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FIGURE 1: TIMELINE OF THE LIVES OF TECUMSEH & TENSKWATAWA

1768: Tecumseh born in village called Piqua, in present day Clark County, Indiana, just south of Springfield. Shawnee and Miami lived together there. Born to Puckecheno (or Pukeshinwa) a prominent war chief in the Kispoko clan of Shawnee, the clan war chiefs typically came from, and his wife Methoataske who was either part Creek or had lived among the Creek people.¹

1774: Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa’s father dies in Lord Dunmore’s War as the Shawnee and other Indigenous peoples battled the Colony of Virginia.² Laulewasikaw (or Lalawethica, later known as Tenskwatawa) born this same year. Methoataske leaves Piqua, leaving Tecumseh, Tenskwatawa, and four other children in the care of their older sister Tecumpease, who was married.³ Tecumseh subsequently raised by older brother Cheeseekau along with Tecumpease.⁴

1786: Tecumseh’s first combat, alongside brother Cheeseekau, against American settlers.

1787/88: Tecumseh and other Shawnee attack American flatboats on Ohio River as they descended down the river toward Marysville, Ohio.⁵

1792: Tecumseh and party of Shawnee attacked by American settlers in December and March.⁶

1794/95: First time Tecumseh noted leading a Shawnee war party against American settlers and begins to consider himself a chief or leader.⁷

³ Drake, Life of Tecumseh. 918.
⁴ Ibid. 930.
⁵ Ibid. 983-1036.
⁶ Ibid. 1120, 1140.
1799: Council between Indigenous people and American settlers on the Mad River, regarding conflicts and tensions. Tecumseh noted as the council’s “most conspicuous orator.”

1805: Laulewasikaw has his vision and gains standing as a prophet. Following this and other visions he changes his name to Tenskwatawa, meaning “The Open Door”.

1806: Indigenous people from different tribes come to visit Tenskwatawa at his village in Greenville, Ohio, and many become his followers. Tecumseh present too, but unclear if he had a meaningful role.

April 1807: Tenskwatawa gathers estimated 400 followers to his town at Greenville, Ohio. In response, Americans hold two councils in the same month with the Shawnee to understand if their motives for gathering were peaceful or violent. Tecumseh made a speech where he rejected both treaties that would sell further lands and the establishment of geographic boundaries by the Americans that Indigenous people were forbidden to cross.

May 1807: At least 1,500 Indigenous people travel from around the Great Lakes region to visit Tenskwatawa in Greenville.

August 1807: Indigenous followers of Tenskwatawa at Greenville now number 800. Includes Shawnee, Potawatomie, and Chippewa (Ojibway). Council also held with Americans where Tecumseh details the views of both Tenskwatawa and himself, and states that he seeks to remain at peace with the Americans.

---

8 Ibid. 1151-61.
10 Ibid. 1255-66.
11 Ibid. 1266
12 Ibid. 1276-87.
13 Ibid. 1297.
14 Ibid. 1297-1307.
15 Ibid. 1370-81.
**September 12, 1807:** Council between Shawnee, Potawatomie, and Chippewa held with governor of Ohio. In a speech, Tecumseh reviewed the treaties that had been made with various peoples in the Northwest Territory and declared them all null and void. While he opposed these treaties, he also expressed a desire to remain at peace with the Americans.16

**Winter 1808:** Tecumseh visits Mississinaway peoples. They agree to join him and Tenskwatawa by June.17

**Spring 1808:** Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa move their village to the Tippecanoe River, at the invitation of the Potawatomie and Kickapoo.18

**Autumn 1808:** Tecumseh engaged in visiting 110 neighboring Indigenous peoples, seeking to gain some unity with them and Tenskwatawa’s teachings.19

**1809:** First time noted that Tecumseh visited some Indigenous peoples and was unsuccessful in swaying them to Tenskwatawa’s cause. These were Wyandotte and Seneca in the Sandusky, Ohio region. Tecumseh went on to visit the Cherokee and Creek to the south.20

**July 1810:** Indian Agent John Johnston meets with Shawnee chiefs near Wapakoneta, Ohio. They stated that they would not ally with Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa and would remain at peace with the Americans.21

**August 1810:** Tecumseh meets with Indiana Governor William Henry Harrison. Tecumseh reasserts his position that the Treaty of Fort Wayne was unlawful, and that the boundary of Indigenous lands should stand as it did in the Treaty of Greenville. Wyandotte, Potawatomie, Ottawa, and Winnebago leaders all stated that they were allied with Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa.22

---

16 Ibid. 1349.
17 Ibid. 1453.
18 Ibid. 1463.
19 Ibid. 1525.
20 Ibid. 1525-35.
21 Ibid. 1607.
22 Ibid. 1743-1806.
Tecumseh notes that he would prefer to ally with the United States in an impending war with Great Britain, but only if the Americans would not make another Indigenous treaty without the agreement of all Indigenous peoples. Otherwise, he would have to unite with England.  

**Summer 1811:** Tecumseh travels south to Creek towns to get them to ally with him and his brother.  

**November 7, 1811:** Battle of Tippecanoe. Indigenous forces under Tenskwatawa’s leadership clash with American forces while Tecumseh away. American forces burn houses, building, and food stores of the town.  

**June 1812:** Tecumseh formally allies with the British at Fort Malden in present-day Amherstberg, Ontario. On June 18, 1812 United States declares war on Great Britain in Canada, and Tecumseh leads Indigenous forces in their first actions against the Americans following war declaration.  

**August 1812:** Tecumseh and Indigenous forces allied with British fight American forces near the River Raisin near Brownstown, MI, and at the capture of Detroit by the British on August 16th.  

**April/May 1813:** Tecumseh and Indigenous forces lay siege to American Fort Meigs (in present day Perrysburg, OH), along with British and Canadian forces. British and Indigenous forces unsuccessful in taking fort.  

**September 18, 1813:** Tecumseh makes speech to British General Henry Proctor recounting promises made and broken to Indigenous forces from the Seven Year’s War to the American Revolution. He questions if the same thing is happening at that moment as British pack up to move further east into Canada. Instead, he urges them to stay and fight the Americans. Proctor and the
British forces ignore him. Following this speech, many Indigenous forces fall away and greatly reduce the numbers of Tecumseh’s warriors.29

**October 5, 1813:** Tecumseh dies at the Battle of the Thames (near modern Thamesville, ON), battle between American forces and a combination of British regulars and Indigenous warriors.30 Tenskwatawa flees on horseback.31

**Spring 1814:** Tenskwatawa asserts that he is now the leader of Indigenous alliance he and Tecumseh built, stationed near present day Dundas, ON. Initially recognized for this by British, but his claims don’t create unity or draw in additional forces.32

**1824:** In winter or spring, Tenskwatawa interviewed by C.C. Trowbridge, while residing in Upper Canada, with Trowbridge recording Tenskwatawa’s understanding of Shawnee religion and culture.33 In summer, Governor of Michigan Territory Lewis Cass invites Tenskwatawa back to Ohio to help persuade the Shawnee to sell their Ohio lands, and be moved to a reservation west of the Mississippi River.34

**1826:** Tenskwatawa, Shawnee, and some Delaware removed from lands in Ohio to Kansas.35

**1832:** George Caitlin paints portrait of Tenskwatawa, along with a number of other Shawnee.36

**November 1836:** Tenskwatawa dies of old age in Kansas.37

---

29 Ibid. 2679-721.
30 Ibid. 2815.
35 Ibid. 2777.
36 Ibid. 2938.
37 Ibid. 2961.
INTRODUCTION

Tecumseh. It is a name that still stirs thoughts and images across peoples and across North America. While there were a host of Indigenous leaders who participated in the War of 1812, Tecumseh often gets a prominent mention in American elementary school history books and continues to hold a place in general American memory. This is usually in association with the Battle of Tippecanoe in 1811. This battle is commonly used to illustrate the end of his efforts to create a pan-Indigenous confederacy. The loss of this battle is often placed on his brother Tenskwatawa, The Prophet, who sought to take matters into his own hands while Tecumseh was away attempting to gather additional allies. Again, according to the familiar schoolbook story, the battle met with disastrous results. Tenskwatawa and his forces were defeated, and Tecumseh’s dream of creating a pan-Indigenous confederacy ended.\(^{38}\)

Many elements of this story are wrong. The battle was not a rout. While Tecumseh was indeed gone, Indigenous forces were not surprised when they were attacked by General William Henry Harrison and his American forces. They also gave nearly as good as they got. It is estimated that Tenskwatawa’s forces numbered between five hundred to seven hundred, opposing roughly one thousand American troops. In the end, though, losses on both sides numbered in the sixties. While the battle was a setback for Tenskwatawa, it was not the end to his leadership, nor was it the end to Tecumseh’s alliance building. Though the Americans had destroyed their homes and burned their crops, Indigenous forces relocated within a year.\(^ {39}\)

The textbook story of the Battle of Tippecanoe and its misinformation is emblematic of the often-noted juxtaposition between Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa. In the year of Tecumseh’s death


in 1813 at the Battle of the Thames near modern Thamesville in Ontario, Canada, the Ohio newspaper, the *Dayton Republican*, called him “perhaps the greatest Indian general that ever lifted a tomahawk.”40 In 1820 the *Indiana Sentinel* echoed these sentiments noting “every schoolboy in the Union now knows that Tecumseh was a great man…As a statesman, a warrior, and a patriot, take him all in all, we shall not look upon his like again.”41 This legacy continues to echo down to the present.42 However, there could be no Tecumseh without his brother Tenskwatawa. It was Tenskwatawa who first had a religious awakening that birthed a spiritual movement. This movement, in turn, attracted Indigenous people from across the Old Northwest and the Ohio valley.43 It was Tenskwatawa, who was the first leader of this pan-Indigenous group of followers. Tecumseh’s leadership would not emerge until nearly six years later.44 Tecumseh would die in battle at the height of his fame, while Tenskwatawa would die of old age in obscurity.45 In the many works on Tecumseh, Tenskwatawa’s story can easily be found. However, he is nearly always portrayed as less important and easily forgotten. He is noted as a man who was a braggart and an alcoholic, a duplicitous person who vied for power.46

This piece seeks to answer two fundamental questions: Are Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa remembered differently because they were dissimilar? Why does Tecumseh’s legacy endure among Americans, Canadians, and Indigenous people (and by extension Tenskwatawa’s) when so many other Indigenous leaders in North America have been forgotten? This work argues that the

41Sayre, *Indian Chief as Tragic Hero*, 1.
differences that are often portrayed between Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa are false ones. It seeks to demonstrate that Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa only seem different when viewed out of context – through a colonialisit lens, whether by Americans or British/Canadians. When they are viewed in context, that is, from an Indigenous perspective, they are far more the same than different. This is particularly true when looking at their lives in the nineteenth century.

Their enduring legacy can be attributed to at least two factors: first, the lives of the two brothers intersected with formative periods and individuals in the early nineteenth century in nation-building projects in the United States and Canada. Elements and individuals from that time continue to be commemorated today, both in the United States and Canada. In Canada, this includes the War of 1812 and a massive monument to General Isaac Brock in Queenston, Ontario. In the United States, this includes the Star-Spangled Banner and the images of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson on American currency. Ideas, policies, and laws that intersected with the lives of the two brothers continue to have a bearing on the present as well, particularly in regard to Indigenous-settler relations in both countries. This is particularly true of three specific themes that are explored within the subsequent chapters: 1) the idea of the noble versus wild savage 2) the Doctrine of Discovery and its American permutation as the concept of Manifest Destiny, and 3) the conflict between Indigenous and non-Indigenous lifeways and land ownership based on different methods of crop farming and animal protein procurement. Secondly, Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa’s legacies continue to represent the ongoing conflict between Indigenous peoples and those of Western European heritage. This is true in both Canada and the United States. The

---

brothers' legacies in both nations also represent the conflict that Indigenous people have with each nation’s federal governments between survival and extinction of both peoples and cultures and recent efforts over the past fifty years by national governments of both countries to rectify that conflicted relationship.

The brothers’ lifetimes from the late eighteenth century to the early nineteenth (1775-1836 for Tenskwatawa) and the War of 1812 also coincided with a significant turning point for Indigenous peoples in North America. This period represented both a change in relations between Indigenous peoples and colonial powers, and one phase of a much longer process of Indigenous-colonial associations that stretched back to the fifteenth century and continues into the present. The war signified the last time Indigenous peoples would be enlisted as part of a fighting force as various colonial powers fought for dominance of the continent. The war indicated the end of their autonomous or semi-autonomous roles as trade partners and military allies. It ushered in treaty relationships that led to removals, reservations, and reserves in both countries.48 The two brothers’ interactions with officials of the United States government and the British Crown represent microcosmic points in a much larger Indigenous-colonialist struggle. It includes how people of Western European heritage viewed, and still view, Indigenous people in relation to themselves and

---

their desires to settle North America. It also includes how Indigenous people have struggled, and still do, to maintain both traditional ways and some degree of autonomy under governments derived from such Western European constructs. This work highlights the perceptions by non-Indigenous people of Indigenous peoples in four specific periods in both countries. First, the years leading up to, and including, the War of 1812, particularly 1783 to 1815. Second, 1830 to 1860 when the majority of early works on Tecumseh were written and the intersections of such writings with the foundational novels of the United States and Canada took place. Third, 1960 to 1980 when many of the ideals that Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa fought for were reflected in Indigenous Civil Rights movements in both Canada and the United States. Fourth, 1970 to the present as the governments of both the United States and Canada have made efforts to reconcile their positions with Indigenous peoples.

There have been mainly three ways that other authors have studied the distinction between Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa. This could be analogized to one observing a lunar eclipse in the phases where the moon partially covers the sun. One could focus on the sun, the moon, or the eclipse’s shadow as it falls on something else. The Tecumseh bookshelf, the focus on the sun, is long - stretching easily to fifty works. Many of these works are covered in greater depth in the first chapter. A few are highlighted here. A consistent theme of these pieces is Tecumseh outshining his younger brother Tenskwatawa. This theme began with the first biography on both brothers, Benjamin Drake’s *Life of Tecumseh and His Brother the Prophet; With a Historical Sketch of the*

---

49 This Western European influence can be traced back to early settlements in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, predominantly by the English and French as well as the Dutch and Swedes. Spanish settlements were also established in the sixteenth century, particularly in the Southwest and along the Caribbean border. Russian settlements were similarly made in the seventeenth century, but these were confined to a narrow band along present day Canada’s western coast, Alaska, and the present states of Oregon and Washington. There is little indication that Spanish influence had much bearing on the lives and outlooks of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, and there is no evidence that they had interaction with Russian settlements. The Western European heritage mentioned here is primarily that of the English and French. Dickason, *Canada’s First Nations*, 98-112.
Shawnee Indians (1831). Drake also does a good job of including details on the life of Tenskwatawa, though Tenskwatawa is present in all such Tecumseh biographies. However, it is still Tecumseh’s legacy that wins out, as illustrated in Drake’s assessment of Tenskwatawa’s standing following the Battle of Tippecanooe:

With the battle of Tippecanooe, the Prophet lost his popularity and power among the Indians. His magic wand was broken, and the mysterious charm by means of which he had for year, played upon the superstitious minds of this wild people, scatter through a vast extent of country, was dissipated forever. It was not alone to the character of his prophetic office that he was indebted for his influence on his followers. The position which he maintained in regard to the Indian lands, and the encroachments of the white people upon their hunting grounds, increased his popularity, which was likewise greatly strengthened by the respect and deference with which the politic Tecumseh – the master spirit of his day – uniformly treated him. He had, moreover, nimble wit, quickness, of apprehension, much cunning and a captivating eloquence of speech. These qualities fitted him for playing his part with great success; and sustaining for a series of years, the character of one inspired by the Great Spirit. He was, however, rash, presumptuous, and deficient in judgment. And no sooner was he left without the sagacious counsel and positive control of Tecumseh, than he foolishly annihilated his own power, and suddenly crashed the grand confederacy upon which he and his brother had expended years of labor…

Allan Eckert’s The Frontiersmen (1967) is written by the author as a work of history but has been called into question by recent Tecumseh biographers, particularly John Sugden. A story of the conflict between settlers and Indigenous people, a theme this paper will explore later, Tecumseh is a central figure. Eckert notes, “Tecumseh and his younger brother, Loawluaysica [A variation of the name Lalawethika, Tenskwatawa’s original name before he changed it when he began prophesying], were almost exact opposites in virtually every respect…Tecumseh could, with ease, best anyone his age or up to three years older in virtually anything; but Loawluaysica was hard put to hold his own…” Recent authors made similar pronouncements. R. David Edmunds, a unique authority on Tecumseh and the Shawnee as will be explored later, noted at the close of his

51 Drake, Life of Tecumseh, 2189-99.
52 Sugden, Tecumseh, 399.
53 Eckert, The Frontiersmen. 250-51.; Edmunds, Shawnee Prophet, 489. Lalawethica meant “Rattle” or “Noise Maker” while Tenskwatawa meant “The Open Door” signifying the doorway to a new and better way of life that his prophecies held for the Shawnee and others.
Tecumseh and the Quest for Indian Leadership (1984), “Tecumseh emerged as the ‘bravest of the brave,’ the ‘Greatest Indian’…”54 Bil Gilbert’s God Gave Us This Country: Tekamthi and the First American Civil War (1989) gives some equal weight to Tenskwatawa and Tekamthi, as he calls him, seeking to stay true to Shawnee pronunciation. However, he sees the two as separate – Tenskwatawa as the spiritual leader and Tecumseh as political and war leader, and makes no mention of Tenskwatawa at all in his final chapter on Tecumseh’s legacy.55 Even John Sugden’s Tecumseh: A Life (1988), which bills itself as the authoritative Tecumseh biography, draws similar conclusions in its closing pages: “Tecumseh has been idealized and his faults forgotten…For when we consider Tecumseh, and his forlorn and desperate attempt to rescue his people against what we would regard as impossible odds, we are reminded of qualities without which men and women would be infinitely the poorer: the essential nobility of self-sacrifice, and the occasional triumph, in moments of great adversity, of the human spirit.”56

