Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 2018, Vol. 54, No. 1: 84–102.
C William Alanson White Institute of Psychiatry, Psychoanalysis & Psychology and the William Alanson White Psychoanalytic Society
ISSN: 0010-7530 print / 2330-9091 online
DOI: 10.1080/00107530.2017.1415106

SUE GRAND, Ph.D

THE OTHER WITHIN: WHITE SHAME, NATIVE-AMERICAN GENOCIDE

Abstract. In this article, the author asks about the genocidal history of the United States, and the forms of reparation and recognition that can be found in white racial shame and white racial guilt. Examining the history of white supremacy in the United States, the author queries the differential practices of twin racial regimes: African-American slavery and the extermination of Indigenous peoples. Because of these differential practices of persecution, the "vanished Indian" will enter white psychoanalysis through the evocation of "creative racial shame"; whereas African-American slavery has entered that psychoanalysis through depressive white guilt. Much as psychoanalysis has distinguished pathological guilt from the depressive guilt that leads to reparation and remorse, the author distinguishes pathological shame from a creative form of shame that allows us to see the Other whom whiteness has vanished.

Keywords: white supremacy, genocide, trauma, shame, guilt

My awareness of collective racial shame began during a visit to Prague. I was standing in the Spanish synagogue in the Jewish ghetto. Awed by the Moorish beauty of this synagogue, I was chilled by its history. Case after case held Jewish artifacts, plundered by the Nazis. Sacred objects, purged of the living hands that once held them. Then shipped across Europe, to be displayed in a museum, once the Final Solution was complete. After the triumph of the Reich. For the gaze of a purified, Aryan race. I am imagining them, gazing at my extinction: blue eyed, blond, unknowing, unthinking. Reading informational plaques that rewrite my extermination. We would simply vanish into Aryan modernity.

Address correspondence to Sue Grand, Ph.D., 764 Wendel Place, Teaneck, NJ 07666. Email: drsuegrandphd@gmail.com

Standing in the Spanish synagogue, I think about genocide and extinction, about who writes the history of atrocity. I am haunted, but I am innocent. Then, memory and history crack open. Suddenly, I am an adolescent, looking at another display under glass. I am looking at the Indian displays and dioramas at the Museum of Natural History in New York City. What, precisely, am I seeing? Life size, three-dimensional portraits of hunters and gatherers. An enormous stuffed Buffalo, ancient pottery, primitive tools, loin cloths, beaded leather, feather headdresses, peace pipes, artifacts of burial. For us, as children, these dioramas were alluring portals to a mythic past. They were realistic and yet magical, sealed and enclosed, but surely possessed of some hidden door—we wanted to get inside them, and time travel to the “wild west.” Intriguing and primitive, these still-life Indians were figural archives of ancient knowledge, spiritual links to the natural world. They were formidable warriors, sensual and cruel, powerful, fearless, both noble and savage. They were the precursors to white modernity, barefoot trackers lost to New York City pavement. They were the legendary ghosts of “our” prehistory. None of us actually knew a “real Indian”; they had simply vanished with time.

In the Spanish synagogue I am having dual vision. I am here, now, imagining Aryans looking at my extinction. And I am reading informational plaques that rewrite the Indian extermination. I am brown eyed, blond, unknowing, unthinking, oblivious. Gazing at these still-life hunter/gatherers, everything seems pastoral, and then, simply, not. Times changed, the buffalo disappeared. At one moment, I am just standing there in my Jewishness, looking at plundered silver candlesticks, prayer books, menorahs. I am certain about the locus of good and evil, and I know which side I am on. But then, my perspective and my identity shift. The Nazi intention refracts white American mythology, and I am no longer sure who or what I am, or where good and evil reside, or what racist lives inside me, or what moral axis I am living in. Imagining Aryan eyes on my bones, I discover myself, looking through Aryan eyes at Native-American bones. My persecuted Jewishness flips into a predatory American whiteness, and there is an all-seeing Native-American eye on that whiteness. I am suffused with shame. *On whose soil have I made my home?*

Shame as Revelation

My innocence is lost. As Layton (2015) suggests, my collective self has multiple identity markers, and two of them are exactly what is visible

and received: American and white. White: my Jewishness is slippery; my skin is marked by predation. My life is inscribed with multiple historical legacies in which I am both a victim of destruction and a collusive agent in the destruction of others. Shame awakens me to this complexity; it is a being-seen, in a first encounter with alterity (see Wilson, 1987). In this condition, the “vanished” Indian Other possesses his or her own gaze and penetrates my white blindness. I have looked through my “Aryan” eyes; I have been seen in that look, and shame refers to a failure of my own ego ideals (Wurmser, 1987; Morrison, 1987). But I am in agreement with Lynd (1958): this shame can also be a call to fulfill those ideals.

