Christian Ayne Crouch

5 The French Revolution in Indian Country: Reconsidering the Reach and Place of Atlantic Upheaval

Two decades ago, Colin Calloway's study, *The American Revolution in Indian Country*, proposed a reorientation of how historians had interpreted revolutionary events; he sought to centre the perspectives, experiences, and contributions of Native peoples in this conflict. This movement away from Eurocentric perspectives on turning points and conflicts, combined with the work by Indigenous scholars to take seriously Native perspectives on the construction of American history and the exhortation by practitioners of the New Indian History to "face east from Indian Country", encouraged many historians to revisit the revolutionary moment and, for some, to do so in ways that explored authors' own stakes in these projects.[1] A consideration of space necessarily requires being aware of an author's location and position, both physically and metaphorically. This chapter is written on the homelands of the Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohican Indians – a point that might seem extraneous to

1 The author wishes to thank Megan Maruschke and Matthias Middell for convening "The French Revolution: A Moment of Respatialization Conference" and is grateful to all the workshop participants for their support and feedback. Profound thanks as well to H.D. Buch and to Jenny Shaw, for their steadfast support, critiques, and suggestions and to the Princeton American Indian and Indigenous Studies Working Group. C. Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country: Crisis and Diversity in Native American Communities*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Examples of recent works expanding on the legacy of and beyond the American Revolution, particularly past the eastern Atlantic coast, include K. Duval, *Independence Lost: Lives on the Edge of the American Revolution*, New York: Random House, 2015; S. Pearsall, "Re-Centering Indian Women in the American Revolution" in: S. Sleeper-Smith, J. Barr, J.M. O'Brien, N. Shoemaker, and S.M. Stevens (eds.), *Why You Can't Teach American History Without Indians*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015, or C. Saunt, *West of the Revolution: An Uncommon History of 1776*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2014. The concept of facing eastwards is explored in D.K. Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003. On Native stakes in historical construction, see E. Tuck and K.W. Yang, "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor", *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1 (2012) 1, pp. 1–40. For the reflections on New Indian History, see J. Merrell, "Second Thoughts on Colonial Historians and American Indians", *The William and Mary Quarterly* 69 (2012) 3, pp. 451–512, and A. Mt. Pleasant, C. Wiggington, and K. Wisecup, "Materials and Methods in Native American and Indigenous Studies: Completing the Turn", *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 75 (2018) 2, pp. 207–236.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110619775-005

a contemplation of the French Revolution. Consider, however, that taking seriously where one begins a historical investigation can offer new questions and perspectives on topics that appear to have been fully mined. Everyone participating in this volume was asked to consider the question of respatializing the French Revolution. This appeared, at first, a somewhat challenging endeavour for a historian working at the intersection of French Atlantic history and Native American and Indigenous Studies. We must confront that Indigenous peoples did understand, respond to, and in some cases incorporate into their own politics the broader transformations of the late eighteenth-century Atlantic world including those set in motion by the French and Haitian revolutions. In fact, the two decades of internecine and international warfare that followed the collapse of the French monarchy overlaps with the efforts of specific American Indian leaders to recast Indian Country politics to halt once and for all the invasion of their lands by Anglo-American settler colonists. Therefore, this chapter applies the concept of "respatialization" as a spatial (geographic) notion as well as a conceptual re-engagement that takes as its point of departure a region little considered by scholars of the French Revolution: Indian Country. As this chapter argues, respatialization offers the potential to move boundaries, literally and figuratively, and allows us to make space for new actors and interpretations in otherwise familiar narratives of French and American history. This new thinking also necessitates considering the place France today has in articulating its history in relationship to all of its former first empire.

In the Anglo-American academy, the influence and reaction to the French Revolution on American settler colonial political figures is taken as a given. In the 80 years since the publication of C.L.R. James' groundbreaking *The Black Jacobins*, the relationship between French Revolutionary thought and developing political philosophy and political economy in Saint-Domingue/Haiti have become widely considered by Atlantic scholars.[2] Despite these advances, the