By comparison, the number of works on Tenskwatawa, the moon in this analogy, is much shorter. The argument of their authors could be summed up as follows: Tenskwatawa was as crucial to Shawnee pan-Indigenous efforts as his brother and was more often a topic of concern to American government agents than Tecumseh, particularly in the time between his prophetic revelations in 1805 through the Treaty of Fort Wayne in 1809.57 This is especially true as

54 Edmunds, Tecumseh and the Quest, 208.
55 Gilbert, God Gave Us This Country, 220-21, 325-41.
56 Sugden, Tecumseh, 2, 401.
57 Edmunds, The Shawnee Prophet, 48-57. Edmunds notes in reading a trove of primary source documents on the Potawatomi and their experiences with both Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, “Although the movement obviously began in 1805, documents from this period make almost no mention of Tecumseh. He does not emerge as an important leader until 1810, following the loss of Indian lands at the Treaty of Fort Wayne. In contrast primary materials from these early years indicate that Tecumseh’s brother…was the leading figure in the Indians’ efforts to resist the Americans.” Similarly, at Indiana University Bloomington Archives: Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archeology: Great Lakes and Ohio Valley Ethnohistory Collection (hereafter cited as GAB-GLOVE) Box 8025, in a period between 1809 and 1811, it is not until the fifth folder, in 1811, that Tecumseh is mentioned by name. All other letters between prominent Americans of the time, particularly correspondence with United States Secretary of
evidenced by early primary sources in the correspondence of then Governor of Indiana William Henry Harrison between 1805 and 1809, and the Lyman Draper Manuscripts held at the Wisconsin Historical Society. Among other things, the Draper Manuscripts include the field notes and interviews that Benjamin Drake used to compose his biography on Tecumseh.\textsuperscript{58} Following the coverage that Tenskwatawa received in Drake’s work, little was written of a biographical nature about him until the mid-twentieth century. In 1973 Herbert Goltz wrote a doctoral thesis at the University of Western Ontario, “Tecumseh, The Prophet and the Rise of the Northwest Indian Confederation.” While never published, this thesis has been a highly valuable source for subsequent scholars writing on Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa. In the opening pages, Goltz laid out his aims directly:

While the story of Tecumseh, the Prophet and their movement has often been told, existing versions are replete with apocryphal material and fabrication. The Prophet is eclipsed by Tecumseh contrary to documentary evidence. This dissertation returns to the story as found in Canadian, American, and British primary sources, attempts to put the Prophet in his rightful place and to strip away the encrusted apocrypha of eight generations.\textsuperscript{59}

Goltz was mostly successful in his aims by citing primary sources like Harrison, Drake, Draper Manuscripts, and others in determining that Tenskwatawa was the primary concern of Americans between 1805 and 1809.\textsuperscript{60} Goltz’s work was followed by R. David Edmunds biography, \textit{The Shawnee Prophet} (1983). It is interesting to note that Edmund’s Tenskwatawa biography preceded his biography on Tecumseh by one year. Edmunds alone holds the distinction of having written book-length biographies on both brothers. Edmunds’ research questions included, “Was Tenskwatawa really responsible for beginning the [pan-Indigenous] movement and did he

\textsuperscript{58} Sugden, \textit{Tecumseh}, 406.

\textsuperscript{59} Herbert Charles Walter Goltz, “Tecumseh, the Prophet and the Rise of the Northwest Indian Confederation.” (Ph.D., The University of Western Ontario (Canada), 1973). 6.

dominate it during the early years?...If Tenskwatawa was the dominant leader in the formation of the movement, why have historians minimized his role? And, finally, if the Prophet was responsible for starting the movement, why have historians portrayed Tecumseh as the most important Indian leader in the decade prior to the War of 1812?""\(^{61}\) Although Edmunds successfully demonstrates that Tenskwatawa was indeed the one that spawned a pan-Indigenous movement, it is something of an apologetic biography. Edmunds often portrays Tenskwatawa as less than his older brother or Tecumseh as using his younger sibling’s religious teachings as a platform for his own political and military aims. This is illustrated by statements by the author, including, “There is no evidence to suggest he [Tenskwatawa] ever possessed enough skill as a hunter to provide for either himself or his family”\(^ {62}\) and “And so Tecumseh used the religious movement of his brother as the basis for his attempts to forge a political and military confederacy among the western tribes.”\(^ {63}\) Toward the close of the work, he dismisses The Prophet with the following, “If Tenskwatawa had not emerged, it is probable that another religious leader eventually would have stepped forward to champion the Indian’s cause.”\(^ {64}\)

The most recent biography of Tenskwatawa is Adam Jortner’s *The Gods of Prophetstown: The Battle of Tippecanoe and the Holy War for the American Frontier* (2012). In this work, Jortner pits Tenskwatawa against William Henry Harrison using their competing religions as a backdrop. Jortner sets Tenskwatawa’s Indigenous beliefs in opposition to Harrison’s brand of Christianity, a Christianity that preached that Divine Providence would allow Americans to spread across the continent. Jortner’s argument then is that the War of 1812 represented a war of religious ideals.\(^ {65}\)

\(^{62}\) Ibid. 528.
\(^{63}\) Ibid. 1500.
\(^{64}\) Ibid. 2966.
Continuing with the eclipse analogy, the third way that Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa have been studied is through indirect focus. These pieces do not make either brother their central topic but make mention them numerous times either throughout their works or in specific chapters. These works help to illustrate the contexts in which the two brothers lived. These books are relatively recent and tend to be authored by non-Indigenous scholars. These works do seek to shed light on how Indigenous people lived and how they made meaning of their lives.

Research in this area of indirect focus has required broad archival examination, reading against the grain, and employing tools and research from other disciplines, including archeology, anthropology, and environmental history. The first of these works to study Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa indirectly is Richard White’s once celebrated *The Middle Ground* (1991). White tells a story that roughly coincides with the Fur Trade in the United States (1650 – 1815) and describes how Europeans and Indigenous people met one another and initially found the other very different. However, together, both parties created a “mutually comprehensible world” in the Great Lakes region. This enabled trade to take place and common meanings to be understood, though this world and its meanings eventually broke down during and just after the War of 1812.66

Through this work, White also emphasized that Indigenous people were modern, in the sense that they made adaptations to adjust to a changing social environment. This challenged much older European notions of Indigenous people trapped in a type of pre-historic stasis.67 Following White’s work was Gregory Evans Dowd’s *A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity 1745-1815* (1992). Like White, Dowd sought to explore the phenomenon of how Indigenous people in what is now the United States east of the Mississippi River dealt with pressures of

---


67 Ibid. 264.
colonialism, including increased encroachment by settlers, decreases in the numbers of game animals, issues of alcoholism, and losses of tribal or village political power. To these Indigenous peoples, the answer was the rise of a string of prophets who called for changes in practices and created the idea of a pan-Indigenous identity.\textsuperscript{68} Tenskwatawa, then, is one of many prophets that fell at the end of this period.

Contributions by Stephen Warren round out these pieces that examine Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa indirectly. His \textit{The Shawnees and Their Neighbors 1795-1870} (2005) and \textit{The Worlds the Shawnees Made: Migration and Violence in Early America} (2014) are in some ways anti-Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa biographies. Warren seeks to demonstrate that a holistic Shawnee history, aside from only the exploits of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, is also essential. In \textit{The Shawnees and Their Neighbors}, Warren specifically notes, “Most historians of the Shawnee and their neighbors have focused the majority of their attention on small numbers of militant resisters such as Tecumseh and his compatriots farther west. In contrast, I argue that multiple approaches to American expansion characterized this period in Shawnee and Algonquian history.”\textsuperscript{69} \textit{The Oklahoma Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma: Resilience through Adversity} (2017) continues in this vein. Though edited, not authored, by Warren, it contains a rich collection of accounts of Shawnee history authored by Shawnee people themselves. These accounts shed new light on different aspects of Shawnee history, including the very way in which the Shawnee conceive such a history.\textsuperscript{70}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{68} Gregory Evans Dowd, \textit{A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745-1815} (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), xiii.
\item \textsuperscript{69} Warren, \textit{The Shawnees and Their Neighbors}, 7.
\end{itemize}
Returning once again to the eclipse analogy, the issue with Tecumseh or Tenskwatawa biographies is that they tend to pit the brothers’ legacies against one another as a binary choice in terms of who deserves more credit for what. It does not discuss them as a set. Nevertheless, first and foremost, these two were brothers who grew up in the same household and interacted with the same people. Of the prophets and prophet-war leader duos that rose between 1737 and 1838, only these two had a sibling connection. These works that examine Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa indirectly help to make the case for the ways in which they were more the same than different.

When considered in their Shawnee context, the brothers were both nativists, in opposition to Indigenous accommodationists. Dowd advances this dichotomy. By nativist, he means Indigenous people that opposed American settler ways of thinking and living. In contrast, accommodationists saw American ways of thought and action as the key to survival and prosperity. Evidence of this is demonstrated in the third chapter of this work. At the same time, this thesis is not the first to discuss the similarities between the two brothers, though it is the longest and covers the most depth. Two essays have made the same argument, albeit to meet specific ends. These are Gregory Evans Dowd’s “Thinking and Believing: Nativism and Unity in the Age of Pontiac and Tecumseh” (1992), and Alfred A. Cave’s “The Shawnee Prophet: Tecumseh and Tippecanoe: A Case Study of Historical Myth-Making” (2002), Dowd challenges the wedge that others have drawn between Tenskwatawa as the religious leader versus Tecumseh as the political head. Cave challenges the notion, as noted at the opening of this work that the Battle of Tippecanoe was the end of Tenskwatawa’s influence.

73 Ibid. xvii-xviii.
A work such as this thesis that seeks to delve into the creation of legacies also raises themes common to a much broader swath of writings on Indigenous history. First, to discuss a history of Indigenous-settler relations is to discuss a history of conflict. This conflict did not always result in a bloody battle. Sometimes it was a conflict of words or a grudge that was held. The most extreme aspects of this conflict are picked up through works like Ned Blackhawk’s *Violence Over the Land* or Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz’ *An Indigenous People’s History of the United States.* Conflict could also result from a matter of misunderstanding. This leads to the second broad theme. A discussion of how Indigenous people are considered or remembered by non-Indigenous people is also a discussion of a history of settler misunderstanding of Indigenous peoples. This issue was referenced by Tenskwatawa himself when he noted that “bad birds” or rumors had been passed on to Governor William Henry Harrison about his actions and intentions, which he claimed were untrue. This theme of misunderstanding has echoed down through books like Vine Deloria Jr.’s *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (1969), to more recent works on Indigeneity in general by other Indigenous scholars, including Thomas King’s *The Inconvenient Indian: A Curious Account of Native People in North America* (2012) and Anton Treuer’s *Everything You Wanted to Know about Indians but Were Afraid to Ask* (2012).
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This notion of misunderstanding has led to the myths and memories that have been created that surround the two brothers, particularly Tecumseh. Mentioning such myths is a common theme in both Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa biographies. Some go into a certain amount of detail on the origins of such myths. Building on this trend, this work is composed of four chapters with the following aims: 1) identify the process of memory and myth-making of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, 2) reveal the truth of the brothers’ lives and connections, 3) apply the facts of the brothers’ lives through the enduring nature of their legacies among Indigenous peoples, and 4) draw connections between Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa’s legacies and current solutions that are being explored, in the federal governments of both the United States and Canada, to longstanding Indigenous-settler conflicts.

The stories, both true and untrue, that have arisen around Tecumseh since his death are multitudinous. So much so that Tecumseh is easily recognized as an Indigenous leader among non-Indigenous Americans and Canadians and Indigenous people in both countries. The first chapter of this thesis seeks to validate the claim that Tecumseh was the most famous Indigenous leader in North America based on the volume of written works that focus on him. It also illustrates how Tecumseh’s story fits into the larger nation-making stories in Canada and the United States. In the United States, in particular, the publication of his first biography intersected with broader issues that the country was wrestling with, including the potential vanishing of Indigenous people and evolving conceptions of race, which led to the elevation of certain “noble savages” like Tecumseh, while dismissing “wild savages” like Tenskwatawa. The United States was also fraught with
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mixed emotions over a particular accomplishment: the combined celebration and mourning of a settled frontier between the Appalachian and Allegheny Mountains and the Mississippi River.

The second chapter examines the creation of a Tecumseh legend from a political and military standpoint in the United States and Canada. It argues that he was the right Indigenous leader at the right time for both emerging nations' during the War of 1812. Americans needed to demonstrate that they had both vanquished a worthy general and that by conquering his army, they had made a path clear for settlement to the Mississippi River. Canadians needed a martyr that was willing to die for the cause of their fledgling nation, even though true nationhood was still just an idea. In these senses, both Americans and British or Canadians needed to portray Tecumseh in a more European than Indigenous mold. This section also shows how Tecumseh’s brother Tenskwatawa was never similarly celebrated. He was feared, denigrated, and dismissed. In closing, this chapter delves into the history of the Doctrine of Discovery in the act of European colonization of North America, the evolution of the idea into Manifest Destiny in the United States, and the intersection of this idea and its evolution with the lives of the two brothers.

The third chapter seeks to shed an accurate light on the accomplishments of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, because of their Indigeneity in general and the fact that they were Shawnee in particular. These were both men who possessed leadership qualities among their people at the turn of the nineteenth century. In turn, they were able to gain alliances from other Indigenous peoples because of shared histories with colonial encounters. Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa had experienced a history of migration of the Shawnee and likely had a much longer view of that history. They also had first-hand experience with a history of violence, having lost their father in Lord Dunmore’s
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War. They had similar first-hand experience with a string of Indigenous prophets and war leaders seeking to create pan-Indigenous alliances, again with their father fighting under the Odawa leader Pontiac. This chapter also seeks to dispel two pervasive myths or narratives that have sprung up in association with Tecumseh, mainly portrayed in Drake’s *Life of Tecumseh* and echoed down through other authors.

The fourth chapter seeks to answer the question: Do Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa’s legacies still resonate with Indigenous peoples? If so, what do they represent? The answer to the first question is a definitive yes. Tenskwatawa's religious themes are also explored and animated from the second great pan-Indigenous movement in the Indigenous Civil Rights era in the United States and Canada in the mid-twentieth century. This chapter also explores the conflict between subsistence means between Indigenous-style co-planting of crops (planting crops together that provide a natural symbiotic relationship to one another) and hunting game and European style mono-crop agriculture and raising domesticated animals.

The conclusion addresses how the United States’ and Canada's federal governments are now working to address long-standing issues of Indigenous people. These are also part of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa’s legacies that help explain the ends that the brothers were seeking to achieve. This chapter draws in a broader connection to the recent phenomenon of global pan-Indigenous identity and questions of Indigenous memory making at a time when both the United States and Canada are in the throes of re-evaluating their national histories.

Recent biographers have posited theories about the endurance and application of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa’s legacies. At the close of Bil Gilbert’s biography of Tecumseh, he observed, “Tecumseh has been remembered, I think because it is generally accepted that he was a hero, a noble man of nature, and one who was right. I also have the notion that the manner in which
Tecumseh has worked on the imagination of white Americans may represent the great triumph and revenge of [Tecumseh].” At the close of R. David Edmund’s biography of Tenskwatawa, he noted, “In retrospect, the Prophet’s life was a microcosm of the Indian experience...” Only when we bring together these two statements do we get at the truth of who these brothers were together and why they remain relevant today, particularly in the ongoing struggle of Indigenous people to maintain cultural traditions and lifeways under Canadian and the United States federal governments. This work seeks to tell that combined story.
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CHAPTER 1: WRITING TECUMSEH, OR THE LITERARY INDIAN

Why focus on Tecumseh? What proof is there of his fame? Tecumseh remains the most famous Indigenous leader in North America. The proof of this is the volume of written works that focus on him by both American and Canadian authors, including works of history, fiction, plays and poems. While there has been a general interest in documenting Indigenous leaders' lives and exploits from the nineteenth century to the present, none have been the subject of more works than Tecumseh. By examining this sustained interest in this specific Indigenous leader, one can extrapolate reasons for a general fascination in writing about Indigenous people by non-Indigenous authors. The reverse is also true. This chapter demonstrates how a general fascination with Indigenous peoples in the nineteenth century influenced Tecumseh literature and scholarship. It also demonstrates how perceptions of Indigenous people by non-Indigenous authors have changed over time.

Canada

Through time, Canadians came to view Tecumseh as a patriot who gave his life for their country's emerging sense of nationhood in their hour of need. Making tributes to him became part of their literary tradition. Such poems lauding Tecumseh included those of Lieutenant Francis Hall in 1818 and Levi Adams in 1824. Levi’s poem closes, “To leave, more brilliantly enshrin’d / The actions of a lofty mind, / And hand another being’s name/ To grace the immortal page of Fame.” Fate further favored Tecumseh through an intersection with Canada’s literary history. John Richardson, considered the greatest early novelist of Canada, wrote an epic poem on Tecumseh as well as a novel about him. These were inspired by first-person observations of the War of 1812,

---

as fifteen-year-old Richardson accompanied the Canadian 41st Regiment of Foot as a volunteer and had personal interactions with Tecumseh in that capacity.  

In Canada, then, fascination with Tecumseh helped to birth the country’s early literary tradition. George Longmore’s book-length poem “Tecumthe, a Poetical Tale in Three Cantos” focused on the man (1824), John Richardson, noted above, followed with a similar poem, “Tecumseh: or, The Warrior of the West” (1828), and then wrote the novel *The Canadian Brothers* (1840). John Sugden has noted of Richardson’s novel, “[it] was intended to educate young Canadians in the ‘gallant deeds’ of their fathers, instilling in them the patriotism and sense of community essential to a new nation.” Poet Charles Mair followed Richardson’s ideals in the belief that the War of 1812 was a crucial point in the project of Canada. Sugden further noted of Mair that his “five-act tragedy *Tecumseh: A Drama* (1886) was regarded in its day as the country’s greatest literary achievement.” Mair acknowledged that Tecumseh fought for his own people and aims, while also portraying him as making the ultimate sacrifice for Canada's sake.