In the reckoning with genocidal history, collective racial shame can have a paradoxical effect. This shame can feel persecutory, it can reify subject–object splits and moral categories; it can readily collapse into violence, denial, and vengeance, and turn us away from knowing the other. But it also encodes the voice of this Other; it can be a call to conscience, an awakening to social pathologies. In its more problematic form, shame seems to divide the sacred and the profane; it certainly imagines that the clean do not shit; it denies the ordinary human-ness of our humanity. It obscures the messiness of intersubjectivity and ethics. It conjures a cold, unforgiving eye upon us. It vacates our world of empathy and self-compassion, and makes us want to hide from the Other.

But collective shame also anticipates movement: from moralism to ethics, from solipsism to I-Thou conversation, from denial to collective responsibility. All of this is inspired by an emergent Other, possessed of an all-seeing eye on our transgressions. To be seen by this eye can feel like an exposed, all-consuming badness; a sense of radical nakedness in relation to radical scrutiny. But as Lynd theorized back in 1958, shame is not simply an exposure of unwanted aspects of self. Shame disrupts our societal roles and false values – because it introduces us to another perspective that is outside of us. In the arena of race, then, collective white shame can rearrange the field of perception, and produce a crack in memory and history, when the other has been “vanished” as white America has vanished the Indian. When we are exposed to the eye of the vanished Other, when we allow ourselves to experience our own “deserved shame” (Watkins, 2016) about cultural evil, that shame allows “our moral sense to tune in to the beacon of goodness and justice” (Lebron, 2013, p. 7). This can inspire us towards the depressive concern and restorative justice that moved so many veterans to protect the recent protests at Standing Rock.

Creative Shame and the Restoration of History

Psychoanalysts have tended to emphasize the sheer destructiveness of shame—as a toxic form of splitting and projection, a cruel and dangerous affect. Thus, shame would seem to reduce our capacity to make amends for our own destructiveness. But does it? In this article I am suggesting a more nuanced understanding of shame as affect, intersubjective process, and cultural commentary. I am complicating shame’s toxicity by highlighting shame’s creative moment: that breach in our white blindness that permits us to see the Other, who we could not see before. As many analysts (e.g., Kohut, 1977; Leighton, 2004; Orange, 2010; Wurmser, 1987) have noted, shame can inflame the disintegrating self, incite aggression, and destroy the human links that we are seeking to restore. I am certainly not an advocate of this kind of toxic, destructive shame. In fact, I endorse another kind of shame that I do see as constructive. As Watkins (2016), Lebron

(2013), and Braithwaite (1989) suggest, there is an ethical call embedded in our retrieval of our own "deserved shame." When we cringe before the all-seeing eye, it can be a first order of engagement with the marginalized Other. We start to imagine another mind to converse with. As Lewis puts it, "The 'me' emerges in distinction from the 'other' … it is the eye of the other in the me who beholds my transgression" (Lewis, 1995, p. 92). If we can acknowledge shame and mitigate its inflammation, the Other outside can become increasingly visible. And this visibility enables us to query cultural evil and our collusion with that evil. This shift is potentiated as the I (eye) of the oppressed perceives, externalizes, and separates from its oppressor (Gaztambide, 2017). Now, as Benjamin (1988) describes it, there is, "a new possibility of colliding with the outside and becoming alive in the presence of an equal other" (p. 221).

To defeat this dialogic possibility, psychopathic regimes often construct seamless insularity for the dominant, so that this visibility is occluded. In her work on "white fragility," DiAngelo (2006) describes these formidable white arrangements: radical forms of exploitation and segregation that foreclose all encounter with our racialized Other. In such radical segregation, there is no hope of finding our way towards reparative guilt. Reparative guilt is predicated on our proximity to the wounded Other, and it is predicated on our wounded Other seeing us. Reparative guilt is threatening, and destabilizing, for racist regimes; it is precisely why oppression is hidden from view. When this concealment reaches

its apex, the master narrative is almost seamless. This is precisely what whiteness achieved with the "vanishing" of the American Indian. In this mythic vanishing, there was no agentic destruction. Shame cannot rupture our insularity or expose our agency. Ambivalence cannot be evoked; reparative guilt is preempted before it can arrive.

The American genocide has been an exemplar of this malignant cultural condition; it has produced a seamless, nonreflective, collective white narcissism. Whenever we are in this cultural condition, we need to be startled by an outside that is outside of us. Repair cannot begin with depressive concern and reparative guilt. It must begin with the rupturing gaze of wounded otherness. If we are not psychopathic, and if we have a way to tolerate the induced shame, history will begin to penetrate us. It can feel toxic to experience what Watkins (2016) refers to as our "deserved shame." But if we hold each other well enough in the first shock of this mortification, that zone can become facilitative of racial justice.

The question, for me, then is not how we avoid experiencing creative shame—a form of shame that actually increases our awareness of the Other and has constructive effects on our relational and cultural contexts. It is how we contain, empower, and decode this together, within a shared sense of tragic complexity, and an understanding of our flawed human goodness. This allows us to resist participation in psychopathic structures. Without this containment, we can get locked down into persecutory systems of malignant shame. There, we will try to put our shame back into the Other, reproducing their sense of "undeserved shame" (Watkins, 2016) in escalating systems of cruelty. To affirm creative shame while we mutually contain shame's potential for savagery is our collective challenge. To face this challenge, we need to understand this: creative shame is not a stable state or an individual capacity. It is an intersubjective moment in a fast-moving intersubjective process—a process that readily becomes toxic. We need to greet creative shame in a spirit of compassion, so that we don't slide into malignant shame. This empathic reception is not false forgiveness; it does not obscure our transgressions or the emergent subjectivity of the Other. Rather, it restores our humanity, so that we can begin the movement towards restorative justice.