2 See, e.g., M. Daut, *Baron de Vastey and the Origins of Black Atlantic Humanism*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017; L. Dubois, *A Colony of Citizens: Revolution and Slave Emancipation in the French Caribbean, 1787–1804*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004; D.P. Geggus (ed.), *The Impact of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2001; D.P. Geggus (ed.), *The French Revolution and the Greater Caribbean*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997; D.P. Geggus and N. Fiering (eds.), *The World of the Haitian Revolution*, Bloomingon: Indiana University Press, 2009; W. Klooster, *Revolutions in the Atlantic World: A Comparative History*, New York: New York University Press, 2009; J. Landers, *Atlantic Creoles in the Age of Revolutions*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011; T. Reiss, *The Black Count: Glory, Revolution, Betrayal, and the Real Count of Monte Cristo*, New York: Crown Publishing, 2012. Numerous works explore as well the relationship of the French and Haitian revolutions to early (Anglo-)America, such as A. White,

connections between Native America and the French Revolution remain poorly explored and little considered. Efforts to revisit the French Revolution have moved beyond the Atlantic impact of political, cultural, and social upheaval to include considerations of the revolution's global impact.[3] These works have made important contributions, but the shift away from the Atlantic repercussions of the conflict might suggest that the Atlantic historiography is complete. It is not.

The French Revolutionary wars had a profound impact on Native North America by accelerating the processes of violence and dispossession that came with what has been called "the long war for the west", encompassing the territory of the Old Northwest and the upper Great Lakes, which lasted from 1754 until 1815.[4] Rafe Blaufarb notes that "although unintentional and unanticipated, a significant outcome of the French Revolution and the global war that ensued was the relative disengagement of the European powers from geopolitical rivalry on the North American continent".[5] This "disengagement", achieved through bilateral treaties between the United States and Britain and Spain respectively, stripped Native peoples of the material assistance and military support provided by Britain and Spain that had facilitated the Indians' active resistance against Anglo-American expansion. The treaties halted the flow of support and ultimately led to systematic removal of Native peoples from their ancestral homelands. Though seemingly distant, the French Revolution reshaped interimperial American strategies and thrust the consequences of Atlantic events into the heart of the continent.

A reconsideration of the spatial influence of the French Revolution can be extended and complicated further. For one thing, historians might consider whether these effects were as "unintentional and unanticipated" as they might

Encountering Revolution: Haiti and the Making of the Early Republic, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012.

3 J. Klaits and M.J. Haltzel (eds.), *The Global Ramifications of the French Revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press and Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1994; L. Hunt and J.R. Censer, *The French Revolution and Napoleon: Crucible of the Modern World*, London: Bloomsbury, 2017; S. Desan, L. Hunt, and W.M. Nelson (eds.), *The French Revolution in Global Perspective*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013.

4 R. Blaufarb, "The French Revolutionary Wars and the Making of American Empire, 1783–1796", in: Desan, Hunt, and Nelson (eds.), *The French Revolution in Global Perspective*, pp. 148–162, at pp. 158–160; F. Furstenberg "The Significance of the Trans-Appalachian Frontier in Atlantic History", *American Historical Review* 113 (2008) 3, pp. 647–677, at pp. 650–651.

5 Blaufarb, "The French Revolutionary Wars", p. 162.

seem on the surface. Blaufarb notes that American audiences (by which he means Anglo-American) "were fully aware of the causal links" between European war, the treaties, and Indian Country.[6] But did Native peoples see the French Revolution and its aftermath in this way? Was it simply a distant phenomenon that shaped the realities of Indigenous communities through Atlantic geopolitics of British and/or Spanish alliance? Or were there ways in which some Indigenous actors responded to the rhetoric emerging around the Atlantic, particularly after the Jay Treaty (1794) and the Treaty of Greenville (1795) seemed to foreclose the options for continued Native resistance? Asking these questions opens up the possibility for exploring what could be termed a "Red Atlantic" Age of Revolution.[7]

We might also think about how the legacy of France's North American empire was operating in the late Ancien Régime and during the revolutionary period in France itself. Native Studies scholars have advocated taking perspectives that centre, rather than continue to marginalize, the spaces and perspectives of Native communities. Therefore, the understanding and effects of the French Revolution among Native peoples might look somewhat different if we approach the question from the position of being located in the homelands of Native peoples.[8] Positioning oneself in this manner not only allows Indigenous agents to be included, it also invites a consideration of how France continues to articulate, or efface, the memory of its early modern Atlantic empire in the very materials and repositories scholars turn to in order to trace these histories. An entry point into this consideration can be through archival material that seems, on its surface, to be utterly disconnected from Native North America.

