending Cherokee land claims at the same time that he represented colonial interests. Harlan, recruited as an intelligence agent by the British, gave misleading information about Cherokee war intentions, and at Nancy Ward’s direction, he warned the white settlers in the Watauga valley of an impending Cherokee attack. Ward saved the life of one white captive from the Watauga settlement, Mrs. Lydia Bean, and she also informed the British commander Joseph Campbell about the plans of the hostile Chickamauga warriors against the white settlers in the Watauga valley.21

Nancy Ward, Beloved Woman and respected leader of the Cherokees, and her daughters brought white men into the Cherokee nation through their marriages, and she informed colonial officials about the intentions of Cherokee warriors. Did she thus betray her people? Although her activities led ultimately to the decline of Cherokee civilization as white men encroached on their territory, she acted according to the dictates of her society that she preserve peace. If her role as a Beloved Woman and councilor at a traditional Cherokee peace town committed her to preserving peace, that peace also involved mediating disputes and preventing conflicts with white society. She could not by the very nature of her role act out of hostility to European settlers in Cherokee territory. If she warned white settlers of impending Cherokee attacks, it may have been toward the end that they would seek refuge in Chota. If she informed British military agents of the warring intentions of Cherokee men, it may also have been to exert pressure on the Cherokee warriors to halt their aggression. However we read her intentions toward whites and Cherokees, to the end of her life she spoke eloquently to her male kinsmen and to Americans to resist proposed cessions of Cherokee land to the United States government. She sought to preserve what was most important to Cherokee identity, the land and the sacred geography that informed its values of war and peace.22

Not all Indian tribes have such dramatic examples of female leadership as Nancy Ward. There are, however, more subtle ways of reading cultural change and women’s roles therein. The Choctaw tribe in Mississippi is an example of the complexity of cultural identity and cultural change.
Hernando de Soto’s encounter with the Lady of Cofitachique was only one incident in the invasion of the American southeast. Pigs escaped from the expedition and ran (and sometimes overran) the forests. More important in the short term, diseases carried by European animals or Europeans themselves probably caused widespread devastation in southeastern Indian communities. From the late 1700s, white settlers were moving into Choctaw territory, bringing with them new ideas and new ways of doing things. Some, like Louis LeFlore, a French trader who established a post in Choctaw territory, represented the vestiges of French colonial influence in Choctaw territory. He married two Choctaw wives, nieces of a leading chief. Others, like Nathaniel Folsom, came from the backwoods of North Carolina across the Tombigbee river (the major geographical boundary between the Choctaws and the neighboring Creeks) and married two cousins of another chief.23

Once again, women provided a cultural entree for white men into an Indian society. By the early nineteenth century, the Choctaws had already begun to experience change as Leflore and other white men introduced livestock and as Choctaw women began to spin and weave domesticated cotton into cloth. White men married to Choctaw women were traders, and they based their livelihood on contact with white society. But their mixed blood offspring still spoke Choctaw. They considered themselves as part of the nation (a cultural ideal), albeit their notion was more informed by American concepts of representative government, and they saw their role as one of preserving Choctaw autonomy (another cultural ideal), although preservation of the nation would also enable them to preserve their own individual land holdings (an American legalistic ideal).

The history of the Choctaws in Mississippi in the eighteenth century is one of rapid change—livestock began to replace deer, cloth replaced deerskins, and Christian missionaries introduced schools and religion in parts of the nation. The leaders of the tribe were increasingly mixed-bloods, the men whose mothers were Choctaws and whose fathers were white, who spoke the Choctaw language but could well understand English, inspired ideas and motivations. One of their acts was to adopt a code of laws that began to enshrine elements of patrilineal inheritance of property, an idea at odds with traditional Choctaw matrilineal descent patterns.

The United States government, in the meantime, began a major legal offensive against the Indian tribes east of the Mississippi River, and in 1830 Congress passed the Indian Removal Act, which provided that the government would trade Indian lands east of the Mississippi River for lands west of the river where Indians could continue to hunt and live in their traditional ways.

The Indian Removal Act had major repercussions for the Choctaws. About 15,000 tribal members moved west. But about 5,000 remained behind, held by the promise that they would be able to have land and keep their homes and fields. In the west, the nation’s government operated under a system of laws that had been enacted in 1826. It began to impose American concepts of division of property on the Choctaws. A man’s property passed to his widow and children upon his death, a change from the traditional Choctaw custom of destruction of personal property upon death and passage of rights of land use and habitation through the female line.24
Customs diverged between the western Choctaws and those who remained behind in Mississippi. The former had land which they increasingly regulated according to American legal principles. The latter were landless, stripped of their tribal identity by provisions in the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, and stripped of the individual land rights guaranteed by that treaty through a series of legal actions by the United States government and the greed of white land speculators. Many, like Okshowenah, an old, infirm widow, were forced from their homes when white men moved in to build cabins on their lands.25

The Mississippi Choctaws congregated finally in areas where there was little white settlement, usually on small creeks or rivers. Without land, they maintained their identity through their language and the informal communities that they could organize on lands not claimed by others. They also maintained the traditional Choctaw kinship system of descent through the mother’s line while the kinship terminology of the western Choctaws shifted to a patrilineal system.