For me, this collective responsibility began in the Spanish synagogue. Once, I was riveted by the dioramas at the Museum of Natural History. I wanted those still-life Indians to come alive. Suddenly, in Prague they came alive with a vengeance. They have continued to rupture my white blindness, and they have called on me to know history. Now the Holocaust will be forever linked to the Native-American genocide, which Hitler praised for its inspiration (Coates, 2014; Sterba, 1996; Stannard, 1992). As Sterba notes (1996), our atrocities certainly rivaled Hitler's, and our "manifest destiny" became his "Lebensraum."

Strategies of Racial Disappearance

Ever since my experience in Prague, I have been thinking about racial guilt and racial shame and genocidal vanishing. I am thinking about the differential structures of racial subjugation; the differential myths that sustain these structures, and the ways they evoke/suppress our deserved shame and guilt. In the United States, black slavery and indigenous extermination were twinned; they were parallel, interdependent regimes for constructing white wealth. But they also had distinctive arrangements of visibility and/or vanishing; I believe that these arrangements have bearing on our capacity for collective shame or guilt.

The enslavement of Africans, the extermination of the Indians: these systems were both clearly genocidal. At the first European contact, it is estimated that the Native population in what would become the territorial United States was 5 million. By 1890, there were 248,000 (Bruyneel, 2007). The number of African slaves who died during the middle passage is estimated in the millions (see Sterba, 1996), without accounting for their deaths in slavery. In the colonial era, both peoples were enslaved by Europeans for trade and free labor.[1] Both were starved, tortured, and rapidly worked to death.[2] Beginning in the 1600s, settlers in Rhode Island engaged in the trans-Atlantic slave trade, exchanging Native captives for African slaves. As Gallay (2009) put it, "both Indians and Africans were depicted as savage heathens" (p. 3).

But by the 18th century, our home-grown genocides bifurcated into divergent pathways. These pathways overlapped, converged, and exacerbated each other[3]; but they differentially constructed racial presence and racial absence. With regards to this differential project, George

---

[1] O'Brien (2010) notes, for example, that the Pokanoket in Cape Cod were enslaved in 1614.

[2] Gallay estimates that before 1715, approximately 30,000–50,000 Native people were taken as slaves by the British.

[3] Most notably in the arena of African American slavery. In the 18th century Native Americans had a considerable role in African-American slavery. See Krauthamer (2013).

Washington put it rather succinctly: “The gradual extension of our Settlements will as certainly cause the Savage as the Wolf to retire; both being beasts of prey tho they differ in shape” (as quoted in Saunt, 2005, p. 17).

The Differential Math of Genocide

Africans arrived on this continent stripped of everything except their labor. Indigenous peoples would be exploited for labor, but also for skills, resources, and land. For settler imperialism, both redness and blackness became subservient to whiteness; both Africans and Indigenous peoples had to absorb malignant projections and justify white dominance. But, over time, white dominance required the visibility and controlled proximity/distance of “whites” and “blacks.” On the East Coast, in the 18th century, the plantation sugar economy expanded. This economy relied on vast infusions of slaves. The Native population was already decimated by slavery, extermination, starvation, and disease, but African slaves were constantly being replenished. By the 18th and 19th centuries, skin color was raced, and slavery was raced as black. African slave labor didn’t entirely replace Native slave labor in the territorial United States, but by that era, another genocidal project became more salient, involving the Native population: that is, the land and dominance to be gained from their extermination and/or removal.[4] Thus, African American slavery was grounded in proximal castes of whiteness and blackness. Native-American extermination became a divine mission of westward expansion and Indian absence. To build the U.S. economy, “redskins” had to “vanish” from the landscape of whiteness. And such is the perversity of racism: once slavery was raced as black, the historical truth of Native American slavery *vanished* from white guilt and white consciousness, as did the Native Americans themselves.

Of course, throughout our history, to be black is also to be disappeared and/or murdered. Jim Crow, convict labor, lynching, mass incarceration, police shootings—these atrocities are acts of disappearance. But before and after the Indian Removal Act, U.S. wealth has been grounded in the regulated *presence of* whiteness and blackness, and in Native-American “vanishing.” Whiteness has always extruded blackness but whiteness has not written blackness into an extinct, distant past. Indeed, whiteness has claimed superiority through its opposition with blackness. But after the 18th century, land seizure required the disappearance of “redskins.”

---

[4] Jackson passed the Indian Removal Act in 1830.