In his assessment of the Tecumseh bookshelf, Sugden has observed, “Tecumseh the patriot was soon an essential part of the education of young Canadians, and every self-respecting series of biographies was expected to devote a volume to him…” Therefore, a Tecumseh biographies' tradition emerged throughout the twentieth century spanning a period from Norman Gurd’s *Tecumseh* (1912) to Betty Jane Wylie’s *Tecumseh* (1982). At least two authors have molded Tecumseh’s legacy to fit their circumstances. Bliss Carmen compared the struggle of Tecumseh and that of his forces to the allies fighting for freedom in the First World War in his poem
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“Tecumseh and the Eagles” (1918). Wallace Havelock Robb cast Tecumseh’s efforts at intertribal peace as an early model of the United Nations in his semi-fictional work *Tecumtha, Shawnee Chieftain-Astral Avatar* (1958). One of the most recent Canadian works is Guy St. Denis’ *Tecumseh’s Bones* (2005), which follows the stories of Tecumseh’s final resting place and efforts to erect monuments in his memory.  

**United States**

Turning south, Sugden made similar assessments of the American literature on Tecumseh as he had about works by Canadians: “Americans saw qualities to admire in Tecumseh: courage, fortitude, ambition, generosity, humanity, eloquence, military skill, leadership…Above all, patriotism and a love of liberty…To some Tecumseh was the epitome of the ‘noble savage’ then beloved by European and American philosophers.”  

In the United States, following a spate of articles that eulogized Tecumseh in the decades after his death, credit for his defeat and that of his warriors became a successful rallying cry for more than twenty politicians from presidents to congressmen. The political intersections with Tecumseh’s legacy will be explored in the following chapter. However, it is worth noting that plays and novels acted as the nineteenth century's political propaganda and advertisements. Poems, plays, and fictional works followed, exalting some of these political leaders' exploits in their struggles with Tecumseh and his forces.  

A raft of nineteenth century plays also featured Tecumseh.

During this same period, when plays and literature on Indigenous people were in vogue in the United States, works focusing on Tecumseh exceeded those on all other Indigenous leaders.
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As noted in the introduction, one of the first significant historical studies was Drake’s *Life of Tecumseh*. Drake conducted comprehensive research by consulting letters from William Henry Harrison and Thomas Jefferson, as well as articles, and incorporated oral histories of those who had had firsthand interactions with Tecumseh and his brother. As its title, *Life of Tecumseh, and of His Brother the Prophet With a Historical Sketch of the Shawanoe Indians*, would suggest, Drake also spent a considerable amount of time documenting and contextualizing Shawnee culture.95

Authors from Benjamin B. Thatcher’s *Tales of the Indians; Being Prominent Passages of the History of the North American Natives Taken From Authentic Sources* (1831) through those writing in the 1950s described Tecumseh as the most outstanding Indigenous leader. Following a brief lull, interest in Tecumseh again took hold in tandem with the Civil Rights era and a renewed interest in Indigenous people. In this era, writers began to examine Indigenous peoples’ values and the injustices that had been visited upon them. At least half a dozen biographical novels were written with Allan W. Eckert’s contributions of *The Frontiersmen* (1967) and *A Sorrow in Our Heart, The Life of Tecumseh* (1993) bookending these works. *The Frontiersmen* was adapted into a play that has run each summer in Chillicothe, Ohio, since 1973.96 Similarly, about half a dozen children’s books on Tecumseh have been written between the 1940s and 1990s.97
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Of the early works on Tecumseh, Drake’s *Life of Tecumseh* is the most credible. It has also had the most significant influence on works that proceeded after it.\(^98\) Drake’s work was published when it was believed that Indigenous people might disappear from the United States after so many tribes were conquered and relocated west of the Mississippi. Sugden has expressly noted, In his own time, Tecumseh had been assured by American officials that the United States had treated the Indians with justice and humanity, and the tribes had no business in rebellion. But from the perspective of the 1830s and after, Tecumseh seemed to have been vindicated. His people had been driven out and appeared to be on the brink of extinction. Now Tecumseh had been noble, determined, and brave. He had also been *right* and deserved the admiration of every American who understood patriotism.\(^99\)

Therefore, it was necessary to capture something about the essence and the known history of these people before they faded from existence. This ideal appeared in literature and other art forms, such as George Catlin’s portrait of Tecumseh’s brother Tenskwatawa toward the end of the latter’s life.\(^100\)
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98 John Sugden, and Adam Jortner all cite Drake in their bibliographies. Edmunds, *Tecumseh*, 216; Sugden, *Tecumseh*, 465; Jortner, *The Gods of Prophetstown*, 234. Edmunds notes, “…Benjamin Drake’s *Life of Tecumseh* remains a valuable source book…Some of Drake’s information is incorrect, but his biography, although it was published in the nineteenth century and is relatively brief, is more accurate than many of those written by later historians.” 216. Sugden offers similar praise. 465.


100 Ibid. 29. It is interesting in itself to note that the image of Tenskwatawa above is freely available in the public domain. Yet a comparable image of Tecumseh is held by Peter Newark American Pictures, and the use of the image is subject to purchase. Even in the art world, Tenskwatawa’s value is less than his brother.
**Tecumseh versus Tenskwatawa: The Noble and Wild Savage Considered and Reconsidered**

Whether non-Indigenous Americans celebrated Indigenous people’s extinction or not was based on an assessment of Indigenous people’s merits between two poles. Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa are positioned at either end. While Cave put it most succinctly, many others agree that the divergent legacies of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa are indeed “a study in opposites.” It is no surprise that this is why one brother is venerated while the other is shunned. Tecumseh represents the *noble savage* – holding many admirable qualities while still destined to lose his battle against civilization’s ongoing progress. Tenskwatawa represents the *wild savage* – to be mocked, whose habits were questionable, and whose backward way of life left nothing to be venerated. ¹⁰¹

Such a categorization was standard in American thought and literature in the late eighteenth through the mid-nineteenth centuries. Americans categorized individual Indigenous people as either *wild* or *noble*. Sometimes, when considering Indigenous people overall, Americans were ambivalent in considering Indigenous people between these two ideals. ¹⁰² These themes of “vanishing Indians” and noble savagery also had deep roots that long predated the two brothers. The idea that individual Indigenous peoples were vanishing had been a trope since at least the eighteenth century though it reached a high point in the early nineteenth. ¹⁰³ Drake’s *Life of Tecumseh* carried on enduring themes on “savage virtues” that had been a part of American thought on Indigenous people since at least 1777 when Scotsman William Robertson penned his *History*
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of America. Based on Robertson’s follow-up work in 1824, Roy Harvey Pearce noted such qualities including eloquent speech, dignity, perseverance, and singular focus in his now foundational study on the otherness of the savage from non-Indigenous Americans, *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and American Mind* (1953), Pearce also noted heroism and bravery in battle as well as devotion by Tecumseh to his tribe.

In works just preceding Drake’s in the 1820s, numerous authors of fiction on the subject of Indigenous people portrayed that “Indian nobility was something that could not survive the inroads of civilization.” Similarly, the *Indian Chief as Tragic Hero* (2005), which Gordon M. Sayre focused an entire work on, had been a literary theme since at least 1766 and aligns with the noble savage theme. Sayre notes, “Indian leaders of wars of resistance against European invaders were the tragic heroes of America. The Indian leaders’ nobility, ambition, and courage as well as their flaws and their demises were portrayed with all the dignity accorded the greatest characters of the classical and Renaissance tragedies by Aeschylus, Racine, and Shakespeare, the most elevated literature of the time.”

From the 1820s through the 1840s, a sub-genre of frontier romances emerged in the United States that further explored the divide between the noble and wild savage. As Ezra Tawil noted in his *The Making of Racial Sentiment* (2006), “…these fictional narratives about racial conflict began to distinguish the ‘races’ on the basis of their emotional rather than exclusively physical properties. By defining the realm of feeling as the most important locus of racial difference, these novels produced what I call ‘racial sentiment’: the notion that members of different races both feel
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different things, and feel things differently.”108 These frontier romances also emerged amid a heightened scientific debate regarding the nature and differences of race. Thus, discussions of such differences emerged in tandem in two different camps: physical differences in the scientific arena and emotional differences in the literary one. While frontier literature and the literature of slavery are often divided, they address overlapping questions of colonialism and capitalism rooted in Tecumseh’s life. They would continue to play out in the lives of Indigenous North Americans over generations. Additionally, it is not only the bookshelf specifically on Tecumseh that is long. Tawil has noted, “During the half-century between the War of 1812 and the Civil War, Anglo-Indian relations were the subject of some seventy-three American novels.”109

James Fenimore Cooper is undoubtedly the most well-known, celebrated, and analyzed of these frontier romance authors. Like John Richardson in Canada, he is considered the United States' first national novelist.110 His fictional Natty Bumpo of the Leatherstocking Tales mirrored both the sympathetic and brutal traits in regard to relations with Indigenous people. While Cooper's works do not directly connect to Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, beyond their proximity in writing and publication to such works as Benjamin Drakes, it is commonly regarded that Cooper's famous Naty Bumpo was modeled after the life of Daniel Boone. Boone had many run-ins with the Shawnee, including the band that his Tecumseh’s was from, and was captured by them. Boone may have even fought Tecumseh’s father in Lord Dunmore’s War.111 Several authors have explored how Cooper demonstrated the ideas of the **noble** and **wild savage** in his writings. In the first of his Leatherstocking Tales, *The Pioneers*, there is a strong theme of violence associated

109 Ibid. 2- 4.
with the wild savage that runs throughout the book. Oliver Edwards, whom it becomes clear is of at least partial Indigenous heritage, is associated with such violence. Therefore, he is not the legitimate owner of a deer that he has shot in this tale. The Last of the Mohicans, the most famous of Cooper’s works, revolves around the abductions of women of European heritage by wild Indigenous savages. Only the work of brave males of European descent could ultimately save them.

At the same time, the wild savage is often conceived of like a caged beast. While he may be fierce and dangerous to an individual, the larger forces of civilization will overpower him. Such is the case with the antagonist Magua in Last of the Mohicans. The same could be said of Conanchet, a central and more complicated figure in another of Cooper’s novels beyond the Leatherstocking trilogy, The Wept of Wish-ton-wish. Throughout the Leatherstocking Tales, Naty Bumpo himself could be considered a wild savage, at least on the exterior. His modes of dress and hunting are nearly identical to his Indigenous counterparts. However, he is not judged as such because he was born of civilization and brought the light of such civilization into the wilderness.

Authors of recent historical scholarship on Tecumseh, over the past thirty years, have turned a skeptical eye on previous works that were considered factual. They assert that many of these works are filled with stories as intricately fabricated as Cooper’s own, with the most prominent critics being Gilbert and Sugden. They have assessed that part of the reason for the endurance of Tecumseh’s legacy is that it has become so malleable to non-Indigenous imaginations. In this way, many authors have put Tecumseh’s legacy through the meat grinder of
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non-Indigenous modes of thinking, living, and being and come up with various archetypes to suit the times and aims of the authors. These include Tecumseh as a tragic hero (gifted and noble but doomed to lose); as a critic of modern colonialism and capitalism; and as a folk hero of an America that is all but past. In many of these, though, Tecumseh’s indigeneity must be stripped away and taken from the context in which he lived. He is portrayed as a slightly more exotic form of European, with similar values of power, freedom, and individualism that were likely alien to his way of thinking and being.

It is also possible that Gilbert, Sugden, and others paid too much attention to the trends in the literature on Tecumseh and did not pay enough attention to the broader context of American literature in which these pieces were published. Tawil explored how theories on race in the early to mid-nineteenth century manifested themselves through early American literature. While color and other exterior traits are considered the basis of twentieth and twenty-first-century concepts of race, Americans of the early to mid-nineteenth century oppositely conceived of race. They believed that the origin of one’s race was in one’s character, and that character then brought about differences in external characteristics. Similarly, the concept of literature itself was not so narrowly defined as it is today. Before the 1850s, works of history, political propaganda, scientific analysis, and fiction could be lumped together under this term. Nineteenth-century racial ideas in the United States derived in turn from ideas generated by eighteenth-century race theories, known by contemporary historians as environmentalism or degenerationism. These theories assert that the color of one’s skin is derived from elements including diet, mode of life, and particularly
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climate. The climate here means not so much the weather and temperature of a specific geography, but the social associations one had and whether one lived in a wild or civilized place. From the 1780s to the 1820s, stories of people changing their pigmentation by association were common in America. There were stories of African slaves becoming white, women of European descent becoming darker due to marriage to African husbands, and Indigenous people becoming lighter skinned after attending college.\textsuperscript{120} Considering this context, it is possible that writers on Tecumseh in this period cast him in a European mold because they genuinely believed that he was, or had become, more like his European-origin neighbors than his Indigenous kin. They could have seen qualities that they saw as non-Indigenous, including intellect, oratory, and compassion, and concluded that he had made a similar transition.

Tecumseh’s literary legacy, therefore, grew due to its multiple intersections. Americans wanted to commemorate the conquest of a frontier, and Canadians wanted to memorialize their new nation's birth. The literature on Tecumseh also emerged in a time of greater focus on Indigenous people in general, partially to preserve ideas about a race that was feared would become extinct. As a symbol of nature and freedom, the Indigenous person would endure, with Tecumseh as its greatest personae, into the present. However, making this image would take a good deal of crafting.

\textsuperscript{120}Ibid. 44-6.
CHAPTER 2: “PERHAPS THE GREATEST INDIAN GENERAL THAT EVER LIFTED A TOMAHAWK” OR TECUMSEH OUT OF FOCUS, AND TENSKWATAWA OUT OF THE PICTURE

This chapter seeks to demonstrate that Tecumseh was the right Indigenous leader at the right time for both Americans and Canadians in the War of 1812. Americans needed to prove that they had vanquished a worthy general. By conquering his army, they had made a path clear for settlement to the Mississippi River's eastern shores. Canadians needed a martyr who was willing to die for the cause of their country. For these reasons, both nations and their early historians and authors needed to portray him as more non-Indigenous than Indigenous. Tenskwatawa, by comparison, was never celebrated. He was feared, denigrated, and dismissed. In exploring Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa’s intersections with the political and military aspects of the War of 1812, this chapter also examines the central conflict between Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa and the American federal government: that of who owns the land and why.

American Origins of the War of 1812: Federal Ideals and Frontier Realities

Following the Revolutionary War and the subsequent Treaty of Paris, the new United States inherited both a solution and a problem from Great Britain. The Treaty of Paris (1783) granted the United States independence. It more than doubled the national territory's overall size from the original thirteen colonies on the Atlantic seaboard to a western border of the Mississippi River. In the process, the United States also inherited a bevy of treaties that Great Britain had made with many Indigenous peoples. Leaders like George Washington, who had made their fortunes in surveying and land speculation beyond the British Crown’s border, settled on the same ironic solution: to ban settlement in lands claimed by Indigenous peoples. Early presidents and their administrations, notably Washington’s Secretary of War Henry Knox, were sympathetic to Indigenous peoples and took their rights seriously by treaty and tradition to live in specific places.
At the same time, Knox and others acknowledged that federal ideals could not keep pace with settlers and state governments' whims to spread out into such lands ahead of treaties. As one example, in defiance of federal law, the state of North Carolina passed the “Land Grab Act” in 1783, declaring the territory west of the Alleghenies (modern Tennessee) to be fair game for surveys and claims. 121

As a result, the reality on the frontier in places like the Ohio Valley was far different from the ideals espoused in the nation’s capital. As settler families, merchants, entrepreneurs, and land speculators continued to push west, they often did indeed outpace the treaty process, putting themselves directly in conflict with Indigenous peoples over land claimed as their own. 122 Attacks, killings, and stories of being taken prisoner by Indigenous peoples were common during Tecumseh’s father’s time. Such experiences were part of the lives of American wilderness icons like Daniel Boone123 While they held different ideals, national leaders were not blind to these realities and sometimes utilized them for their own ends. National politicians also saw Indigenous people as being supported by the British. In Canada, a war with Britain would both sever this tie that armed pro-British Indigenous allies and help open up the Northwest Territory for settlement. 124

When President James Madison addressed Congress on June 1, 1812, in a document that would lead to a formal declaration of war against Great Britain, he specifically called out collusion between British forces and their agents and Indigenous peoples in perpetrating horrors on the western frontier:


123 Though Boone’s full story would not be told until much later in the nineteenth century. See Draper, *The Life of Daniel Boone*, 216-285. For story of the capture of Jemima Boone as well as her friends, see 6735-6888. For Daniel Boone’s captivity story, see 7540-7903. For death of Boone’s sons James and Edward, see 9719.

In reviewing the conduct of Great Britain toward the United States our attention is necessarily drawn to the warfare just renewed by the savages on one of our extensive frontiers—a warfare which is known to spare neither age nor sex and to be distinguished by features peculiarly shocking to humanity. It is difficult to account for the activity and combinations which have for some time been developing themselves among tribes in constant intercourse with British traders and garrisons without connecting their hostility with that influence and without recollecting the authenticated examples of such interpositions heretofore furnished by the officers and agents of that Government.\footnote{125}

Between the realities of violence and concern with alliances between Indigenous peoples, both frontier leaders and those in the District of Columbia were concerned when large numbers of Indigenous peoples banded together with the possibility of committing violence against the United States. These fears were only heightened with the possibility of allying with the British against the Americans. Such generalized anxieties in North America pre-dated the United States but were explicitly noted in the Declaration of Independence.\footnote{126} Such worries were similarly continued during the administration of President Thomas Jefferson beginning in 1805, coinciding with the beginning of Tenskwatawa’s rise as a religious leader and the subsequent numbers of individuals that were drawn to him and his teachings. These people came from several different Indigenous nations, first the Odawa, Wyandot, and Seneca, along with his own Shawnee. Later, the Kickapoo, Potawatomi, Ojibway, and Ho-Chunk, were drawn from across the Ohio Valley and Old Northwest to him and his village near Greenville, Ohio.\footnote{127} During this time, Tenskwatawa “The Prophet” was mainly the concern of American leaders, as opposed to Tecumseh, regarding both the intent of his growing band of followers and the question of an alliance with the British.\footnote{128}


\footnote{127} Edmunds, \textit{The Shawnee Prophet}, 581.