Basic Choctaw kinship termed men as fathers, brothers or sons. Women were sisters or aunts. Traditional terminology grouped the father’s sisters and their female offspring through all generations together under the term aunts, or as one missionary described it, they counted “aunts in a row.” This terminology created a collectivity of female relations.26 The terminology in the western nation began to group male relatives in the father’s line together in a single term (one might say “uncles in a row”). If language is one of the most significant markers of identity, this shift of linguistic emphasis from matrilineal grouping in Mississippi to patrilineal groupings in what is now Oklahoma is indicative of a significant change in family relationships. Kinship terminology is more than an esoteric exercise of linguistics. What people say to each other has real and immediate impact on the way they treat each other. Kinship terms set up certain expectations of mutual obligation and responsibility. These ideas, embedded in language, are then an integral part of the structure of behavior in society.

As we began with the importance of women in origin traditions because of their association with the earth, so we must end on an ironic note. The Choctaws in Mississippi told of their origins in Naniy Waiya, the sacred mound in what is now northeastern Mississippi. They had a spiritual sanction to occupy their homeland. Even as White men entered Choctaw lands, established their trading posts, and fathered mixed-blood children by Choctaw wives, the majority of the nation still spoke the Choctaw language, with its kinship terms that designated the mutual obligation and responsibility that structured the society. That language emphasized the female line of relatives, and the special obligations and respect that they had for women.27

As the Choctaws encountered white men and began to adapt to their customs, their leaders had to accept the American idea of private property and responsibility in the form of legally binding treaties. As they did so, even their language changed to reflect the predominance of men in their social structure. In Mississippi, where the Choctaws lost their land, they maintained through most of the nineteenth century a matrilineal kinship system emphasizing responsibility toward property and community in a much different way than did their white neighbors.
Does land define the identity of a group of people, or do they define themselves through the land? The Choctaws who moved west of the Mississippi changed their system of government and subsequently their kinship terminology to emphasize male control. Those who remained in Mississippi lost their land, but their language and what small enclaves of land they could occupy were the source of their identity. Community persisted, even as land was lost, and for a time, women’s roles in those communities were recognized in the very fabric of their language, while to the west, changing language patterns reflected profound changes with respect to land.

Through changes in subsistence patterns and legal relationships with the United States government, the western Choctaws began to adopt American ideals of government and land. Those ideals were based on American concepts of individualism, the idealized yeoman farmer of Jeffersonian democracy. For many Choctaws, particularly the mixed-blood element, their relationship to the land shifted from one based on spiritual associations to one based on American legal principles. For the Mississippi Choctaws, deprived of their land, they maintained their culture through community and language, and if they did not have legal rights to land in the western sense, they lived within the boundaries of the homeland that they had always known.

The Choctaw association with their homeland shifted and changed over time. Land began to take on new meanings and associations as Choctaws signed treaties with the United States government. For those in the west, property and laws of inheritance were marked by a shift in language from a female oriented kinship system to male oriented one. For those in the east, who lost their land, a matrilineal kinship system persisted, showing that communities could preserve their senses of relationship to each other, and that that sense could preserve culture even when land was lost.

The language of cultural identity shifts over time. Women have played, and continue to play, many roles in their own communities. They continue to identify themselves in relation to their own communities. Wilma Mankiller, elected principal chief of the Cherokees in Oklahoma, leads the tribal council in making decisions concerning the whole tribe, decisions that now include economic policies that affect tribal land and tribal communities. They move beyond their communities to establish a national identity. Ada Deer, a member of the Menominee tribe, is Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior for Indian Affairs. Louise Erdrich has won the National Book Critics Circle Award (and numerous others) for her novel *Love Medicine*.

The accomplishments of Indian women in contemporary society have moved the impetus of Pocahontas forward into the modern world. They continue to exercise the same kind of power that she did in a kind of continuity of cultural identity. The fora within which they exercise that power differs, but the sources of identity in Indian communities persist—the leader, the spokesperson, the storyteller. These are women’s roles, and they are still honored in Indian communities today.
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