“Redskins” were further sequestered from whiteness by master narratives about American origination. These narratives tell us that Europeans “discovered” America; that U.S. civilization began with European settlement. They tell us that we created modernity, that this modernity was an essential good,[5] and that Indians were unable to adapt and assimilate, thereby writing them-selves out of existence. As O’Brien (2010) notes, local histories of 19th-century New England were regularly identifying the “last Indian.” [6,7] This narrative of disappearance was mythologized in James Fennimore Cooper’s “American masterpiece,” The Last of the Mohicans. A disappearance through a failure of adaptation, this myth is contradicted by historians. The indigenous population was extraordinarily adaptive to its colonizers (see O’Brien, 2010; Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014; Gallay, 2009; Miles, 2005; Saunt, 2005). Nonetheless, those who survived extermination, cultural annihilation, and disease were forced to march, starving, and nearly naked in the snow, to the barren “Indian territory” west of the Mississippi. Most of them died on this “trail of tears.”

White settlers were infinitely inventive in their practices of extermination and erasure. Those Indians who somehow remained in physical proximity to whiteness were often reinscribed as not-really-Indian. Here, there is a stunning, predatory differential between the twin genocides. In African-American slavery, the one-drop rule was used to define blackness. As white masters raped slave women, questions arose about the condition of the children. Did they follow the condition of the slave mother, or that of the master father? If they followed the father into

---

[5] This mythology is ongoing. David Brooks (2015) writes in “The American Idea”: “America was settled, founded and built by people who believed they were doing something exceptional.… American was defined by its future, by the people who weren’t yet here and by the greatness that hadn’t yet been achieved … once the vast continent was settled the United States would be one of the dominant powers of the globe.”

[6] Thus “Ishi,” as the last known member of the Native American Yahi people, would be celebrated and studied as the last “wild Indian” (Kroeber, 1961).

[7] Even now, there seem to be ongoing disputes about this firsting and lasting. In 1996, the 8,500-year-old skull of “Kennewick man” was discovered in Washington, and claimed as Caucasian. Native Americans said that these were the bones of their ancestors, and tried to reclaim Kennewick Man for burial. Lawsuits contested repatriation. Recently, Danish scientists settled this dispute over identity and history: they conclusively determined that Kennewick Man is most closely linked to Native Americans. Nonetheless, repatriation is still in doubt.

whiteness, these children would gain their freedom. With the one-drop rule, slave states determined that just one drop of blackness disqualified these children from claiming whiteness, thus protecting the slave economy from the financial losses of manumission. Through rape, the one-drop rule of African slavery actually *increased* the number of black slaves, while sustaining the (relative) visibility of blackness to whiteness. But the

Native-American predicament operated in reverse: A drop of whiteness was used to eradicate “redness,” although redness could never acquire the full privilege of whiteness. In the official narrative, only the “full bloods” were “real Indians,” who always maintained traditional practices. In most land treaties (all of which were broken), only these “full-blooded Indians” held land rights. But, of course, over centuries of slavery, rape, accommodation, and assimilation, Native Americans had engaged with white settlers and black slaves and black freemen. There were intercultural penetrations, cultural transformations, intercultural kinship networks, mingled DNA, the destruction of indigenous land, culture and economies, and therefore, fewer “full bloods” living traditional lives. Because only “full bloods” had land rights, most Indians could be expelled from their land.

Here we can see the differential math of white wealth and racial subjugation: Black slaves are multiplied by their one-drop rule whereas the Indian population is subtracted through its inverse. When Native Americans did assimilate and adapt, their “semi-whiteness” disqualified them as “real Indians.” Reading history, one has the impression of an unseen psychopathic hand arranging all this madness. These strategies constructed and sustained the myth of the “vanishing Indian” as Native peoples were regulated out of their own identity and existence. This myth recast genocide as evolution: Redskins just seemed to fade away into white *homo erectus* (see Saunt, 2005; Senier, 2014; Gallay, 2009; Newell, 2009; Snyder, 2010; Miles, 2005).

It is no accident, then, that centuries later, U.S. psychoanalysis has been silent about this atrocity and its traumatic legacies. In the 21st century, mythic narratives continue to erase atrocity, writing the Indian out of existence. Certainly, with the exceptions of Apprey (2003), Gump (2000, 2010), Alan Bass (2003), and Grand (2014), psychoanalysts have barely attended to African-American slavery. But we have attended not at all to the Native-American genocide. This absence in psychoanalysis parallels the void in our national narrative. Where Native-American trauma should be inscribed, there is only an *absence without commentary*. This mirrors the problem of *who* writes on psychoanalysis, and what culture and region of the United States they are writing from within. White psychoanalysts of the urban North East live in some proximity with anti-black racism; many white analysts are addressing that racism (Altman, 2000; Grand, 2014; Suchet, 2007). But—and this is a terrible admission—for analysts in the urban Northeast, Indians can seem archaic and so absent that they can’t even elicit this white racial address. This psychoanalytic silence perpetuates our national myth.