\footnote{128} Ibid. 48-57
The War of 1812 through National & International Politics

Though American’s feared another fight with the British and an Indigenous uprising, the fledgling United States was not united in its desire for war. Donald J. Hickey has noted in his well-revered The War of 1812: A Forgotten Conflict (2012), “The War of 1812 was one of America’s most unpopular wars. It generated more intense opposition than any other war, including the war in Vietnam.” One of the reasons why the Americans were not more successful in the War of 1812 was due to issues of political dissent along party lines in Congress between the Republicans and Federalists. This issue ties into the legacy of Tecumseh at the end of the war. Broadly, it could be said from the start that the Republicans were for the war, while the Federalists were against it. Hickey noted,

A successful war would redound to the Republicans’ advantage, while retreat would have just the opposite effect...Thus by 1812 many Republicans had concluded that there were compelling diplomatic, ideological, and political reasons for going to war against Britain. If all went well the Republicans could expect to win concessions from the British, vindicate American independence, preserve republican institutions, maintain power, unify the party, and silence the Federalists.

Specific to an invasion of Canada, Federalists felt that the War was “not only unjust but also unwise.” Citing the drive to invade Canada and distinguish between this, a needless offensive war, and a justifiable defensive war, Congressman Morris Miller of New York put it well when he argued with his fellow legislators in January of 1814 as the Republicans pushed to increase war funding, “Let it not be said, then, that we refuse you the means of defence. For that we always have been – we still are ready to open the treasure of the nation. We will give you millions for defence; but not a cent for the conquest of Canada – not the ninety-ninth part of a cent for the
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extermination of its inhabitants.”  

Federalists also had reason to oppose the war for purposes of self-preservation: they believed that such expansion would increase Republican strength while at the same time undermining national stability. However, the heady optimism that had buoyed Republicans along at the beginning of the war collided with stark realities in 1814. As Hickey has noted, “Lack of men and money and mounting trade with the enemy all contributed to the crisis of 1814.” The nation’s economy was suffering partially due to a British navy blockade along the Atlantic coast, which hit the Southern and New England colonies particularly hard. This issue was compounded by the federal government’s need to borrow increasing amounts of money to finance the war debt. Consequently, in the congressional elections of that year, “…the war catalyzed a Federalist revival. As a result, Federalists achieved a more commanding position in the region than at any time since the 1790s.”

In August of 1814, Great Britain opened peace negotiations with the United States, which stretched on into December of the same year. In August, the British presented their first round of terms. Included in these was a promise that they had made to Tecumseh: that their Indigenous allies be included in land settlements and lands set aside for them in the Old Northwest. The British recommended that the Treaty of Greenville of 1795 set the boundaries of this land. Had the American’s agreed to these terms, Indigenous peoples would have gained “about a third of Ohio, half of Minnesota, and almost all of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin,” or an area of about 250,000 square miles with 43,000 Indigenous inhabitants at the time of the terms.
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request, the British were not simply practicing altruism. They were also calculating that this would keep Indigenous allies on their side if they needed to call on them in the future and create a buffer between the United States and Canada if an invasion by the United States re-emerged as an issue.\textsuperscript{138}

At the same time, the British needed to contend with their history in North America. They had made no concessions for their Indigenous allies in the Peace of 1783 (following the Revolutionary War) or the Jay Treaty of 1794 when the British agreed to abandon their forts on the American side of the Great Lakes.\textsuperscript{139}

The American’s rejected the initial peace terms that would end the War of 1812. In the end, British terms concerning their Indigenous allies were much more feeble. They merely “agreed to settle for a pledge to restore the Indians to their status [as non-combatants] as of 1811.”\textsuperscript{140} As Hickey notes, “For all practical purposes, the British once again had abandoned their Indian allies.”\textsuperscript{141} The Treaty of Ghent, which established this idea, also essentially agreed to keep the United States and Canada's land boundaries as they were before the war.\textsuperscript{142} The Federalists were particularly celebratory regarding the Treaty. They believed that it proved them and their anti-war stance right, and that they would reap the benefits in the coming elections. However, the Republicans spun the peace so that it did not appear to be a futile war, but instead was a defensive war to keep the United States from being subjected to British rule for a second time. According to this new Republican story, it was the second war of independence.\textsuperscript{143} The Republican tactic was a severe blow to the Federalists' power, and the party would die out in a little under ten years in 1824.
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Had the Republicans been less successful, or had the Federalists taken the lead in crafting their side of the story, things may have been different both for the Shawnee and the numerous Indigenous peoples who lived east of the Mississippi River. It is important to remember that the Federalists were anti-expansionists. The process of Western settlement in the emerging states and territories may have slowed or stopped had they gained power. The Republican spin was so successful that it rekindled old enmities for the British, increasing American hatred toward them. Early in the war, in 1813, the House of Representatives published findings that criticized the British for allowing or inciting Indigenous brutalities. Particular emphasis was placed on the atrocities wrought by Indigenous warriors in the Old Northwest. William Henry Harrison himself, reflecting on his run-ins with Tecumseh’s forces, noted that “…Americans would long remember the ‘horrible species of warfare’ practiced by the Indians allied to the British.”

*After the Battle of the Thames: Tecumseh, Indigenous Forces, and Memory in Canada*

While Americans had much to fear from British and Indigenous forces, they had little to fear from Canadians. Canada’s population was outnumbered two to one by its southern neighbor at this time. It had developed little industry, and the militia forces that it did have were small and not well trained. Therefore, following Tecumseh’s death at the Battle of the Thames on October 5, 1813, the British feared the loss of Indigenous forces in their ongoing conflict with the Americans. They desperately wanted another Indigenous leader who could act as a galvanizing force among Indigenous people. In 1814, they anointed Tenskwatawa as such a leader, awarding him a pair of pistols and a sword as a mark of honor. Tenskwatawa was more than happy to play
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the part. However, he was never able to inspire or combine Indigenous forces as a fighting force in the way that his brother had. The British also sought to enshrine Tecumseh’s memory as a martyr to attempt to keep their Indigenous allies engaged. Indigenous forces would continue to fight in various battles until the war’s end in 1814, but never in so coordinated a fashion as under Tecumseh.

The process of nation-building in Canada has been far more peaceful than the process undertaken by its neighbor to the south. Canada exited its colonial status from Great Britain peacefully in 1867 and never suffered the internal civil wars that the United States and other South American nations suffered. As Hickey has noted, this war was the closest such event for Canada as the United States Revolutionary War and acted as a binding force in bringing the country together. Several heroes grew out of this war. Tecumseh’s heroism and legacy in Canada have already been explored through Canadian literature in the first chapter. Additional heroes include Laura Secord and Charles de Salaberry. General Isaac Brock was memorialized for his death early in the war at the Battle of Queenston Heights on October 13, 1812 and was also recognized for galvanizing Canadian forces. A monument to General Brock was quickly erected in 1823, with assistance from government funds.

Similar efforts were made to create a monument for Tecumseh. Their realization would be long in coming, partially because the early efforts did not enjoy the same government financial support that Brock’s monument had. As Guy St. Denis noted, “To the genteel classes of white society [in 1841, particularly members of the Tecumseh Monument Committee], Tecumseh epitomized the noblest of savages, and one who deserved a monument fit for a white hero.”
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Throughout the 1840s, and again in the 1870s, various parties attempted to erect a monument in Tecumseh's memory. Most sought to place the monument in locations that Tecumseh had either passed through, as in Fort Malden in Amherstburg, or near Moraviantown, where he met his demise near the Thames.\textsuperscript{152} However, these groups were never able to raise sufficient funds to create such a monument. One was not created to commemorate Tecumseh in Canada until the early twentieth century. Even then, it amounted to a meager boulder and a plaque commemorating both the fall of Tecumseh and the Battle of the Thames.\textsuperscript{153} This monument has since expanded and received government support. Its full history and description are more fully explored in the fourth chapter. To the south, efforts to memorialize Tecumseh would also be made, albeit in a different light. They would manifest themselves in words and writings for political purposes.

*The United States Aftermath of the War of 1812: Political Office through “Indian Killing” as Spoils of War and the making of the Tecumseh Legend*

Both sides of the 1840 presidential campaign referenced Tecumseh as they vied for power, as it was alleged that Harrison’s opponent Richard Johnson had killed Tecumseh at the Battle of the Thames.\textsuperscript{154} Andrew Jackson, Zachary Taylor, and Lewis Cass all also utilized Tecumseh’s legacy to launch themselves toward the presidency, with all but Cass finding success.\textsuperscript{155} Hickey has called the Battle of the Thames “a kind of Bunker Hill in western legend.”\textsuperscript{156} Sugden has noted that “The battle was heralded by Americans as their first important breakthrough of the war.”\textsuperscript{157} Both statements are correct but in different contexts. Sugden’s statement holds more closely to the actual events of the war. The campaigns of 1812 had not gone as planned, with Americans losing
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control of their forts along the eastern shore of Lake Huron to British forces and their Indigenous allies, and an easy invasion of Canada had not materialized.\textsuperscript{158} At the same time, Hickey’s statement speaks to the Republican efforts' to position the War of 1812 as a defensive war in retrospect, as previously noted.

It is worth taking time to interrogate the actual battle to understand how far Republican efforts to change perceptions of the war from an offensive to a defensive one had gone. Comparisons between the Battle of the Thames on October 5, 1813, with the Battle of Bunker Hill on June 17, 1775 cannot justly be made, as there are few commonalities. In the Battle of Bunker Hill, the Americans were slightly outnumbered (estimates of 2,400 American forces to over 3,000 British) and placed in a defensive position on two hills when the British made an attack. While the British won the battle, they sustained substantial casualties, many more than the Americans, causing them to take the American army more seriously.\textsuperscript{159} By contrast, in the Battle of the Thames, the position of the forces was reversed. Tecumseh and his warriors took up a defensive position in a swamp alongside British General Proctor’s troops, while the Americans advanced on their position. Proctor and Tecumseh’s forces were far outnumbered (estimates of 1,600 combined British and Indigenous forces against over 3,700 American), and much has been made of Proctor’s lack of preparation, poor choice of a defensive position, and cowardice in the field as he fled the battle toward the end.\textsuperscript{160} However, the Republican story of the Battle of the Thames as a defensive engagement was an effective one. This battle alone produced one vice president, three state
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governors of Kentucky, three lieutenant governors, four United States senators, and twenty Congressmen.161

Of these politicians, no one had a closer connection to Tecumseh than William Henry Harrison. Though Harrison’s presidency was the shortest due to his early death, his “Log Cabin Campaign” has been recognized as a turning point in the practice of American politics. Harrison’s Whig party presided over a highly divided constituency. They could agree that they were displeased with incumbent Martin Van Buren and blamed him for a down economy but could agree on little else. Rather than focusing on issues in this election, the Whig party focused on their constituency's images and emotions. In the early days of the campaign, two other historical giants vied for power: Henry Clay and Daniel Webster. When Harrison was announced as the party favorite, Webster quickly became a fierce supporter, which may have further contributed to Harrison’s presidential victory.162 However, it was agreed that Harrison and his legacy would make for the most compelling candidacy.163 The campaign was filled with parades, slogans, and songs. Men who worked to make Harrison president introduced the concept of stump speeches and heavily utilized popular newspapers to convey their messages. The campaign was not opposed to celebrity endorsements of the day, and even frontier hero Davy Crockett got in on the act.164

To meet the needs of this campaign style, William Henry Harrison needed a makeover. Along with defeating Tecumseh, he was portrayed as an ordinary man who lived in a rough-hewn log cabin and drank hard cider.165 In actuality, Harrison was highly aristocratic. He was the son of Founding Father Benjamin Harrison - grew up on a plantation in Virginia and attended the
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University of Pennsylvania to study medicine. He made his fortune through both a military and political career and created a similar plantation-style home near Vincennes, Indiana called Grouseland.\textsuperscript{166} Whigs appealed to the public's memory of the War of 1812, charging that Van Buren had done nothing during that time while Harrison “Old Tippecanoe” was out protecting Western homesteads and battling Indigenous forces.\textsuperscript{167} Harrison mainly found favor with veterans of various wars with Indigenous peoples who knew first-hand the hardships that accompanied frontier battles, and Western settlers on the frontier who were hungry for additional lands.\textsuperscript{168} Even the women participated, which in and of itself was a further campaign innovation. The “Lady Toasts” which tended to accompany dinners in Ohio notably illustrated how the crafting of Harrison’s presidential personae had come to resonate with the public:

\begin{quote}
Mrs. H. Little – Harrison: We love him, because he first loved us.
Mrs. J. Little – Harrison: He saved us from the savage tomahawk; may he be the highest office, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.
Mrs. H. James – Gen. Harrison: The Hero who defended us in war, shall in peace be defended by us.
Mrs. Combs – He who protected the Widow and Orphan in 1813, will not be by them forsaken in 1840.\textsuperscript{169}
\end{quote}

Harrison’s staff also changed how he was portrayed in his relations with Indigenous peoples. He was transformed from the victor of battles, including Tippecanoe and the Thames, to a determined protector and friend of Indigenous people. Admittedly, through his time as Governor of Indiana, Harrison was given a no-win charge: to both protect Indigenous peoples from encroachment and other unfair dealings by non-Indigenous settlers while also gaining as much land as possible for the federal government. Biographers and campaigners downplayed the acquisition of millions of acres through several treaties that Harrison helped negotiate, which carved up the Old Northwest. Instead, they highlighted Harrison’s moral qualities and cast him as
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sympathetic to Indigenous issues, including fraud, land seizures, and loss of game. In the battles with Indigenous forces, including those led by Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, these forces were cast as pawns. They were driven to fight by a combination of settler exploitation and British influence. In this way, biographers and campaigners could thread the needle between still uplifting Harrison’s valor as a warrior without blaming such conflicts on him.\textsuperscript{170} In his pamphlet, \textit{Discourse on the Aborigines of the Ohio Valley}, published in 1840 during the presidential campaign, Harrison sought to uplift policies of fairness and care for Indigenous people that he espoused. These were in line with those of previous Presidents Thomas Jefferson and James Madison and contrasted with crueler policies and practices under President Andrew Jackson and his successor Martin Van Buren.\textsuperscript{171} In the same document, Harrison upheld and detailed the “moral and intellectual qualities” of several Indigenous leaders from the War of 1812. When it came to Tecumseh, though he acknowledged Tecumseh’s abilities as a leader, he was critical of his efforts to launch a pan-Indigenous war against the Americans or create an independent Indigenous state. He offered far more praise to Black Hoof, an older Shawnee leader who had been allied to the Americans and kept his followers neutral throughout the war.\textsuperscript{172}

While it could be argued there is an element of mythmaking and truth-stretching to any political campaign, for purposes here, it is worth exploring the validity of Harrison’s claims of mercy and justice towards Indigenous peoples. On August 7, 1811, Harrison wrote a letter to Secretary of War William Eustis. It was one of a long string of correspondence between the two,
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as Harrison had been watching Tenskwatawa’s growing body of followers with some concern. This letter was also sent three months before the Battle of Tippecanoe, where Harrison and his forces attacked Tenskwatawa’s followers. Harrison notes the following plans to disperse Tenskwatawa’s followers in the letter:

The outlines of my plan are to call upon all the Tribes in the most peremptory terms to deliver up such of their people as may have been concerned in murdering our citizens. To require them also to fulfill that article of the Treaty of Greenville which obliges them to give information and to stop any parties passing through their districts with hostile intentions, and that all such as are marching to join the Prophet are considered by us as of that description. To require them also to cause such of their people as may have joined the Prophet immediately to return to their respective tribes or to put them out of their protection. From the Miamies I will require an absolute disavowal of all connection with the Prophet, and as they are the owners of the land, he occupies I will endeavor to prevail upon them to express to him their disapprobation of his remaining there. To all the Tribes I will repeat a declaration which I was instructed to make to them some years ago by the Secretary of War. That the United States had manifested through a series of years the utmost justice and generosity toward their Indian neighbours and had not only fulfilled all the engagements which they had entered into with them with good faith, but had spent considerable sums in endeavors to civilize them and promote their happiness but if under those circumstances which they all had an opportunity of knowing any Tribe should dare to take up the Tomahawk against their Fathers, they need not expect that the same lenity would be shown them, as they experienced at the close of the former war, but that they would absolutely be exterminated or driven beyond the Mississippi.173

This disdain and wanton violence theme were at odds with his self-avowal of justice, mercy, and fairness in his treatment of Indigenous peoples previously noted. Additionally, in the Battle of Tippecanoe, when the American forces entered Prophetstown following the retreat of Tenskwatawa’s forces, they not only destroyed the houses and food stores of the village. They also dug up the graves of Prophetstown, leaving the bodies exposed and rotting.174 The bodies of fallen warriors were similarly desecrated and mutilated at the Battle of the Thames, where Harrison was field commander.175

The Democrats sought to counter the Whig campaign through the exploits of Vice-Presidential Candidate Richard M. Johnson. Johnson was also a veteran of the War of 1812 and fought in the Battle of the Thames, where Tecumseh died, while Harrison was still en route to the battlefield. It was commonly believed that Johnson was the one to fire the fatal shot at the
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Indigenous leader. Democrats used the slogan, “Rumpsey, Dumpsey, Colonel Johnson Killed Tecumseh.” They portrayed Johnson as the real hero of the war and Harrison as a distant second who was also too old for the presidency. Unfortunately for the Democrats, none of this language stuck.176

Doctrine of Discovery versus Indigenous Understanding: European International Law, Tecumseh & Tenskwatawa, American Presidents, and Clashes of Legal Interpretation of Land Ownership

Coming full circle to the beginning of the War of 1812, there is a historical debate about precisely what caused the United States to declare war on Great Britain in 1812. However, it is undeniable that the land hunger was at least partly to blame. Part of what drove American land-hunger, and the attendant dispossession of such lands from Indigenous peoples through treaties such as those Harrison helped to make, was through the international body of law that has come to be known as the Doctrine of Discovery. One author, Dr. Robert J. Miller, himself a member of the Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma who are descendants of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, even draws a direct connection between the Doctrine of Discovery from papal edicts in the fifteenth century, to American policy in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, to the term “Manifest Destiny.”177 While the previous section noted elected officials that gained office due to their connection to fighting or defeating Tecumseh and his forces, this section examines the struggles that Tecumseh, and to some extent, Tenskwatawa had, in defining their position to create a land base where Indigenous peoples could live on their terms. This struggle began in connection with Thomas Jefferson and extended through to William Henry Harrison. In contrast to the
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Doctrine of Discovery, Tecumseh pointed to an Indigenous understanding of the law and the connections of the Shawnee and other Indigenous peoples to lands as a basis for his claims.