6 Ibid., p. 161.

7 On the use of the term "Red Atlantic", see J. Weaver, *The Red Atlantic: American Indigenes and the Making of the Modern World, 1000–1927*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

8 Recent scholarship has revised and taken account of Native engagement with the American Revolution to make Indigenous voices proactive, rather than reactive, to these political changes. See, e.g., Duval, *Independence Lost*, or Saunt, *West of the Revolution*. A wide range of Native American and Indigenous Studies scholars forward the perspective of centring narratives in Native space. Some examples include L. Brooks, *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008, and *Our Beloved Kin: A New History of King Philip's War*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018; M. McDonnell, *Masters of Empire: Great Lakes Indians and the Making of America*, New York: Macmillan, 2015; M. Witgen, *An Infinity of Nations: How the Native New World Shaped Early North America*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

On 25 February 1791, the National Assembly of France issued a law regarding pensions granted to Acadian and Canadian officers (civilian and military) and their families. Publicized as being made in Louis XVI's name, the law stemmed from a 1789 report of the Committee on Pensions to the National Assembly, "demanding justice on behalf of citizens whose tender attachment to the mother-nation went uncompensated, and were in fact treated barbarously by the Ancien Régime". The "bloody" Seven Years' War returned civilian and military officials from Canada, Acadia, and St. Pierre-de-Miquelon, to France, but the committee noted with disapproval that, once home, these refugees received minimal pensions from the Ministry of the Navy, ranging from 600 livres tournois to, shockingly, 50 écus or less.[9] In 1791 and again in 1792, a series of laws were passed by the National Assembly, explicitly as attempts to right the wrongs of the monarchy in this domain. The correction rested on a public treasury endowed with 50 million livres to enable a continued disbursement of the former pensions now supplemented by daily stipends of "8 sous to the septuagenarians, 6 sous to heads of households and widows, 4 sous to children and orphans until age 20".[10] The publication of the law, filled with demographic information on the veteran families, including the names of every claimant remaining in France, their residence, date of birth, and the sums they could expect until age 20 or for life, suggested the earnestness of this project of restitution and an expectation of its long-term continuation in reformed France. Thirty years after New France (Canada) was first offered to Great Britain by Étienne-François de Choiseul in the Treaty of Paris (1763), the French government was deeply engaged in the lives of its American subjects once more.

This intervention by the National Assembly and its explicit self-positioning as an act of restorative justice is all the more noteworthy when we consider how aggressively officials of the Bourbon monarchy had moved, after the fall of Montreal and Québec, to erase the legacy and memory of the first French Atlantic empire in metropolitan France and (as I have argued in my previous work), in the wake of this, completely revised the boundaries of who could engage in colonialism and what the purpose of any future French empire would be. After the cession of Canada in 1760 and the return to France of the elite tier of colonial society in the aftermath of that defeat, officials in the Choiseul administration delegitimized the fidelity of these subjects, placing leading colonial officials on

9 *Rapport fait A l'Assemblé Nationale au nom du Comité des Pensions, sur les Secours accordés aux Acadiens et Canadiens, Imprimé par ordre de l'Assemblé Nationale* (1789), pp. 1–2.

10 *Loi Relative aux Secours accordés aux Officiers, tant civils que militaires, Acadiens & Canadiens, & à leurs familles donnée à Paris, le 25 février 1791*, Paris: De L'Imprimerie Royale, M DCC XCI, pp. 1–2.

trial for corruption and suppressing the uncomfortable colonial legacy visible in the midst of the French population. To this end, they segregated returned Canadian colonists in the province of Touraine and refused them a place in the new French imperial endeavours directed towards the Caribbean and the Pacific.[11]

The proposed 1792 law and the language of "uncompensation" for a "barbarous" act of betrayal showed the National Assembly radically reimagining the responsibilities of the state to its loyal subjects – now citizens – who had given the entirety of their belongings for *la patrie* (the homeland). The statutory debate also opened up an avenue to think about how the members of the National Assembly might best harness the expertise and past experience of these populations to further French territorial goals, first in securing France's borders and then, as the 1790s moved forward, in expanding them outwards. In 1792, a petition brought by a Paris-based playwright named Marie-Joseph Chénier, proposed making 14 foreigners from Europe and across the Atlantic world into citizens of the new French Republic because these men were "representatives of humanity as a whole".[12] Their incorporation would help to demonstrate "how the revolutionaries built universalism not solely out of rights ideology but also by incorporating foreign peoples and projects into the republic".[13] Among the foreigners put forward for citizenship were a handful of Americans like George Washington and Thomas Paine.