To break up this myth, we need these moments of creative shame. White presence, Indian absence: this was not about evolution. It was about centuries of warfare, rape, starvation, and enslavement; disease; broken treaties; laws that forbid Indians from hunting, trapping, and fishing on their own land; land theft; narrowing racial laws; the purposeful slaughter of the buffalo and provision of smallpox-infected blankets; and the maddening switchbacks through which whites defined the “blood quantums” of "real Indians." And this absence is not about innocent white settlers under attack by savage warriors. This is a history of asymmetrical violence, of white predators, and Native-American victims. As Dunbar-Ortiz (2014) points out, the colonialists always addressed indigenous tribes with practices of total extermination, using atrocities against them that were previously unknown to indigenous warfare. Scalping was invented by white settlers (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014); Indian scalps were sold for profit, and celebrated as conquest.8 In all of this malignancy we obscured Indigenous protest: "Why should you take by force that from us which you can have by love? Why should you destroy us, who have provided you with food? What can you get by war? … You see us unarmed, and willing to supply your wants, if you will come in a friendly manner, and not with swords and guns, as to invade an enemy" (Wahunsonacock, Powhatan, 1609, quoted in Wilson, 1998).9

Refusing gratitude and denying their own dependency on native resources and generosity, whiteness clamored about "manifest destiny."

---

8 The term, 'redskin' originated as a descriptor of the wounded craniums of these scalped bodies (see Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014).

9 Also, for example, in their effort to dominate South Carolina, the British attacked French allied Choctaws, and also attacked the Apalachee to strike at the Spanish. The Chickasaws switch alliance from the French to the British, and take native slaves for the British (Gallay, 2002). In the King Philip's War (1675–1676), New England colonists went to war with their allies—Mohegan and Pequot—against Wampanoags, Narragansetts, Nipmucs, and others. For Native Americans, there were 5,000 casualties (Gallay, 2009).

White greed moved west with ethnic cleansing, erasing indigenous culture, befouling and stealing the land, removing survivors to remote and unwanted land. And insofar as whiteness did have proximity to its victims, whiteness kept extruding its "deserved shame" (Watkins, 2016) into the imago of the "drunk Injun."

Slaves and Masters: Transmissions of Shame and Malignance

Throughout all of this predation, white dominance ensured that the natural alliances that could have defeated it were not allowed to form. In our early history, Africans and Indians were enslaved, starved, tortured, and persecuted *together*. Their alliance would have been formidable. But American wealth has always been grounded in a divisive hierarchical system of "vanished Others," of those who have been raced, classed, and gendered into subjugation, exploitation, antagonism, and mistrust. All arranged in layers of relative privilege, colonized by scarcity, written and divided by the master narrative, so that unity and resistance are weakened. It's all here, in this terrible history.

In the colonial era, the French, Spanish, and British were in contest for dominance, all of them enlisting Native warriors, commanding them with threats and promises, seducing them with European goods and weapons, enlisting them as partners in commerce and as slavers, exploiting their prior intertribal conflicts, so that intertribal alliances were in continuous flux.10 In every region, each tribe was its own nation with distinct language, culture, economies, land, and religion. There were no *Indians* until European presence made "them" into *redskins*. From the beginning, Europeans persecuted these nations as one, even as they exploited their preexisting rivalries and alliances. The effect was bewildering, and solidarity was belated. Indian confederacies could not be formed until the indigenous population was being decimated, and diverse nations recognized themselves as the annihilated Other, raced by Europeans as *redskins*:

"Brothers – my people wish for peace; the red men all wish for peace; but where the white people are, there is no peace for them… The white men …do not think red men sufficiently good to live …Brothers – if you do not unite with us, they will first destroy us, and then you will fall an easy prey to them. They have destroyed many nations of red men because they were not united, because they were not friends to each other. Brothers – we must be united, we must smoke the same pipe; we must fight each other's battles" (Tecumsah, quoted in Nabokov, 1999, pp. 97–98).11

---

10 By the mid-18th century, the capture and sale of Native slaves decreased east of the Mississippi as tribes formed confederacies and refused large-scale slaving (Gallay, 2009).

Colonization arouses our mutual terror and our hatred; it violates, starves, and degrades us; it pits us against one another in gradations of privilege, objectification, survival, and abjection. Who is a subject? Who is disposable? Predatory conquest is brilliant and incisive. It perceives and foments our rivalries, our competitions, our cravings for wealth, status, and inclusion. In these conditions, we can all become agents of the machine that is destroying us. We can commit what I have called, the "bestial gesture of survival" (Grand, 2000), dehumanizing those who are suffering the same fate.

Divide and conquer: U.S. wealth is a historic register of this obscenity. If Indian resistance was much less violent than whiteness imagines, it is not always innocent. Native peoples were both slavers and the enslaved. There were slaving tribes who captured other tribes, entering into commercial arrangements with the very colonists who would subsequently enslave these Indian slavers. While Africans were being kidnapped by Africans in Africa for shipment to American colonies, Indians were being captured by Indians for shipment to the Caribbean colonies, Canada, the Great Lakes region, and from the South to the North in the territorial United States (Gallay, 2002; Newell, 2009; Rushforth, 2012; Snyder, 2010).12