As Miller and others have noted, the idea of a divine or providential right to claim lands by Western Europe’s colonial powers pre-dated Columbus’ fateful voyage in 1492. The Doctrine of Discovery has deep roots, stretching back to the Crusades and the Roman Catholic Church’s conception of “worldwide papal jurisdiction.” The Doctrine of Discovery was advanced in the early years of European colonization and exploration through a series of papal bulls written by Pope Nicholas V. Of particular interest is the bull Dum Diversas, written in 1452, which gave King Alfonso V of Portugal the right to invade non-Christian lands, and make those lands profitable. While King Alfonso applied this bull to Africa, it was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 3: 10 Elements of the Doctrine of Discovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) <strong>First Discovery</strong>: First European country to discover new lands unknown to other European countries gained sovereign rights over the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) <strong>Actual occupancy and current possession</strong>: To complete title, European country had to occupy or possess the lands through building a fort or settlement and leaving people there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) <strong>Pre-Emption</strong>: The discovering European country gains sole right to buy land from Indigenous people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) <strong>Indigenous Title</strong>: Following Discovery, indigenous people were considered to have lost their claim to ownership of their lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) <strong>Tribal limited sovereignty and commercial rights</strong>: After Discovery, Indigenous nations and peoples were considered to have lost their inherent sovereign powers, rights to free trade, diplomatic international relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) <strong>Contiguity</strong>: European powers could lay claim to large areas of land surrounding the settlements or forts they possessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) <strong>Terra nullis</strong>: Literally the earth is “null or void”. If lands were unoccupied or were not used in a European manner, they were considered empty and vacant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) <strong>Christianity</strong>: The rights to lands and sovereignty by non-Christian peoples were trumped by Christians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) <strong>Civilization</strong>: Combined with #8, a belief that God had called Europeans to act as guardians over Indigenous, read inferior, peoples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) <strong>Conquest</strong>: Either a military victory over Indigenous people that involved them losing their lands or the process by which the conditions noted above caused Indigenous people to lose their lands, or some control over them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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also applied to later voyages to the Americas.\textsuperscript{179}

In analyzing the Doctrine of Discovery, Miller noted, “In essence, the Doctrine provided that newly-arrived Europeans immediately and automatically acquired legally recognized property rights in native lands and also gained governmental, political, and commercial rights over the inhabitants without the knowledge or the consent of the Indigenous peoples.”\textsuperscript{180} The Doctrine would become a part of international law throughout the European colonial period, including utilization by England and France in their initial claims to rights and powers in North America.\textsuperscript{181} England and France also developed the idea of \textit{terra nullius}, or a null or void land, to justify their right to take lands from Indigenous peoples. One way to interpret \textit{terra nullius} is as “lands that were occupied but not being used in a fashion that European legal systems approved.”\textsuperscript{182} The implications of this understanding will be further explored in chapter four in the conflict between Indigenous versus non-Indigenous means of subsistence but are worth introducing here as well for its land ownership implications.

The Doctrine of Discovery was similarly understood by American colonists and was adopted by its leadership in the transition from British colonies to nationhood.\textsuperscript{183} Miller note, “Our Founding Fathers were well aware of the Doctrine [of Discovery] and utilized it while they were part of the English colonial system. They then naturally continued to use Discovery under the flag of the new United States.”\textsuperscript{184} The Doctrine of Discovery also evolved in its application in the United States. In the early days of the nation, the United States needed to keep strong alliances
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with Indigenous nations. This was both due to the small size of its population relative to the massive amount of land that the country had gained from Great Britain in the Treaty of Paris and a need for Indigenous military allies to help guard against territorial incursions by other European colonial powers. Language reflecting this need was noted in the third article of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 that opened lands around the Great Lakes to settlement and incorporated the territory into the United States:

> The utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians; their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent; and in their property, rights and liberty, they never shall be invaded or disturbed, unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress; but laws found in justice and humanity shall from time to time be made, for preventing wrongs being done to them, and for preserving peace and friendship with them.

In these early days of the United States, no President had a stronger connection to the Doctrine of Discovery, nor a more lasting resonance in its application, than Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson’s administration also was directly linked to Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa. Jefferson’s presidency coincided with the beginning of Tenskwatawa’s pan-Indigenous alliance-building from 1805 to 1809. Along with his Secretary of War Henry Dearborn, Jefferson regularly corresponded with Governor William Henry Harrison on Tecumseh, Tenskwatawa, and their forces. As President, Jefferson often met with the leaders of Indigenous nations and villages and nearly met Tecumseh himself. Jefferson explained to these leaders the legal rights of occupancy.
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and use, and that only the United States could buy their land compared to other colonial powers. Jefferson even went so far as to share copies of the United States Trade and Intercourse Act with them.\(^{190}\) It is entirely possible that Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa learned of such a characterization of rights as explained by other Indigenous leaders that met with Jefferson.

Like Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, Jefferson has his myths that have come to surround him as a learned and gentleman of science and letters. By contrast, President Andrew Jackson is commonly vilified for his removal of the Cherokee, Chickasaw, and Choctaw peoples through the infamous Trail of Tears.\(^{191}\) However, Jefferson was “one of the most aggressive and strategically expansionist presidents who ever held the office.”\(^{192}\) Perhaps one of the reasons for the myth-making around Jefferson about Indigenous people is the juxtaposition of his writings and personal outlook with his professional actions, similar to the dichotomy between his personal and professional actions regarding slaves of African origin (notably his relationship with Sally Hemings versus his inability or unwillingness to abolish slavery).\(^{193}\) In his personal notes, Jefferson portrayed a belief that Indigenous people were equal to those colonists of Western European descent. He admired their governmental forms and desired to have them assimilated into American society, even noting that marriages between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples would be a good thing. At the same time, he believed that Indigenous people were caught in a perpetual cycle: they were uncivilized, so they exhibited savage qualities.\(^{194}\) Jefferson believed that they could escape this cycle by emulating the American farmer through the American and European practice


\(^{191}\) Miller, *Native America*, 1639.

\(^{192}\) Ibid. 1407.


of mono-crop agriculture and livestock raising. This issue will be further explored in chapter four.195

In contrast, Jefferson’s political actions were very different. Early in his first term as President, between 1802-1803, he formulated plans for Indigenous removal from their lands: specifically, they would need to be moved west of the Mississippi River to make way for the creation of new states and the expansion of the United States’ settler population.196 The formation of such states and the sale of lands to settlers also paid off debts from the Revolutionary War and funded federal government operations.197 As Miller has noted, Jefferson was “the first person to formulate an official federal policy of [Indigenous] removal, the first to set it in motion, and the first to start removing tribes west of the Mississippi.”198 If Indigenous nations opposed removal, Jefferson called for their annihilation.199 Jefferson’s vision went still further and coincided with the Louisiana Purchase of lands from France stretching from the Mississippi River's western shores to the eastern foothills of the Rocky Mountains. He envisioned Indigenous nations being removed at least twice – once to the west of the Mississippi River and again further west as the American settler population occupied more and more land.200 To these ends, Jefferson designed a four-step treaty-making scheme that would be perpetuated throughout the rest of the nineteenth century.

These were:

1) run the hunters into debt, then threaten to cut off their supplies unless the debts were paid out of the proceeds of a land cession; 2) bribe influential chiefs with money and private reservations; 3) select and invite friendly leaders to Washington to visit and negotiate with the President, after being overawed by the evident power of the United States; and 4) threaten trade embargo or war.201

---

196 Miller, Native America, 1418-24.
197 Ibid, 1753.
198 Ibid, 1424.
199 Ibid, 1424.
200 Ibid, 1659.
201 Wallace, Jefferson and the Indians, 304.; Miller, Native America, 1575, 1588.
Jefferson specifically inquired if Tenskwatawa could be bribed into land sales or ceasing his spiritual leadership. 202

Tecumseh’s rise to power and visibility occurred through the negotiations for one such treaty that Jefferson endorsed: The Treaty of Fort Wayne, signed in 1809. The treaty was negotiated by Indiana Governor William Henry Harrison, with leaders of the Lenape (Delaware), Miami, Eel River, and Potawatomi peoples. The treaty ceded three million acres of modern Illinois and Indiana to the United States. The Shawnee lived within this area but were excluded from the negotiations, partially at Harrison's urging. This treaty was also the spark that would set Tecumseh and his allies on the road to armed conflict with Americans through the War of 1812. 203 Tecumseh had his own ideas about American treaties based on first-hand experiences and those of the Shawnee and other Indigenous peoples who had signed such treaties in the past. He also had personal conceptions of land ownership based on his Shawnee culture and traditions, conceptions that would resonate with other Indigenous nations' understandings. Tecumseh was hardly the first to argue against the Doctrine of Discovery’s application, though he is most famous for doing so. Indigenous nations came to understand how their property rights were defined by colonial powers and argued against such an interpretation. Some argued against the imposition of this alien framework and its impact on their lands and livelihoods, while others argued that colonial powers did not have the right to trade tribal property rights back and forth between themselves. 204
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Due to treaties made under the administrations of Washington, Adams, and Jefferson, Tecumseh found many Indigenous nations and villages in states that he found appalling by 1809. Particularly under the administrations of Adams and Jefferson, between 1800 and 1809, “part of northern Ohio, the southern third of Indiana, southeastern Michigan, most of Illinois and Missouri, and part of Wisconsin had been transferred by one treaty or another to the United States.”

The Haudenosaunee (Iroquois), once a feared Indigenous contender with both European powers and other Indigenous nations, had been split, with half the population fleeing to Canada. At the same time, those that were left in the United States were tied to a small reservation in New York. The Wyandotte, near present-day Sandusky, Ohio, had made similar significant land cessions. The Shawnee led by Black Hoof had not made similar cessions but were trying to live in peace with their settler neighbors and sought help from the Quakers and United States government agent William Kirk to create a sawmill. In many of these cases, Indigenous nations were struggling. This was either due to a loss of game due to smaller land bases that they controlled coupled with the encroachment of settlers, or the switch from Indigenous modes of agriculture and hunting, to settler modes of mono-crop agriculture and livestock raising.

To Tecumseh and many Indigenous people, the Treaty of Fort Wayne was a treaty that went too far and broke previous promises that the United States had made. To the understanding of many Indigenous people who lived in the Old Northwest, the binding Treaty between them and the United States was the Treaty of Greenville of 1795. This treaty followed after a series of battles between American forces and British and Indigenous allies, led by Indigenous leaders from the Wyandot, Delaware (Lenape), Shawnee, Ottawa (Odawa), Chippewa (Ojibway), and Potawatomie peoples, between 1785 and 1795. The treaty ceded large portions of the present state of Ohio to...
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the United States. It drew a line roughly through the middle of the state, enabling settlement south of the line and reserving lands to the north of it for Indigenous peoples.°\textsuperscript{207} Tecumseh expressed his frustration indirectly through a message to Harrison from a Joseph Barron, through whom he stated,

> The great spirit said he gave this great island [the Americas] to his red children. He placed the whites on the other side of the big water [the Atlantic Ocean], they were not contented with their own [lands in Europe] but came to take us from ours [lands]. They [Americans] have driven us from the sea to the lakes, we can go no farther They have taken upon themselves to say this tract belongs to the Miamis, this to the Delawares, & so on. but the Great Spirit intended it as the common property of all the Tribes, nor can it be sold without the consent of all.°\textsuperscript{208}

Tecumseh was not only venting his frustration to Harrison regarding the American demands for more and more Indigenous lands. Nor was he only accusing the Delaware leaders, Potawatomi, Miami, and others of selling lands that were not theirs. Both of these were common themes throughout Tecumseh’s life and have been well researched by others.°\textsuperscript{209} It is also essential to put Tecumseh in his proper context. Due to their stance as nativists, as will be explored in greater depth in the fourth chapter, both brothers believed that traditional modes of Indigenous life, modes that had origins before European settlement, were the proper way for Indigenous peoples to live and that adherence to such modes would guarantee their survival into the future. This set them at odds with Indigenous accommodationists, such as Miami leader Little Turtle who was also a signatory of the Treaty of Fort Wayne, who believed that taking on modes and beliefs that emulated American settlers would guarantee survival. Tecumseh, Tenskwatawa, and others who shared their views had a common understanding of land ownership.

°\textsuperscript{208} Sugden, *Tecumseh*, 188.
This understanding did not derive from European international law or the Pope's authority, but the experiences and culture of Indigenous peoples before European settlement. Tenskwatawa’s adherence to similar ideas was illustrated through a speech from his disciple, The Trout, in 1807. In this speech, The Trout conveyed messages that Tenskwatawa had received from the Great Spirit: “They [Americans] are unjust. They have taken away your Lands which were not made for them…My Children the Whites I placed on the other side of the Great Lake [the Atlantic Ocean], that they might be a separate people. To them I gave different manners, customs, animals, vegetables, etc for their use…”

Tenskwatawa and Tecumseh’s ability to amass a large gathering of followers is a testament to the resonance of such a message. Eric Dannenmaier has defined the elements of such a belief as to the social, cultural, and spiritual dimensions that connect Indigenous peoples to lands. The land here means the ground itself and natural resources and the broader ecosystem it is a part of. It is this deeper connection then that Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa were referring to when they objected to lands being exchanged for money in a transactional manner. The brother’s demand that any further treaties required the signatures of all Indigenous leaders was similarly not just a stalling tactic. It was a deep acknowledgement that these lands held a common connection to many Indigenous peoples. This more profound
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connection to the land and a different philosophical framework than non-Indigenous Americans or Canadians is explored in the subsequent chapter.

Figure 4: Greenville Treaty Line bisecting present Ohio. Creator Unknown. Ohio Guide Photographs, State Archives Series 1039 AV. Courtesy of Ohio History Connection.
CHAPTER 3: ON BEING SHAWNEE AT THE TURN OF THE 19TH CENTURY, OR TECUMSEH AND TENSKWATAWA IN FOCUS

Why were Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa so successful in attracting Indigenous allies? This chapter seeks to demonstrate that both brothers had the right leadership qualities at the right time, and most importantly were of the right culture, Shawnee, to build an indigenous alliance. This chapter demonstrates how the brothers were more similar than different and how their actions fit into a broader Indigenous context, composed of lifeways, culture, and a history of interactions with European settlers. While this history of settler interactions was familiar to many Indigenous peoples, the Shawnee experience was unique in several different ways that positioned them to lead a pan-Indigenous coalition.


Early sources seemed convinced that Tecumseh could persuade many different peoples to join his cause over thousands of miles through his abilities of oratory, charisma, and inducement alone. Such an assessment is demonstrated in a letter from William Henry Harrison to US Secretary of War William Eustis on August 7, 1811. However, it is unlikely that Harrison knew, or fully grasped, what truly enabled Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa to bring such a large body of Indigenous people together:

The implicit obedience and respect which the followers of Tecumseh pay to him, is really astonishing, and more than any other circumstance bespeaks him one of those uncommon geniuses which spring up occasionally to produce revolutions and overturn the established order of things. If it were not for the vicinity of the United States, he would, perhaps, be the founder of an empire that would rival in glory Mexico or Peru. No difficulties deter him. For four years he has been in constant motion. You see him to-day on the Wabash, and in a short time hear of him on the shores of lake Erie or Michigan, or on the banks of the Mississippi, and wherever he goes he makes an impression favorable to his purpose….213

Drake called the Shawnee a “restless, wandering people…” and was mostly correct in this assessment of a history of vast Shawnee migrations. As a result of colonial violence since European contact, the Shawnee created alliances and migrated throughout the present United States east of the Mississippi River. The Shawnee had a long history of attachments to numerous regions and cultural groups due to the Fur Trade Wars (c. 1640-1700) and other violent conflicts with colonizers and Indigenous communities allied with them. These alliances ranged from as far north as New Jersey, to the Southeastern peoples of the Creek and Cherokee, to the Old Northwest’s Miami and Delaware (Lenape). Shawnee migrations from initial European settlement in North America in the seventeenth century through the nineteenth century have been well documented by other scholars. Before European settlement, they may have originally lived along the Delaware and Susquehanna Rivers between 1607 and 1632. Before the 1660s, they lived south of Lake Erie. Based on Sauk and Fox oral tradition, the Shawnee were related to them, and all three peoples lived along the St. Lawrence River. There was also a connection between the Shawnee, Mohicans, and Delaware. By 1672, they were living with the Seneca. The Shawnee and their allies were defeated in a war with the Iroquois (Haudenosaunee) confederacy in that same year. After 1672, they dispersed to the south and east but stayed to the Mississippi River's east. In the 1770s, some Shawnee lived in Virginia but were driven out through
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a short conflict known as Lord Dunmore’s war with the colony. They settled on the Ohio River below the Wabash, in Kentucky as well as in Georgia and the Carolinas. Those who lived in the Carolinas lived among the Creeks. Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa had a specific connection to the Creeks through their mother, which Tecumseh would later use to his advantage in pan-Indigenous alliance building.