And yet, it is important to highlight that for all the innovation of the 1791 and 1792 proposals, their progressive authors and champions overlooked formal reparations to or civic inclusion of two significant populations of individuals who had actually shaped the contours of the old northern French imperial world. Unmentioned were the peoples who had been the core of bringing it into being and who had also made tremendous sacrifices on behalf of France, first in war and then as collateral damage as the northern French Atlantic imperial project shuddered to a halt. The National Assembly took account of neither the French settler colonial *habitants* (former French Canadian colonists) who had stayed in the North American territories ceded to Britain nor of sovereign Native peoples who called the Americas home. We

11 C.A. Crouch, *Nobility Lost: French and Canadian Martial Cultures, Indians, and the End of New France*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014, pp. 148–152, 158–161.

12 S. Desan, "Foreigners, Cosmopolitanism, and French Revolutionary Universalism", in: Desan, Hunt, and Nelson (eds.), *The French Revolution in Global Perspective*, pp. 86–100, at pp. 86, 88, 92, quotation at p. 89.

13 S. Desan, L. Hunt, W.M. Nelson, "Introduction", in: Desan, Hunt, and Nelson (eds.), *The French Revolution in Global Perspective*, pp. 1–12, at p. 8.

cannot, Native Studies scholars would argue, have a fully rounded and complex understanding of any Atlantic events without including the perspectives of Haudenosaunee, Wabanaki, or Algonquin residents in the mission communities like Odanak (called Saint François by the French) and Kahnawake (Sault Saint Louis) near the St. Lawrence River or of the Anishinaabeg (Odawas, Potowatomis, and Ojibwes), Wyandots, Miamis, and Shawnees residing in proximities to old French forts, in places like Detroit and Michilimackinac.

Native peoples' lives had been entwined with both continental France and with its settler colonists, including many among those who had returned to France. Mission communities in particular had paid an exorbitant price, in blood and in property damage, for their perceived assistance to French interests in America during the two decades of conflict that culminated in the Seven Years' War. Had not the Ancien Régime wronged these communities as much, if not more, than the returned *habitants* – and, in the case of Native peoples, wronged them doubly? Under Choiseul's leadership, France had ceded Native homelands to the British in 1763 without the consent of Native residents and without Indigenous representation at the treaty table in Paris. Worse still, when the French returned as a military presence in North America in 1778, they did so on the "wrong side" for many of those communities, backing the settler colonial claims of rebelling Anglo-American colonists in a conflict that was resolved, once again, at treaty negotiations in Paris in 1783, which did not include any Native representation or participation.

Perhaps, one could argue, there was no compensation mandate made by the National Assembly for Indigenous Americans because there were no Native peoples residing in France. Perhaps – but the Acadian and Canadian populations found in France in the 1790s were statistically tiny as well and, more to the point, a number of prominent French-Canadian families had intermarried with Native communities so we cannot know for certain that there were no people of Native descent living in France at that time, or, at the very least, that there were not kinship ties or other bonds of connection that held together expatriate colonial and Indigenous populations. In 1778, when Admiral Charles Henri Hector d'Estaing anchored his French fleet in Boston, a Kanien'kehá:ka (Mohawk) delegation travelled from the community of Kahnawake, first to Philadelphia to meet the French consul, Gérard de Rayneval, and then to Boston, to explicitly seek out a "cousin" amongst the French – the French officer whom they had made into an adopted Kahnawake, Louis Antoine de Bougainville. Fictive kinship carried as much, and at times possibly more, weight in these communities as blood alliance and they had not forgotten these bonds of unity in the nearly two decades that had passed between 1760 and

1778.[14] Moreover, throughout the 1760s and 1770s, Lenape and Anishinaabeg resistance against British and Anglo-American land claims in what Anglo-Americans called the Old Northwest was reputedly phrased by individuals like Pontiac, the Odawa war chief, in the language of the French king "regaining his legs" and returning as a "father come to life" who would protect his "children" from Anglo-American settler colonialism. Observers in the 1760s and d'Estaing again in 1778 noted the apparent pleasure with which Native delegations recognized Roman Catholic priests and the "white flag" representing France.[15] Thus, could not these communities have received compensation from France in the 1790s, alongside the Acadians and others, given these outward shows of their long-suffering fidelity recorded by agents of the state?