On our shores, Indians were enslaved *with* Africans, and they formed familial bonds. Insofar as African slaves and Native peoples sustained their alliances, they effectively threatened the genocidal regime. The Tuscarora provided sanctuary for escaped black slaves, and formed an underground railroad as early as the 1600s; the earliest slave revolt was jointly mobilized by Native and African slaves in New York City in 1708 (Miles, 2009). The Seminoles of Florida welcomed fleeing black slaves, formed kinship systems, became fierce warriors of resistance, and were

---

11 Native slavery was officially outlawed in the mid-18th century, but it continued.

12 These tribes included the Choctaws, Chickasaw, Cherokee, and Creeks. Miles (2009) traces Native American plantation slave practices through the Cherokee family of Shoe Boots and the Cherokee Van family (Miles, 2005). Krauthamer (2013) highlights these practices of the Choctaw and Chickasaw in Indian Territory

renown as the “undefeated tribe” (see Brooks, 2002; Henson, 1849; Hill, 2009; Krauthamer, 2013; Miles, 2011; Saunt, 2005). But according to Saunt (2005) and Miles (2005), alliances between black slaves and native peoples were sparse. And when these alliances occurred, white dominance could read its future defeat. Black slaves and native tribes would be purposefully divided by racial hierarchies, the racing of slavery, and by the false promise of Indian survival if they assimilated to white “civilization.” The resulting divisions between redness and blackness were exacerbated by laws that criminalized sanctuary of fleeing African slaves (Krauthamer, 2013; Miles, 2005).

The pressures of indigenous survival undermined alliances between these two persecuted peoples. Nonetheless, Miles, Snyder, Saunt, and Gallay all conclude that native peoples did share culpability in the African-American genocide. Until about the mid-19th century, Africans were enslaved *with* Native peoples. Throughout the Southeast, Northeast, and Indian Territory, Indians had been stripped of the resources that defined and sustained them; but they were also lit up by the greed that lit up their colonizers. These tribes owned, and traded in, black slaves. According to these historians, Indians had a significant role in the African slave trade, even as they formed bonds of kinship and mingled DNA (Saunt, 2005; Snyder, 2010; Miles, 2005).

And by the late 17th century, colonists had established their separate and contradictory “one drop rules” for Africans and Indians. They had “bizarre blood-quantum requirements claiming that Native identity ‘dissolves’ with intermarriage … [colonists] began recasting indigenous people as ‘colored,’ ‘mulatto,’ ‘French’—anything but ‘Indian”’ (Senier, 2014, p. 2). Blackness was, as always, at the lowest rung of the caste system, and, given the one-drop rule of *African* slavery, blackness could *never* attain *either* redness or whiteness. For a Native person to be labeled “colored” or “mulatto” or kin with blackness could further dilute Native-American identity and land claims and would distance them forever from any entry into “white civilization.” And to have one-drop of blackness was to be at risk for being sold into black chattel slavery. Native-American survival would increasingly require the affiliation with whiteness and the corresponding disavowal of blackness. In these ways, the white incursion broke apart the natural alliances that would have defeated it, and mutual antagonisms were inflamed. Black Indians often found themselves doubly abased and vanished, by both whiteness and redness, existing at the marginalized nexus of this complicated history. Blackness *could* be absorbed into Indian kinship systems, but only if this blackness was denied and vanished. But Southeast Native tribes would also acculturate, and accrue wealth and status by establishing plantations, enslaving blacks, and repudiating black kin.[13] Some Native planters enslaved *their own black kin* (Krauthamer, 2013; Miles, 2005, Saunt, 2005).[14] Free families of African descent continued to live in Indian nations (Snyder, 2010). But, as Krauthamer notes, some Southeast tribes[15] fiercely opposed abolition, supported the confederacy in the Civil War (also Saunt, 2005), and resisted emancipation in Indian Territory even after the War was lost. Fleeing slavery, blacks often encountered reenslavement as they sought sanctuary in Indian Territory. The resulting alienation and animus has haunted generations;[16] it splintered familial bonds *and* political alliances.[17,18] Recently, there has been an effort to repair this legacy and to recognize the black Indian.

Flawed Human Goodness: Redeeming Our Shame

Any genocide that lasts centuries is not going to be a pure story. But in this history, there *are* some *very* clear lines between good and evil; between perpetrators and their innocent victims. However, in these conditions, we don't know what we ourselves would do. The complexity of this history can further bewilder our "deserved" and "undeserved" shame; it can make us more resistant to knowing history. Most of us cannot escape from bias and greed, from collusion, from the exigencies of terror and hunger and survival, or from the prejudicial myths written by master narratives.19 To resist racist regimes, we need to find a way to restore the human bonds that genocide seeks to destroy. But to speak to the Other, the allseeing eye of shame must be softened by another kind of vision. This is a compassionate sight that sees our flawed human goodness, and allows us to witness our own ignorance and welcome the stranger even though we are not yet purged of our prejudice. This is a form of the “radical hope” that Lear (2006) found in the dream of Plenty Coups. This radical hope has been passed through the ages; it is in this story told by Josiah Henson in his encounter with the Native-American stranger,20 as he fled African-American slavery:

---

[13] According to black slave narratives, conditions varied—often Indian masters were described as more humane. See Minges, 2004.