A history of violence perpetrated by European settlers and their governments against Indigenous peoples had a broad impact across North America, as well on the Shawnee in particular. In his opening to Violence Over the Land: Indians and Empires in the Early American West (2008), Ned Blackhawk observed, “The narrative of American history...has failed to gauge the violence that remade much of the continent before U.S. expansion. Nor have American historians fully assessed the damaging effects of such expansion on the many Indian peoples caught within the continental changes.” Through a specific focus on the Shawnee, Stephen Warren has observed that this culture of violence and its resultant Indigenous relocations forced by circumstances and policies other than treaties helped birth men like Tecumseh. He notes:

Beginning in the 1720s, the Shawnees and their neighbors abandoned their villages in response to settler colonialism. They became the first participants in acts of violence and estrangement caused by European land hunger and massive demographic shifts in British North America. I argue that we must understand these long-term continuities in Indian-white relations if we are to understand the social movements pioneered by Native peoples on the eve of the Seven Years War. By the 1720s, advocates for race-based understandings of identity competed with those who preferred older notions of village-based autonomy. The conflict between these groups foreshadowed the Seven Years’ War as they responded to the increasing social and geographic distance between Native peoples and Europeans.
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Warren demonstrates through both historical accounts and archeological records that a combination of tribal wars, Indigenous slavery, and disease was the reason that the Shawnee left their homelands and moved about the country, offering greater insight into the motivations of the Shawnee beyond Drake’s fairly simple notations of their movements and alliances with various peoples over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Europeans supplied guns to the Iroquois (Haudenosaunee) and other Indigenous nations, which upset the balance of power that had existed before European contact. Similarly, English desires for Indigenous slaves sparked, and then fueled, conflicts between these nations. The Shawnee had a long history in this culture of violence - first being displaced by the Haudenosaunee and others as previously noted and then acting at various points as traders, European guides, and mercenary warriors. Such violence and its attendant uncertainty began to affect the Shawnee and others in the seventeenth century and continued into Tecumseh’s life and beyond. Warren notes explicitly, “Tecumseh and his brother...Tenskwatawa, grew up amid Indian-white warfare that pushed the Shawnees from their land and debilitated Indian tribes across the Old Northwest.”

While there was violence, there was also some common ground forged between Indigenous people and European settlers in the Old Northwest. Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Indigenous peoples of this region were essential partners to the French and British empires through the fur trade. However, the early nineteenth century would mark the end of this
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relationship. Toward the end of Tecumseh’s life, the Shawnee and others were hemmed in by illegal American settlements on lands that had not yet been ceded by treaties, as was explored in the previous chapter. They were also confined on treaty lands, based on at least seven treaties made between 1795 and 1809. Those that had not yet ceded lands, again like the Shawnee, complained of overcrowding and poor hunting. By Tenskwatawa’s death in 1863 of natural causes, all of the states that now compose the Old Northwest would be incorporated into the United States due to treaty-based land cessions. These challenges caused Indigenous peoples to come up with their own solutions to these problems in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries: the end of the Fur Trade relationships, Indigenous land loss, and Indigenous-settler conflicts.

The Indigenous answer to these challenges was the rise of a string of both war leaders and religious leaders. These leaders blamed Indigenous misfortunes on an over-reliance on non-Indigenous settler ways of living, and called Indigenous people back to ways that were more aligned to their own cultural traditions, as well as creating the idea of pan-Indigenous identity. Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa then were some of the last of such prophets and warriors in a long-line of those calling for a return to more nativist ways, and just two among many of an even longer line of Indigenous leaders that resisted American settlement.

Such Indigenous leaders that preceded Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa included Mohawk Joseph Brant, who attempted to unite Indigenous peoples of the Great Lakes, and Alexander McGillivray, who attempted to unite the Creek. Both of these men sought such unification during
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the American Revolution. Pontiac led a Great Lakes confederacy that would include many of the peoples that Tecumseh would later unite, including the Shawnee. Tecumseh’s father was also involved in that confederacy. Just before Tecumseh’s rise to power Red Pole, Captain Johnny and Blue Jacket worked to create a large but tenuous confederacy of northwestern tribes to defend the Ohio country between the 1770s and 1790s. Late in the nineteenth century, the Hunkpapa Lakota leader and mystic Sitting Bull would attempt to create a confederacy to oppose the American movement toward the Rockies in the 1860s and 1870s.238

**Indigenous Holistic Perspective: Culture, Religion, and Life in Villages**

The peoples previously noted are often considered tribes. However, Richard White and Stephen Warren have called into question the notion of a unified “tribe” as the most helpful way to identify Indigenous people in the Old Northwest between the late seventeenth and early nineteenth centuries. White articulates an idea of villages with similar customs and cultures roughly based on Algonquin languages and beliefs, corroborating Drake’s analysis that the Shawnee were a part of broader Algonquin cultural and linguistic traditions.239 Warren offers a slightly more precise and nuanced analysis: “‘Being Shawnee’ depended less on political allegiance and more on language, gender, and the ritual practices that affirmed these cultural beliefs.”240 By Tecumseh’s time, the Shawnee had picked up both Iroquoian and Algonquin cultural traits, potentially due to their history of migrations. White threw the Shawnee in with many other peoples who occupied the Old Northwest between the 1640s and 1810s, creating a cultural agglomeration.241 However, other authors including Warren and Sugden, indicate that a distinctive Shawnee culture was present, even in villages of individuals from mixed Indigenous peoples.
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What the Shawnee did share, not only with their neighboring peoples in the Old Northwest but with many Indigenous peoples across North America in general, was a holistic philosophy that blended culture, religion, and daily life. Nearly every routine action had a spiritual aspect to it, making everyday living an act of perpetual worship. Annual festivals also took place that also coordinated with nature, such as the beginning of spring or the first corn harvest, that offered unique opportunities to give thanks to the particular spirits or manifestations most associated with those events and bring people into an even closer relationship with the divine. In part, it was a belief that they had somehow displeased Washaa Monetoo (The Great Spirit) that brought many of the Shawnee back to the Ohio valley in the mid-eighteenth century, a traditional homeland for them, to rekindle his favor after their fortunes had deteriorated following contact with American settlers. Concepts of time and place were similarly viewed holistically. Time was viewed cyclically which was reflected in numerous ways, from the seasons of nature to the span of human life. This cyclical idea was then reflected through Indigenous cultural practices, from the construction of a home to religious rituals or ceremonies.

*Tenskwatawa’s Rise to Power Through an Indigenous Perspective*

Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa had to reckon with the Indigenous perspectives previously noted if they were to gain power or standing among the Shawnee. Drake asserted that Tenskwatawa longed for power with the Shawnee or a larger group of Indigenous people who lived near each other and sometimes allied together in the Ohio Valley. Readings of both primary and secondary

sources indicate that if there was one commonality among the two brothers, it was one of keen observation and the ability to interpret and act on those observations.\textsuperscript{246} In this way, Tenskwatawa held a singular vision, coupled with observation of what was going on in his community, and saw an opportunity both for change and to gain power. Such observations included land loss, increases in alcoholism, and associated violence and poverty. This was likely a lens he turned on his own life.\textsuperscript{247} In general, the interconnection between power, religion, and lifestyle as it applied to the Shawnee is particularly relevant here. The issues of land loss, scarcer game, and alcoholism were also issuing that were both increasingly familiar and alarming to many Indigenous peoples and villages in the Old Northwest. When non-Indigenous scholars distinguish between Tenskwatawa’s religious leadership and political leadership, his Indigenous followers would not have drawn the same distinction.\textsuperscript{248} Therefore, one who grasped for power, like Tenskwatawa, could easily have seen a prophet's role as one that would open other doors. Recognizing common problems and a spiritual solution would allow him to gain influence over the multiple tribes that lived together in the Ohio Valley at the turn of the nineteenth century.

Tenskwatawa’s teachings were not new, but when his legacy is tied to that of his more famous brother, they are the most enduring of the Indigenous prophets who preached a gospel of pan-Indigenous unity and adherence to more traditionalist ways.\textsuperscript{249} If Tenskwatawa is viewed as an opportunist who used his observations to obtain power, these teachings become even more logical.\textsuperscript{250} It is important to briefly revisit his world to understand how each of these teachings played out for him. While the lives of Indigenous villages were in crisis, the suffering was not
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equal. Indigenous leaders who had fought in past wars between colonial powers got rich themselves due to their connections, but in many cases, they did not share those riches with their peoples.

In some cases, accommodationist Shawnee, like Black Hoof, had switched to non-Indigenous style farming with mono-crop agriculture and the use of a plow. With help from the Quakers, initially, the Shawnee prospered with large herds of animals and fields of corn. However, all this changed when Quaker assistance was removed. This episodic assistance by Americans and the combination of broken treaties and neighboring tribes that continued to live in poverty fueled Shawnee suspicions of the American government.  

Tenskwatawa’s specific teachings were full of denouncements of non-Indigenous practices and admonishments to return to nativist practices and traditions, including Indigenous cooperation. Pan-Indigenous unity was a concept that was central to Tenskwatawa’s religious system and Tecumseh’s life. Both brothers had seen how European colonial governments, and particularly the American government, had pitted individual tribes against each other, bribed tribal leaders with money and alcohol, and helped them sell lands that were not theirs. Both realized that the only way to stop such tactics was to band together. In particular, Tecumseh is known for pushing the notion that no further treaties should be made without the agreements of all the tribes.

Debunking Myths of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, Reinforcing Similarities

In his essay, “Tecumseh, The Shawnee Prophet, and American History: A Reassessment” (1983), R. David Edmunds has noted, “If white Americans could design an ‘ideal Indian,’ they
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would have designed Tecumseh. His concepts of political and military unifications under a centralized leadership appealed to whites because it was what they would have done.”\(^{254}\) While many myths have sprung up around the two brothers, two are explored here that further demonstrate their similarities and the Indigenous context in which they lived.\(^{255}\) The first of these is that only Tenskwatawa was a nativist. Drake and other biographers have sought to place a wedge between Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, as was explored in the first chapter, with Tenskwatawa portrayed as the wild savage. In contrast, Tecumseh was portrayed as the noble savage. In actuality, the brothers were more the same than different in their attitudes, which put them in conflict with older leaders who received more benefits from colonial powers, like the Shawnee leader Black Hoof.\(^{256}\) A part of this separation may be artificial. As Gregory Evans Dowd noted, non-Indigenous scholars have tended to put Indigenous prophets and Indigenous war leaders in two camps. This is particularly true of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa. However, the division is false if considered from an Indigenous perspective.\(^{257}\)

Similarly, Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa drew on the previous pan-Indigenous unity efforts advanced by other pairs of religious and war leaders. Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa were familiar with Pontiac and Neolin, the most recent pair of religious and war leaders before the two brothers. In Tecumseh’s travels to the south of modern Indiana, he was seeking to gather alliances from the Creek and Cherokee. He understood that reasoned persuasion was insufficient to fully appeal to Indigenous, particularly nativist, sensibilities. Tecumseh understood that a spiritual argument would have far greater resonance. With this in mind, Tecumseh traveled with another Shawnee
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prophet named Seekaboo to spread a message of religious revival and political alliance. The records on Seekaboo are sparse, but they indicate that he and Tecumseh were together successful in gaining Creek allies. Seekaboo stayed with the Creek in the south and helped them force the Americans to fight the War of 1812 on two fronts, both in the north with the Shawnee and their allies and in the south with the Creek Red Sticks. The Creeks also considered Tecumseh to be a holy man, and some even mistook him for Tenskwatawa. In a speech to the Creeks, Tecumseh advised them to throw away American implements and practices, kill livestock, and return to more nativist ways. Though Tecumseh emerged in the American record as the greater leader, particularly in letters between Governor William Henry Harrison and Secretary of War William Eustis, this did not mean that he eclipsed Tenskwatawa’s leadership among Indigenous followers in practice. Tenskwatawa preached a holistic message, mixing political, spiritual, and material messages. As one example of the brothers’ unity in leadership, while Tecumseh was known to be incensed by the Treaty of Fort Wayne in 1809, Tenskwatawa also spoke out against it in 1810.

The second myth concerns the extent of the brothers’ pan-Indigenous confederation. Using Drake as a sole source could lead one to believe that Tenskwatawa first united the Shawnee under his leadership and then other tribes, creating a vast community of believers and then a large pan-Indigenous army. From 1805, when Tenskwatawa had a spiritual vision and rose to power, Drake painted a picture of a quickly growing force of pan-Indigenous followers. It was not until 1809 that Drake noted the first instance of a tribe not convinced to join Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa. However, the truth is more nuanced. Warren notes that in Tecumseh’s father’s time, most of the
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estimated 3,000 Shawnee living in the Old Northwest emigrated on their own across the Mississippi before the rise of either brother, avoiding much of the conflict and changes that Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa witnessed. Only about 1,000 Shawnee were left in the Ohio Valley. Of these remaining, most of them followed the accommodationist leader Black Hoof, believing that if they lived like non-Indigenous people in terms of farming and treaty-making, they could prosper and live-in peace. It was only a small minority of militant Shawnee that followed Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa.263

Neighboring accommodationist leaders like Jean-Baptiste Richardville and Little Turtle rejected Tenskwatawa’s teachings as they had prospered through their colonial alliances, as had the Delaware (Lenape) and Wyandots. Between 1805 and 1811, Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa were only able to persuade forty Shawnee warriors to join their cause. Most of the brothers’ support came from the Kickapoos, Potawatomi, and Winnebago (Ho-Chunk) of Illinois and Wisconsin. These peoples were only beginning to experience the influx of settlement and had not had the same partnership experiences with Americans as their southern Indigenous neighbors.264 Starting with Drake, various Tecumseh biographers have also cast him as an Indigenous army general, galvanizing his troops through his vision and then commanding them in legions. As Dowd has rightly noted, based on the letters of Indiana Governor William Henry Harrison and Michigan Governor William Hull, “Harrison and Hull focused their energies on the commonality of belief and practice as described by the Shawnee Prophet rather than the diversity within the movement.”265 While Tecumseh may have coordinated forces in a way similar to a commanding officer in individual battles, such a command and control structure ran in stark contrast to
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principles of independence and freedom that were common to Indigenous people living in tribal
countries in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Tecumseh, Tenskwatawa, and the
pan-Indigenous movements' leaders before them struggled to balance tribal and village interests
with their overall goals.

Some Shawnee battled against the two brothers and their forces. Quatawapea (Captain John
Lewis) was a contemporary of Tecumseh. He allied with the Americans and actively fought against
Indigenous forces allied with Tecumseh in the War of 1812. Lewis signed the Treaty of Spring
Wells on September 8, 1815, that effectively ended the United States war with the Shawnee and
helped guide them to a new home on the Missouri-Arkansas border. Tenskwatawa’s religious
movement itself was also far less unified than authors like Drake’s might lead one to believe. Ottawa (Odawa) and Potawatomi supporters of Tenskwatawa ignored many of his’s teachings. In another case, Main Poc, an influential religious leader among the Potawatomi, allied with
Tenskwatawa and his religious movement, but disagreed with some of its tenants. While he helped
Tenskwatawa locate a new village at Prophetstown and grow his followers from a few hundred to
nearly a thousand, he also went against the teachings of Tenskwatawa by continuing to drink
alcohol and bucked The Prophet’s admonishment that all Indigenous people should live in peace
by waging war with the Osage on the western side of the Mississippi. While both brothers died
in the nineteenth century, the key elements they stood for, including adherence to nativist ways
and pan-Indigenous alliance building, would continue to resonate with Indigenous peoples and
forcefully re-emerge in the mid-twentieth century.

CHAPTER 4: TECUMSEH INSIDE OUT, OR A BIT OF UNFINISHED BUSINESS

If one finds oneself traveling along Highway 401 in Chatham-Kent County, Ontario, it is easy to locate a monument to Tecumseh and the Battle of the Thames based on a series of road signs that begin at the highway. The monument has its own history. In 1911, just before the bicentennial of the War of 1812, residents of Thamesville placed a granite boulder at the site of the Battle of the Thames both to commemorate the battle and to honor the place where Tecumseh fell. By 1924, a plaque was affixed to the boulder, formally announcing its significance. In 1960, a larger monument was erected with a longer description of Tecumseh, including his image. In 2014, following Canada’s sesquicentennial commemoration of the War of 1812, additional elements were added to the location. It now includes many historical panels that give descriptions of Tecumseh, Tenskwatawa, Prophetstown, and the War of 1812. An art installation was created adjacent to the panels. This installation includes a steel domed structure which incorporates several Indigenous clan symbols, including Tecumseh’s symbol – the panther. Chatham-born artist Gordon Reeve created this installation, “A Place of Many Grasses”. This public art piece takes its name from a variety of grasses from across North America and Indigenous lands that were planted at the site.

However, it is another part of Reeve’s art installation that scholars of Indigenous history, monuments, and memory may find most interesting. Surrounding the sculpture are a number of steel interpretive benches. From a distance, they appear to be benches where one could sit to view the larger sculpture from different angles and are easily missed and dismissed. Upon closer
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inspection, each bench is etched with written memories and reflections on Tecumseh's life from Indigenous people from across North America. Some of the reflections come from peoples close to Tecumseh both by heritage or geography: Delaware of Moraviantown, just a few minutes' drive from the site of the Battle of the Thames; Eastern Shawnee from Oklahoma – people that can trace their heritage back to the Ohio Valley, and to Tecumseh, and Tenskwatawa; and Great Lakes peoples like the Haudenosaunee and Ojibwe. There are also voices included from as far away as Plains Cree of Manitoba and the Zuni of New Mexico.