[14] The Choctaws did not develop slave codes until after removal. But later, their laws would forbid marriage with African Americans, and prohibited black slaves from learning to read or from owning firearms, in disturbing mimicry of white masters (Snyder, 2010).

[15] The Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, and even the Seminoles (Krauthamer, 2013).

[16] With the Dawes Act of 1887, federal land allotments are determined by "blood quantums," with "full blood" Indians receiving the largest allotments, and former black slaves the smallest (Krauthamer, 2013).

[17] The transgenerational legacy of this complexity persists: in the recent controversy about removing the Confederate flag flying above the South Carolina capital, a white conservative wanted to erect a monument to a Cherokee chief who became a confederate general (Pitts, 2015). To this day, there are tensions between Native tribes and "black Indians" (Saunt, 2005; Miles, 2005).

[18] By contrast, Northern Creeks actually anticipated the 13th Amendment, abolishing slavery, granting freed slaves equal tribal status in September 1863. (Saunt, 2005).

> :We were instantly on the alert as we could hardly expect them to be friends. The advance of a few paces showed me they were Indians, with packs on their shoulders; and they were so near that if they were hostile, it would be useless to escape … they looked at me in a frightened sort of way for a moment and setting up a peculiar howl, turned round, and ran as fast as they could.… [W]hat they were afraid of I could not imagine, unless they supposed I was the devil whom they had perhaps heard of as black. … [M]y wife was alarmed too, and thought they were merely running back to collect more of a party, and then to come and murder us, and she wanted to turn back.… [A]s we advanced, we could discover Indians peeping at us from behind the trees and dodging out of our sight.… [T]he chief … soon discovered that we were human beings … and now curiosity seemed to prevail. Each one wanted to touch the children who were shy as partridges … a little while sufficed to make them understand what we were, and whither we were going and what we needed; and as little, to set them about supplying our wants, feeding us bountifully, and giving us a comfortable wigwam for our night’s rest. The next day, we resumed our march … they sent some of their young men to point out the place where we were to turn off and parted from us with as much kindness as possible.… “(Henson, 1849, pp. 53–54)

---

19 As Snyder (2010) put it, “rather than a one-way monologue crafted by the white elites, the language of race was a dialogue shared by whites and Indians and shaped by the violent intimacy of the Southern border wars. New articulations of race blended with— and complicated—older notions of Native identity. Challenging colonialism, Indians drew on their experiences with ‘Virginians’ to craft a racial ideology underpinned by nativism” (p. 172).

20 Northern Ohio, tribe unknown.

REFERENCES

Altman, N. (2000). Black and white thinking: A psychoanalyst reconsiders race. Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 10, 589–605. doi:10.1080/10481881009348569.

Apprey, M. (2003). Repairing history: Reworking transgenerational trauma. In D. Moss (Ed.), Hating in the first person plural (pp. 3–29). New York, NY: Other Press.

Bass, A. (2003). Historical and unconscious trauma: Racism and psychoanalysis. In D. Moss (Ed.), Hating in the first person plural (pp. 29–45). New York, NY: Other Press.

Benjamin, J. (1988). The bonds of love. New York, NY: Pantheon Press.

Braithwaite, J. (1989). Crime, shame, and reintegration. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Brooks, D. (25 September, 2015.) The American idea and today’s GOP. The New York Times. Retrieved

from https://mobile.nytimes.com/2015/09/25/ opinion/david-brooks-the-american-idea-and-todaysgop.html?referer=https:// www.google.com/
Brooks, J. F. (2002). Captives and cousins: Slavery, kinship and community in the Southwest Borderlands. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Bruyneel, K. (2007). The third space of sovereignty: the postcolonial politics of U.S. indigenous relations. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Coates, T. N. (2014, January 16). Hitler on the Mississippi banks: Thoughts on Timothy Snyder's Bloodlands. The Atlantic. Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2014/01/hitler-on-themississippi-banks/283127/
DiAngelo, R. (2006). My race didn't trump my class: Using oppression to face privilege. Multicultural Perspectives, 8(1), 51–56. doi:10.1207/s15327892mcp0801_9.
Dunbar-Ortiz, R. (2014). An indigenous people's history of the United States. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
Gallay, A. (2002). The Indian slave trade: The rise of the English empire in the American South, 1670–1717. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Gaztambide, D. J. (2017). A "psychoanalysis for liberation": Reading Friere as an act of love. Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society, 22(2), 193–212. doi:10.1057/s41282-016-0033-9.
Gallay, A. (2009). Introduction. In A. Gallay (Ed.), Indian slavery in colonial America (pp. 1–33). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
Grand, S. (2000). The reproduction of evil: A clinical and cultural perspective. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
Grand, S. (2014). Skin memories: On race, love and loss. Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society, 19, 232–249. doi:10.1057/pcs.2014.24.

Gump, J. (2000). A white therapist, an African American Patient: Shame in the therapeutic dyad: Commentary of paper by Neil Altman. Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 10, 619–632. doi:10.1080/10481881009348571.
Gump, J. (2010). Reality matters: The shadow of trauma on African American subjectivity. Psychoanalytic Perspectives, 27(1), 42–54.
Henson, J. (1849). The life of Josiah Henson: Formerly a slave, now an inhabitant of Canada, as narrated by himself. Boston, MA: Arthur D. Phelps.
Hill, Sr. R. W. (2009). Rotihnahon:tSi and Rotinonhson:nI: Historical relationships between African Americans and the Confederacy of the six nations. In G. Tayac (Ed.), Indivisible (pp. 99–109). Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian, National Museum of the Native American.
Kohut, H. (1977). The restoration of the self. Madison, CT: International Universities Press.
Krauthamer, B. (2013). Black slaves, Indian masters: Slavery, emancipation, and citizenship in the Native American South. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
Kroeber, T. (1961). Ishi in two worlds: A biography of the last wild Indian in North America. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Layton, L. (2015). Beyond sameness and difference: Normative unconscious process and our mutual implication in each other's suffering. In D. Goodman & M. Freeman (Eds.), Psychology and the other (pp. 168–188). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
Lear, J. (2006). Radical hope: Ethics in the face of cultural devastation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Lebron, C. J. (2013). The color of our shame: Race and justice in our time. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
Leighton, J. (2004). The analyst's sham(e): Collapsing into a one-person system. In W. J. Coburn (Ed.), Transformations in self psychology: Progress in self psychology (Vol. 20, pp. 169–188). Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
Lewis, M. (1995). Shame: The exposed self. New York, NY: Free Press.

Lynd, H. M. (1958). On shame and the search for identity. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Miles, T. (2005). Ties that bind: The story of an Afro-Cherokee family in slavery and freedom. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
Miles, T. (2009). Taking leave, making lives: Creative quests for freedom in early black and native America. In G. Tayac (Ed.), Indivisible (pp. 139–151). Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian, National Museum of Native American.
Miles, T. (2011). Of waterways and runaways: Reflections on the great lakes in underground railroad history. Michigan Quarterly Review, Summer 2011. Retrieved from http://www.michiganquarterlyreview.com/2011/10/ofwaterways-and-runaways-reflectionson-the-great-lakes-in-undergroundrailroad-history/

Minges, P. (2004). Black Indian slave narratives. Winston-Salem, NC: John F. Blair.
Morrison, A. (1987). The eye turned inward: Shame and the self. In: D. L. Nathanson (Ed.), The many faces of shame (pp. 271–291). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
Newell, E. M. (2009). Indian slavery in colonial New England. In A. Gallay (Ed.), Indian slavery in colonial America (pp. 33–67). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
O'Brien, J. M. (2010). Firsting and lasting: Writing Indians out of existence in New England. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Orange, D. (2010). Thinking for clinicians: Philosophical resources for contemporary psychoanalysis and the humanistic psychotherapies. London, England: Routledge.
Rushforth, B. (2012). Bonds of alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
Saunt, C. (2005). Black, white, and Indian: Race and the unmaking of an American family. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
Senier, S. (2014). Introduction. In S. Senier (Ed.), Dawnland voices (pp. 1–21). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
Snyder, C. (2010). Slavery in Indian country: The changing face of captivity in early America. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Sterba, J. P. (1996). Understanding evil: American slavery, the Holocaust, and the conquest of the American Indians. Ethics, 106(2), 424–448. doi:10.1086/233624.
Suchet, M. (2007). Unraveling whiteness. Psychoanalytic Dialogues, 17(6), 867– 887. doi:10.1080/10481880701703730.
Stannard, D. E. (1992). American Holocaust: The conquest of the new world. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
Tecumsah. (1999). Tecumsah. In P. Nabokov (Ed.), Native American testimony: A chronicle of Indian-white relations from prophecy to the present, 1492–2000 (pp. 95–98). New York, NY: Penguin Books.
Watkins, M. (2016). The social and political life of shame in the U.S. presidential election 2016. Paper presented at the Massachusetts Institute for Psychoanalysis, Cambridge, MA.
Wilson, E. (1987). Shame and the other: Reflections on the theme of shame in French psychoanalysis. In D. L. Nathanson (Ed.), The many faces of shame (pp. 162–194). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
Wurmser, L. (1987). Shame: The veiled companion of narcissism. In D. L. Nathanson (Ed.), The many faces of shame (pp. 64–93). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Sue Grand, Ph.D., is a member of the faculty and supervisor at the NYU Postdoctoral Program in Psychoanalysis. She is also on the faculty at the Mitchell Center for Relational Psychoanalysis; a faculty member in the trauma program at the National Institute for the Psychotherapies; a member of the faculty in the trauma program, Manhattan Institute for Psychoanalysis; a faculty member in the Couples and Family Specialization at the NYU Postdoctoral Program in Psychoanalysis; and a visiting scholar at the Psychoanalytic Institute for Northern California. She is the author of two books: The Reproduction of Evil: A Clinical and Cultural Perspective (Analytic Press) and The Hero in the Mirror: From Fear to Fortitude. She is an associate editor of Psychoanalytic Dialogues and Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society. She is in private practice in New York City and Teaneck, New Jersey