Figure 5: Steel Structure and Bench, “A Place of Many Grasses”
Sculptor: Gordon Reeve. 2015. Thamseville, ON
Courtesy of Gordon Reeve. Photographs by the author.
In an explanation of the sculpture and benches at an installation ceremony, Reeve stated that it was dedicated not only to Tecumseh but to all First Nations peoples. While this nomenclature is usually associated only with Indigenous people in Canada, Reeve refers to all Indigenous people in North America.\(^{273}\) The words of the Indigenous people on the installation from across the continent certainly bear this out. A skeptic may claim that Reeve handpicked these individuals because their statements aligned with his sculpture's vision. This is untrue. Reeve also left the benches unedited to “be certain these were not [a] white man’s words, but rather people telling the story they wished to tell as they wished to tell it.”\(^{274}\) Some offered glowing praises of Tecumseh and viewed his struggle as synonymous with millions of Indigenous peoples' struggles across the United States and Canada against colonial oppression. Ovide Mercredi, former National Chief of the Assembly of First Nations and Cree from Winnipeg Manitoba, succinctly stated, “Tecumseh understood it [belonging] to mean the survival of his people and their freedom to live on Mother Earth without oppression, displacement, or exploitation.” Odawa musician Barbara Croall, from the Georgian Bay area of Lake Huron, noted, “He [Tecumseh] only fought to keep our lands so that our people could still have a place to live and food to eat.” Greg Peters, Chief of the Delaware Nation at Moraviantown opined, “I have always believed that each of us holds the spirit of Tecumseh in our heart. That spirit is the love you feel for your people [your own Indigenous tribe or nation]; the willingness to fight for what’s right.”\(^{275}\)

However, not all voices only offered straightforward praise for Tecumseh. Rick Hill, Sr. A member of the Tuscarora Nation of the Six Nations Legacy Consortium in Ohsweken, stated,


\(^{274}\) Gordon Reeve, Correspondence with the author. November 22, 2020.

“Tecumseh was a complex character. Many did not like him. Many have made too much of him. There seems to be a need to define a single hero to symbolize our [Indigenous peoples] struggle.”

Ben Barnes, Second Chief of the Shawnee Tribe, offers an even more complex and interesting estimation of Tecumseh, as well as Tenskwatawa:

My hope is that the people who come here remember that Tecumseh was just a man; a father, a son, a brother, a Shawnee leader. Too often, we create a mythic figure of him. He came about during a time when leaders had tried and failed to find solutions in dealing with the violent displacement of their families and forced removal from their territories. He was, like many young people today, a severely disaffected youth tired of seeing infighting amongst his own people and the waffling back and forth of elder statemen, like Blackhoof, about supporting either the British or the Americans…You cannot speak of Tecumseh’s ascent to leadership without discussing his brother. They were two sides of the same coin. While Tenskwatawa, The Prophet, was gathering many people to his “sermons” about a return to Native ways, Tecumseh was espousing armed uprisings and a coalition of nations…Like Tecumseh, thousands of young men, and not just Shawnees, were angry and they coalesced under his leadership. He realized the only solution was to stand together, to rally as a League of Nations. It is safe to say that he assumed the “mantle” of war chief because others saw him as “that man that can get it done.” That is how I hope he is remembered.

The legacies of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa among Indigenous people have endured from just after the brothers’ lifetimes to the present. As demonstrated in the previous description of the Tecumseh monument, particularly in the quote from Barnes, Indigenous peoples have celebrated Tenskwatawa just as they have celebrated Tecumseh. The reasons for Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa’s enduring legacies with Indigenous peoples are many. Richard White has noted that Tecumseh’s life unfolded at the end of the “middle ground” period. By the close of the nineteenth century, Indigenous reservations would be established across the United States and Canada, and large-scale armed conflict between Indigenous peoples and American forces had
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While this was an end to armed resistance, it did not mean that it was an end to conflict. These were experiences that began as early as the eighteenth century and extends into the present. This “continuum of violence,” as some political geographers have termed it, is still a present reality for Indigenous peoples in both countries and has been since before the time of both Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa.

Additionally, Tecumseh and Tenskwatawà’s lives and the aims they were seeking to achieve embodies Indigenous peoples' experiences in both the United States and Canada. This is particularly true for the teachings of Tenskwatawa. Cave has summed up Tenskwatawà’s teachings most succinctly:

The Prophet’s movement, as it evolved from 1806 onward, had three major thrusts: the revitalization of Native-American communal life everywhere through the elimination of practices offensive to the Great Spirit and the institution of new rituals to win his support; the establishment of a new, separatist community free of corruption; and finally the forging of a pan-Indian alliance to protect Indian lands from further white encroachments.

These three themes are particularly helpful in summary, but there is one term that is worth questioning here. That is Cave’s use of the term separatist. What may be more accurate here would simply be the term separate. This is validated through the account by Tenskwatawà’s disciple the Trout, as he was relaying the Prophet’s teachings to other Indigenous peoples in May, 1807:

“…The Whites I placed on the other side of the Great Lake, that they might be a separate people – to them I gave different manners, customs, animals, vegetables, etc. for their use…”

The difference between the two being that separatist implies a threat of breaking away from a larger
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283 *Michigan Historical Collections v. 40*. Speech of Le Maigouis, 129.
body, whereas separate here simply means the ability to live different lifestyles. With this correction then, these three themes were particularly evident through the second era of pan-Indigenous unity in the Indigenous Civil Rights Movements in both the United States (1960s and 70s) and Canada (late 1960s – 1980s). The American Indian Movement in the United States influenced such movements in both countries, and, like Tenskwatawa’s origins, it was, first and foremost, a spiritual movement. The Movement explicitly noted that it took the teachings of Tecumseh, and Tenskwatawa by extension, around pan-Indigenous unity and the opposition of the exploitation of Indigenous lands as a guide for their efforts.284

Revitalization of Native American Communal Life

Indigenous activists, including Hank Adams and Vine Deloria Jr. in the United States and Howard Adams in Canada, have decried the denegation of Indigenous cultural norms, religious beliefs and traditions, and language by the dominant societies in both countries that echo the losses that Tenskwatawa raised. These individuals, and others, have noted a long history of the illegality of certain religious practices and the speaking of Indigenous languages. These were compounded by practices of boarding schools in both countries that sought to destroy all aspects of Indigeneity in individuals and peoples.285

In particular, Adams was often the hand and mind behind the scenes, guiding the Indigenous Civil Rights movement in the United States. In testimony with United States Senators on the Select Committee on Indian Affairs in 1976, Adams sought to describe how geography intersected with Indigenous identity and broader issues of Indigenous sovereignty. He argued that
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an Indigenous person retained their ethnicity even if they moved from the reservation of their birth
or heritage to another reservation, and that one’s identity should not solely be tied to treaties that
allocated land to one’s ancestors.\footnote{David E. Wilkins, ed., \textit{The Hank Adams Reader: An Exemplary Native Activist and the Unleashing of Indigenous Sovereignty} (Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 2011), 232-41.} Adams also authored one of the best examples of the call for
these issues in the Twenty Point Position Paper, as written in 1972 and adopted in conjunction
with the March on Washington as a part of the Red Power Movement. The first nine of the twenty
points address treaty violations by the United States federal government and lay out several
different remedies for past and present violations. Deloria Jr. worked closely with Adams and
summed these up as follows:

…the points outlined a fairly sophisticated understanding of the type of relationship with the federal
government that could best be defined as a quasi-protectorate status. It would have severely limited the
arbitrary exercise of power by the federal government over the rights of the tribes. Most of all, the acceptance
of the Twenty Points would have meant that the treaties which the United States had signed with the
respective tribes a century earlier would have the rightful, legal status which they deserved, equal to the legal
status accorded foreign treaties.\footnote{Deloria, Jr., \textit{Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties}, 51}

The tenth point addresses the creation of a permanent 110-million-acre Indigenous land
base that would be divided among Indigenous nations.\footnote{Steltenkamp, \textit{The Sacred Vision}, 86.; Carmody and Carmody, \textit{Native American Religions}, 6, 9.} This is important as it draws attention to
the interconnected nature of land, lifeways, and culture. It would particularly resonate with
nativists. It also sought to enable Indigenous ownership and benefits from the natural resources on
reservation lands as “a beneficial method of consolidating useable land, water, forests, fisheries,
and other exploitable and renewable natural resources into productive economic, cultural or other
community-purpose units, benefiting both individual and tribal interests in direct forms under
autonomous control of properly defined, appropriate levels of Indian Government.”\footnote{“Trail of Broken Treaties 20-Point Position Paper” Point 10-B. American Indian Movement, accessed 27
Like other civil rights movements, the desires, demands, and grievances of Indigenous people in North America are encapsulated in specific signature works. The two that have become the hallmarks of the movements are Vine Deloria Jr.’s *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (1969) in the United States, and Howard Adams, *Prison of Grass: Canada from a Native Point of View* (1975). Deloria covered a broad range of Indigenous issues, and was commonly acclaimed as a critical leader in the United States Indigenous Rights Movement. In his introduction, he laid out the challenges that Indigenous people in the United States have had overall with stereotypes, which resonates with the experiences of historians who have attempted to separate myth from reality regarding Tecumseh:

Because people can see right through us, it becomes impossible to tell truth from fiction or fact from mythology. Experts paint us as they would like us to be. Often we have to paint ourselves as we wish we were or as we might have been. The more we try to be ourselves the more we are forced to defend what we have never been. The American public feels most comfortable with the mythical Indians of stereotype-land who were always THERE. These Indians are fierce, they wear feathers and grunt…To be an Indian in modern American society is in a very real sense to be unreal and ahistorical.

Deloria spent a fair amount of time on treaties, noting that the United States had broken all of them and that as early as 1832 in the Supreme Court case, *Worcester v. Georgia*, any early hopes of Indigenous peoples being treated as equals by Americans were quickly dashed. Deloria highlighted that rather than making and keeping such treaties in good faith, the American government has largely made and interpreted treaties as it suited it - particularly a string of treaties made during the War of 1812 - to ensure tribal allegiances to the United States. The combination of broken treaties and unequal treatment resulted in Indigenous poverty. Deloria also explored
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the different philosophical foundations of post-Enlightenment Christianity to Indigenous tribal understandings of religion and Christianity’s place in complicity with American politics, depriving Indigenous people of freedom, traditions, and resources. Unsurprisingly, Deloria drew the same conclusions about Indigenous use of European mono-crop agriculture as did Tecumseh, Tenskwatawa, and those exploring the creation of the wild and noble savage stereotypes. He stated, “Practically all subsequent legislation has revolved around the Congressional desire to make Indians into white farmers. Most laws passed to administer Indian lands and property have reflected the attitude that, since Indians have not become successful white farmers, it is perfectly correct to take their land away and give it to another who will conform to Congressional wishes.”

Canada’s answer to some of the issues and questions raised by Deloria can be seen in Adams’ work. Adams echoed many of the critiques raised by Delora Jr. and other members of the American Indian Movement. He decried the isolation that reserves had caused, making it difficult for Indigenous Canadian nations to compare problems or unite to make changes. He was similarly critical of Canadian practices in agriculture, which largely mirrored those in the United States. Indigenous agricultural practices were mainly micro-managed, and a small number of Indigenous people received special treatment to illustrate sham farm viability. He disparaged the treatment of Indigenous people as second-class citizens due to being seen as wild savages. Adams noted that Indigenous people had no control over the presentation of their history and that non-Indigenous policies and practices had created poverty in Indigenous communities. Offering resources to Indigenous people who held accommodationist views, in line with broader Canadian
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society, and pitting them against those who held more traditional Indigenous views was also observed.  

Establishment of Separate Community Free of Corruption

In their respective works, Deloria spoke of sovereignty, and Adams referenced liberation, but the underlying concept was the same. Sovereignty is a tricky and fraught term when discussing Indigenous communities. Jeremy Webber does a good job of demystifying sovereignty by offering four definitions in his chapter “We are Still in the Age of Encounter: Section 35 and a Canada Beyond Sovereignty” in the book From Recognition to Reconciliation: Essays on the Constitutional Entrenchment of Aboriginal and Treaty Rights (2016). While written from a Canadian point of view, Webber’s assessment is applicable to the United States as well. Of his four definitions of sovereignty, it is the third, sovereignty as the originating source of law, that is most applicable to the teachings of Tenskwatawa as well as the critiques of Adams and Deloria. Webber notes, “…sovereignty can refer to the idea that law and the associated governmental rights originate from within the particular people’s traditions. They have their own autochthonous origin, their own autochthonous legitimacy; they are not the result of a grant of authority from another entity…” This definition becomes even clearer when it is applied, as in the Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, Vol. 2, “For many Aboriginal people, this is perhaps the most basic definition of sovereignty – the right to know who and what you are. Sovereignty is the natural right of all human beings to define, sustain, and perpetuate their identities as individuals, communities, and nations.” This was also addressed in the Twenty Point Paper, which
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recommended that tribal government accountability moves from their relationship with the United States federal government to that of the Indigenous people that they directly governed.\footnote{304} The concepts of Indigenous sovereignty and a separate community are closely interlinked. Deloria recounted an anecdote that illustrates this linkage: “someone asked Alex Chasing Hawk, a council member of the Cheyenne River Sioux for thirty years, ‘Just what do you Indians want?’ Alex replied, ‘A leave-us-alone law.’”\footnote{305}

A significant sub-set of sovereignty and self-determination deals with agriculture and natural resource usage. Of all Tenskwatawa’s admonishments, the one against the use of European style agriculture seems to have been one of the most vindicated, in part due to early signs. While Thomas Jefferson had visions of making Indigenous people model Americans through their emulation of the yeoman farmer, Jefferson’s vision was flawed even when he was alive. Successful farmers needed not only the fallow ground but modern technology of plows and other implements. They needed access to nearby markets and mills to make a profit.\footnote{306} Through treaty negotiations, including with the Shawnee, Delaware (Lenape), Wyandotte, and others, Indigenous people were removed to lands that were not conducive to agriculture west of the Mississippi. Even peoples who were not removed but were able to establish reservations in their home territories were often removed to lands that were still not conducive to growing crops. In either case, combinations of broken promises regarding supplying Indigenous people with agricultural implements, or the cash to buy them, and the remoteness of reservations did not set Indigenous people in the United States
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up for success as non-Indigenous style farmers.\textsuperscript{307} A very similar story played out in Canada.\textsuperscript{308} Subsequent policies and practices by the United States and Canada's federal governments made it nearly impossible for Indigenous nations to create thriving agricultural bases. Allotment policies removed Indigenous lands from being commonly held by tribes and broke them up, placing parcels under individual Indigenous people's control. This allowed excess land to be sold to non-Indigenous buyers or allowed individuals to sell their newly acquired lands for goods or cash. This policy shrunk treaty land bases by eighty percent in both the United States and Canada.\textsuperscript{309}

\textit{Forging Pan-Indian Alliance to Protect Indian Lands from Further White Encroachment}

Through the civil rights movements in both the United States and Canada, Indigenous people found that they would be more effective in calling for reforms by banding together.\textsuperscript{310} Notable among these, for their achievements and membership sizes, is the Assembly of First Nations in Canada and the National Congress of the American Indian in the United States.\textsuperscript{311} When the National Congress of the American Indians (NCAI) was formed in 1944 in opposition to the United States Termination Policy, members noted the following in the preamble to their constitution:

\begin{quote}
We, the members of Indian and Alaska Native tribes of the United States of America, invoking the Divine guidance of Almighty God in order to secure to ourselves and our descendants the rights and benefits of the traditional laws of our people to which we are entitled under the laws of the United States, and the several states thereof; to enlighten the public toward the better understanding of Indian people; to preserve the rights under Indian treaties or agreements with the United States…\textsuperscript{312}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{311} Dickason, \textit{Canada’s First Nations}. 328.; Deloria, Jr., \textit{Custer Died for Your Sins}. 17, 75.

The Assembly of First Nations had an even more expansive view. National Chief Phil Fontaine reflected on its’ achievements in a Confederation of Nations meeting on December 9, 1999:

We’ve reached beyond our borders in our efforts to establish our own presence, our own significant presence in the business of nation-states throughout the world. Last summer in Vancouver we had a historic gathering of tribal leaders from the United States meeting with First Nations leaders in Canada. For the first time in 60 years. This is clear recognition that in our struggles to achieve what is ours…rightfully ours, that we need to reach out beyond our borders, to reach out to indigenous peoples in all parts of the world. And the protocol of kinship and cooperation that we signed with the National Congress of American Indians is a historic and important document because it presents us an opportunity, a wonderful opportunity to go into the new millennium with a new spirit of cooperation with our brothers and sisters in the United States, and as a next step very soon convene a world congress of indigenous peoples that would build on the principles that would guide the future relationships of tribal leaders in the United States with First Nations leaders in Canada. And so clearly, all of what we’re doing here is setting the stage for First Nations in the new millennium.313

Land Use and Livelihoods Conflicts

When Tenskwatawa’s disciple the Trout sought to convert Indigenous people to the Prophet’s new religion, he was speaking about a return from American settler ways to more Indigenous methods of making a living. The Trout is noted as having said, “To them [Americans] I gave different manners, customs, animals, vegetables, etc. for their use…. You are not to keep any of these Animals, nor to eat their meat – To you I have given the Deer, the Bear, and all wild animals. And the fish that swim in the River, and the Corn that grows in the fields for your own use…”314 What Tenskwatawa and the Trout were pointing to here were not merely an admonishment to turn to older Indigenous ways. They were also pointing to the fundamental difference in Indigenous and American settler perceptions on the proper ways to use the land to make a living. When Tenskwatawa told his followers to return to Indigenous ways of procuring food, he would have meant a return to co-planting crops. This would have particularly meant corn,
beans, and squash planted together in the “three sisters” style. This ingenious method of agriculture was used by Indigenous peoples for hundreds of years, particularly in the Eastern Woodlands. While corn is a nitrogen-hungry plant, the soil is kept fertile by the influx of nitrogen from the beans. Squash or pumpkins also tend to keep weeds from choking out the plants, while the beans use the corn stalks as a natural lattice for their runners. When these practices were combined with burning underbrush, which was also a common practice for the Shawnee, farming was even more effective in growing crops in the nutrient-rich soil left behind by the controlled burns.\textsuperscript{315}

Several sources indicate Indigenous agriculture in this way. Jortner notes that Indigenous agriculture did not look like non-Indigenous settlers expected to find it. Harvested vegetables made up most of the diet of the Shawnee and that of many other peoples east of the Mississippi.\textsuperscript{316} Their fields or gardens were composed of corn, beans, and squash in miles of plots within the forest instead of neat rows of crops on tilled lands.\textsuperscript{317} The most compelling account, though, is a quote from the journal of Ensign William Schillinger on July 23, 1813. Schillinger was out for a leisurely ride on his horse when he stopped at the Shawnee town of Wapakoneta. The residents of the town were friendly to the Americans, so Schillinger had little to fear. He observed a mass of “vines, such as Pumpkins, Water & Musk mellons, cucumbers, beens [sic] of various kinds, growing among their corn which was planted without any kind of order.”\textsuperscript{318} Indigenous people, including the Shawnee, similarly managed forest ecosystems so that game animals would be available but would balance out both crops and each other.\textsuperscript{319} Some of this balance had been thrown off by the
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Fur Trade's economic pressures, but memories of such a balance were maintained by village elders.\footnote{White, *Middle Ground*, 46-8.}

These modes of Indigenous livelihood went against American understandings of the “proper” way to make a living. The origins of such European ideas can be traced back to English philosopher John Locke. In Section 34 of his *Second Treatise of Government*, he notes:

God gave the world to men in common, but since he gave it to them for their benefit and the greatest conveniences of life they were capable to draw from it, it cannot be supposed he meant it should always remain common and uncultivated. He gave it to the use of the industrious and rational, (and labor was to be his title to it;) not to the fancy or covetousness of the quarrelsome and contentious. He that had as good left for his improvement, as was already taken up, needed not complain, ought not to meddle with what was already improved by another’s labour….

It was this observation of Locke’s that led Americans to the belief that the only proper use of lands was through private property, farming, and agriculture. Intersecting with the second chapter’s emphasis on the Doctrine of Discovery, by extension lands that were not being used in this way, were wasted. It was a common American belief that such waste should be dealt with by removing Indigenous people from these lands to be replaced with settlers.\footnote{Tawil, *Making of Racial Sentiment*, 134.} Locke’s views also bolstered Thomas Jefferson’s opinion that if Indigenous people lived on lands in the United States, they should become farmers and private property owners in the settler model.\footnote{Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization*, 67-8; Wallace. *Jefferson and the Indians*, 234-5, 2413-5.}

CONCLUSION

The issues of conflict and misunderstanding, particularly those around land ownership and use, that Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa wrestled with are the same ones that Indigenous people continue to wrestle with into the present. Little had changed in terms of the grievances and negative experiences of Indigenous peoples concerning those of Western European descent and their respective national governments in the United States and Canada. This truth extended from Tenskwatawa’s later life on a Kansas reservation in the 1820s and 1830s through to the experiences of many Indigenous individuals on both sides of the border through the 1970s and 1980s and into the present.324

However, over the past thirty years in Canada and forty years in the United States, the tide has begun to shift. Federal government policies and practices in both countries led to acknowledging wrongdoing and attempting to approach Indigenous people as closer to equal than inferior.325 In turn, Indigenous entities and nations have blossomed in their attempts to preserve or resurrect cultural, linguistic, and lifeway traditions. This, too, represents the legacy of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, and the realization of their desires for Indigenous peoples to be viewed as equals to their non-Indigenous neighbors.326 These efforts are a start, not a full realization of the brothers’ vision. It is worth returning to two themes of Cave’s analysis of Tenskwatawa’s teachings to

326 It could also be argued that this is the legacy of other combinations of prophets and warriors as opposed specifically to Tecumseh’s. However, as was explored in the first chapter, the two brothers are better known and remembered than these others, and it is therefore easier to draw a line of continuity of their legacy into the present as opposed to that of others. Tecumseh’s closest rival in legacy is Pontiac, but between literature and monuments, Pontiac comes in second. For other prophets, see Dowd, Spirited Resistance, 1. For commentary on Pontiac’s legacy, see Sayre, Indian Chief as Tragic Hero, 126.
explore this manifestation of their vision by the United States and Canadian federal governments: establishing separate communities free of corruption and the revitalization of Indigenous communal life.\footnote{Cave, “The Shawnee Prophet,” 644.}

**Establishment of Separate Community Free of Corruption**

While there had been a precedent of some wins by Indigenous people in Supreme Court cases in both the United States and Canada, the number of those cases that Indigenous people have won in the past forty years has significantly accelerated in both countries, particularly in the United States. Increasing numbers of nations have successfully filed land claims for additional territory or achieved recognized Indigenous status. In the area of Pointe Pelee, Ontario, a band of Ojibway people known as the Caldwell First Nation that were displaced from that area in the 1960s had been awarded $105 million in 2010 to reestablish their reserve in a place of their choosing in southern Essex County.\footnote{CBC News “Caldwell First Nation Approves Land Claims Offer” 23 August 2010. Accessed 3 December 2019. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/windsor/caldwell-first-nation-approves-land-claim-offer-1.975428.} More importantly, in recent times, courts in the United States and Canada have begun to recognize Indigenous ceremonies, oral traditions, and songs as evidence that people once inhabited a particular place.\footnote{Patrick Macklem and Douglass Sanderson, “Introduction: Recognition and Reconciliation in Indigenous-Settler Societies,” in *From Recognition to Reconciliation: Essays on the Constitutional Entrenchments of Aboriginal and Treaty Rights*, ed. Patrick Macklem and Douglass Sanderson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), 1-14. 4.; Michael Asch, *On Being Here to Stay: Treaties and Aboriginal Rights in Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division, 2014). 79-85.; Deloria, Jr., *Behind the Trail of Broken Treaties*. 50-1}

Canada has also made a significant attempt at advancing Indigenous sovereignty through its agreement with the Inuit in Nunavut. In 1993, the Government of Canada and a portion of the Inuit population made a legal settlement that resulted in creating the Nunavut Territory, which was then carved out of the Northwest Territory in 1999.\footnote{Natalia Loukacheva. “From Recognition to Reconciliation: Nunavut and Self-Reliance – An Arctic Entity in Transition,” in *From Recognition to Reconciliation: Essays on the Constitutional Entrenchment of Aboriginal and Treaty Rights*, eds. Patrick Macklem and Douglass Sanderson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), 391.} When the negotiation process began,
Nunavut was to comprise roughly one-fifth of Canada’s overall landmass, and the 35,000 residents were to receive $580 million in cash over fourteen years. Through the settlement, this would be the first territorial unit in Canada with an Indigenous majority and was slated to have specific constitutional and political developments favoring the Inuit. Unfortunately, Nunavut, as a sovereign and self-sustaining territory, is still a work in progress. Since 2006, an organization representing the 1993 beneficiaries of the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement has been suing the government of Canada for breach of contract.

Perhaps the most encouraging pieces involved in creating a new middle ground deal with the intertwined Truth Commission and Inquest on Missing and Murdered Women and Girls in Canada which points to valuing Indigenous peoples and cultures in a new way. Through the Truth Commission, Canada's government acknowledged its wrongs in seeking to erase the culture of millions of Indigenous people through government-run boarding schools and created the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement in 2007. The Truth Commission can make sweeping and significant changes to the treatment of Indigenous people by the Canadian government. Ninety-two “Calls to Action” have resulted from the Truth Commission’s findings. Several of these are worth highlighting here. The most significant is a call for full implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a framework to reconcile the long-standing conflicts between Indigenous people and those of Western European heritage. Another calls for reopening of treaty agreements based on principles of “mutual respect, and shared
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responsibility for maintaining those relationships into the future.”⁵³³ Still, another calls for the “repudiation of concepts used to justify European sovereignty over Indigenous peoples and lands.”⁵³⁷ The reconciliation process of the Truth Commission also included an apology from then Prime Minister Stephen Harper.⁵³⁸ Part of the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement that has resulted from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission has allocated a minimum of $1.9 billion for common experience payments to students that lived at Indigenous residential schools. This amounts to $10,000 per residential school student for the first year attended and $3,000 for each additional year to address the trauma and cultural eradication that was the common practice of such schools.⁵³⁹ In their negotiations leading up to the settlement, Indigenous leaders have sought to frame it in a broader context. They argued that not only individual wrongs, but also collective and cultural wrongs should also be addressed. Their main reason for this is that the residential schools’ primary goal was to extinguish Indigenous culture and language.⁵⁴⁰ Not all Indigenous people have benefitted from the settlement directly, and there is an additional $125 million set aside for community healing projects. Some, like Courtney Jung, remain skeptical of the fidelity of the effort, as she noted in her essay “Walls and Bridges: Competing Agendas in Transitional Justice” in the book From Recognition to Reconciliation: Essays on the Constitutional Entrenchment of Aboriginal and Treaty Rights (2106).⁵⁴¹ At the same time, the settlement results are beginning to manifest through the institutions and lives of Canadians in the dominant society. In Ontario, the province has changed its regulations for how it deals with Indigenous youth in
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⁵³⁸ Jung, “Walls and Bridges,” 358.
⁵³⁹ Ibid. 368-72.
⁵⁴⁰ Ibid. 369.
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Based on studies from Statistics Canada, from 1980 to 2015, Indigenous women made up nearly one-quarter of all homicide victims in Canada. However, Indigenous females comprise only four percent of Canada’s overall population.\footnote{344}{National Inquiry. “Our Women and Girls are Sacred.” 7-8.}

Outcomes for Indigenous women are little better in the United States. In some counties, murder rates of Indigenous women are ten times higher than the national average, and overall rates of sexual assault and rape are higher than either African American or white women.\footnote{345}{Bachman et al., “Violence Against American Indian and Alaska Native Women.” 5-6.} In Canada, the Inquest on Missing and Murdered Women and Girls in Canada addressed this issue. In Canada, while the National Inquiry is still in the process of gathering testimony and data, it anticipates making recommendations, including compensation for family members and survivors, as well as law and policy changes. In the meantime, the Inquest has called for implementing all the recommended “Calls to Action” from the Truth Commission, particularly those about Indigenous women and
children. It has also called for full implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and full compliance with a Canadian Human Rights Tribunal from 2016. The tribunal found that Canada was racially discriminating against many Indigenous children.\(^{346}\) The United States is taking a first step in following suit. In November 2019, Attorney General William Bar announced the creation of The Presidential Task Force on Missing and Murdered American Indians and Alaska Natives. This task force would provide “a more coordinated law enforcement response to [Indigenous women and girls] missing persons cases.”\(^{347}\)

**Revitalization of Indigenous Communal Life**

The federal governments of both the United States and Canada have similarly recognized the validity of Indigenous practices, which were formerly illegal or were overseen by non-Indigenous government agents or contractors. In the United States, such changes have taken place in three specific areas: Indigenous control of federal services for Indigenous people, protections of Indigenous culture and community, and Indigenous control of natural resources and economic development.\(^{348}\) As a result, while Indigenous peoples in the United States still fare worse than most of the rest of the nation’s populace, improvements have been made. In the 1970s, when these legislative changes began to occur, Indigenous nations only controlled 1.5 percent of the service delivery and administration to their peoples. Today, they control more than half of that sector.\(^{349}\)

Though a contentious issue that does not benefit all Indigenous nations equally, Indigenous gaming is an example of where Indigenous economic control has benefited Indigenous nations and
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\(^{349}\) Ibid. 480.
surrounding communities. It had grown from a $200 million industry in 1988 to over $25 billion in net income in 2011. Gaming revenues have allowed some Indigenous nations to create other enterprises, including hotels, restaurants, and retail, amounting to more than an additional $3 billion. Perhaps most importantly, gaming and non-gaming operations support 346,000 jobs and pay $12 billion in wages to employees. These employment opportunities and the tangential economic and regional benefits are assets to both Indigenous peoples and the Americans who live in surrounding communities. 350 Similar accomplishments have been made in Canada. Over thirty years, from 1969 to 1999, the number of Indigenous people attending post-secondary institutions jumped from eighty to 27,000. Twenty thousand small businesses were owned and managed by Indigenous people throughout the country. In one case, in Fort McMurray, Alberta, a national corporation, conducted 60 million dollars’ worth of business with Indigenous businesses in that region. This resulted in the employment of 1,000 Indigenous people. Indigenous people have started their own television network, the Aboriginal Peoples Television Network, and are enacting their own environmental protections. They have secured two billion dollars in additional funding from the Government of Canada in sectors including health and job training. 351

The Rise of Global Pan-Indigeneity, and Questions and Answers of Memory

The struggles for sovereignty and the ability to practice nativist ways not only apply to Indigenous people in North America but have resonated more broadly across the globe since at least 1982. 352 Former leader of the Liberal Party of Canada Michael Ignatieff put it well when he noted,

…I want to situate the discussion in what should be called the Indigenous “international.” Estimates vary, but there are 350 million people around the world who self-identify as Indigenous people and who identify with similar peoples around the globe. Over the past twenty years, this sense of belonging to an Indigenous identity that is both local and global has been strengthened by the shared struggle to secure the United Nations

350 Ibid. 498.
Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. In the process, Indigenous peoples everywhere came to understand that they share common battles. Indigenous peoples have pressed for the right to benefit from economic development on their lands; they have sought protection for cultural and linguistic rights; and, above all, they have insisted on recognition of their historical place in the founding narratives of their countries.

It is also worth noting the context of these words. When the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was passed in 2007 by the United Nations General Assembly, four nations opposed it: Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States. These four countries have some of the most troubled histories with their Indigenous populations, partially born out through this work on Canada and the United States. It would take until 2010 when President Barack Obama acknowledged the Declaration in the United States, and Canada officially adopted it in 2016.

Just as Indigenous women of Canada and the United States have found that the justice system has often turned a blind eye to their abuse and murder, the Maori people have found common cause with the African American community in the wake of George Floyd’s murder by law-enforcement officers in the United States, citing harsher policing tactics used against their communities than against the rest of the populace. African American, North American Indigenous, or Maori, their global experiences bear out as “less than” compared to colonists of European heritage. Renowned Indigenous scholar Phillip Deloria has similarly noted in a recent review of Peter Cozzens’ new book on Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, *Tecumseh and the Prophet:*
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354 “United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.”


The Shawnee Brothers Who Defied a Nation (2020), “In 1811 the Shawnee leader Tecumseh, anticipating the movements of Scott and Floyd, departed the Ohio Country and journeyed two thousand miles across the South, seeking to recruit tribes to a Native confederacy able to withstand the land hunger of the United States.”357

Such awareness-raising by Deloria, the Maori, or African Americans, is understandable. However, it is also a part of an old trope that puts the burden of addressing histories of racism and discrimination on those that most often experience it.358 As the United States considers its larger memory and memory-making project through the removal of Confederate statuary and sites to help rectify the horrors of slavery, should the nation go further to rectify the history of genocide and cultural depredations experienced by Indigenous people?359 Should such statues of President Andrew Jackson in Washington DC and New Orleans also be questioned and possibly torn down, due to Jackson’s position as the figure most closely associated with both “Indian hating” and “Indian murder”?360 Should statues of Thomas Jefferson include an accompanying panel that notes his complex history in dealings with Indigenous peoples as well as African slaves? Some efforts are being made to address the deaths of African American men like George Floyd at the hands of law enforcement in connection with longer histories of civil rights efforts and discriminatory practices against this racial community.361

Perhaps once again, the United States can take a cue from its Canadian neighbor, considering the recent creation of an 1812 monument in Windsor, Ontario by sculptor Mark Williams, depicting both Tecumseh and General Brock, or the Tecumseh monument in Thamseville discussed in the previous chapter. Placing such a statue in Windsor’s Sandwich neighborhood makes sense as the historical records demonstrate that Brock and Tecumseh worked together there, particularly leading up to the capture of Fort Detroit and the surrounding town on August 16, 1812. While there is skepticism around myths of a Tecumseh-Brock friendship, there is no doubt that the two were allies. As the statue depicts, both have come to be considered Canadian heroes of the War of 1812. This statue and Reeves’ recent installation at the place of Tecumseh’s death, as discussed in the previous chapter, bear striking similarities as projects, likely due to their recent creation. These two pieces, one that places Brock and Tecumseh on equal footing and the other, depicting both Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, represent an invitation to consider a new interpretation of Indigenous-settler history in North America. They demonstrate how Indigenous people, in general, and Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa in particular, continue to have a visible place in history and memory-making. Monuments like these challenge the notion

363 Ibid. 300, 304, 308.
of Indigenous extinction and advance a conversation toward understanding Indigenous people in their own context.

Figure 6: Tecumseh and General Isaac Brock Statue. Old Sandwich Town Roundabout – Windsor, ON. Sculpted by: Mark Williams. 2018. Courtesy of Mark Williams and The City of Windsor. Photograph by the author.
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Tecumseh has been hailed as the most famous Indigenous leader in the United States and Canada. Many scholars have bemoaned the difficulty in separating man from myth. One thing is clear: there could be no Tecumseh without his brother Tenskwatawa. It was Tenskwatawa who first had a religious awakening that birthed a spiritual movement. It was Tenskwatawa who was the first leader of this pan-Indigenous group of followers. Tecumseh’s leadership would not emerge until nearly six years later. In the many works on Tecumseh, Tenskwatawa’s story can be easily found. However, he is nearly always portrayed as less important and easily forgotten. This thesis seeks to answer two fundamental questions. Are Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa remembered differently because they were dissimilar? Why does Tecumseh’s legacy endure among Americans, Canadians, and Indigenous people (and by extension Tenskwatawa’s) when so many other Indigenous leaders in North America have been forgotten?

This work argues that the two brothers only appear different when they are viewed out of context, through a colonialist lens. When they are viewed in context, from an Indigenous perspective, they are far more the same than different. This work also demonstrates that the legacies of the two brothers endure due to their intersection with formative periods and people in the early nineteenth century in the nation-building projects in the United States and Canada, with
elements and individuals from that period still being commemorated today. The ideas, policies, and laws that intersected with the lives of the two brothers continue to have a bearing on the present as well, particularly in regard to Indigenous-settler relations in both countries.
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