One problem for French Revolutionary officials considering North America, and France's colonial legacy there, lay in the ways in which Native peoples had not subordinated their sovereignty to the colonizers. Unlike the Canadian veterans who had been poorly used after their return to France, the vast majority of Native communities remained in the Americas; having refused to cross the Atlantic could have been read as demonstrating their lack of fidelity to the metropole. Moreover, the statements of the "French king" waking up renewed the relevance (or worse, the legitimacy) of the Ancien Régime, which by 1792 was becoming increasingly inconvenient for radicals in the National Assembly. When the Louisiana creole Joseph Pontalba requested that First Consul Napoleon Bonaparte return the colony to French rule on 29th Fructidor (16 September 1801), he noted that "the old men among the Indians" carried a positive memory of French America and would "see the return of their former protectors with the satisfaction equal to the umbrage which the United States will take at it".[16] In its description of these Indians, Pontalba's successful application carefully stripped the monarchical overtones that had characterized the statements of Native peoples when they enquired about a French return.

Pontalba additionally used language that subordinated Indians to their "protectors". This was important because, as Anglo-Americans and Canadian *habitants* observed in the 1760s and 1770s, Anishinaabeg and Lenape orators claimed French resurgence strategically, reasserting the optimal nature of what Native-French relations had been – a mutual alliance based on reciprocal obligations that would help these Indigenous nations confront continuous and violent Anglo-American expansion. The French return would not be to inaugurate

14 Crouch, *Nobility Lost*, pp. 181–182.

15 G.E. Dowd, "The French King Wakes up in Detroit: 'Pontiac's War' in Rumor and History", *Ethnohistory* 37 (1990) 3, pp. 254–278, at pp. 263–264; Crouch, *Nobility Lost*, p. 179.

16 Pontalba quoted in Dowd, "The French King Wakes up in Detroit", p. 271.

a subjugation of Native communities, practices, and resources to French interests. Abundant colonial sources up until 1760 left an archive available to the new French Revolutionary regime, which demonstrated the role that Native peoples played in both creating and contesting the French empire's claims to dominance and uniformity. I would argue that this made Native presences potentially dangerous to the foundation of the new French national project due to the steadfast demonstrations Indigenous communities had made regarding their own sovereignty and traditions for nearly two centuries. Thus, the French Revolution enacted a fundamentally conservative action of removing Indigenous peoples from its consideration of who could transition from the old French Atlantic world into a participant in the new revolutionary one. The irony, of course, was that in silencing Indigenous presence and not atoning for the wrongs done to allies, the French Revolution laid the groundwork to continue the settler colonial practices of its predecessor state. Nowhere was this logic extended more clearly than in Napoleon's declaration of his rule and reinstatement of French claims to Louisiana (along with his attempt to restore legalized chattel slavery everywhere in the French Americas).

I will return to the implications of this continued erasure of Native peoples in French imperial and French republican narratives at the end of this chapter, but first, let us explore another possibility for tracing the French Revolution in Indian Country. As European tensions borne of the French Revolution spilled into the Atlantic, and at the very moment that French officials began publicizing the reimbursement of Canadian veterans for their suffering, some British authorities in 1792 revived an idea from a decade earlier of creating what might be termed a "Republic of Indians" – a proposed buffer state between Canada and the United States that would be populated by Native peoples and recognized as sovereign Indigenous space.[17] As France's fortunes rose in the revolutionary wars of the 1790s, Britain sought to quickly settle its disputes with the United States through negotiation, culminating in the unpopular treaty negotiated by John Jay and British officials. The United States was able to gain only one concession in the Jay Treaty, but it was an enormously important one: British withdrawal from forts in the Old Northwest and an end to British support for any potential "Republic of Indians". This agreement was reinforced by

17 On the first proposed buffer state, see R. White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, pp. 410, 433–434; C.G. Calloway, *The Victory with No Name: The Native American Defeat of the First American Army*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015, p. 30, and Blaufarb, "The French Revolutionary Wars", p. 151. On the revival of buffer state idea in the 1790s, see Blaufarb, "The French Revolutionary Wars", p. 155.

the Treaty of Greenville, concluded between the United States and leaders of the Anishinaabeg Confederacy, Wyandots, Lenapes, Shawnees, and Weas, which permitted Anglo-American expansion into Ohio and Indian territory in the Old Northwest. There was a large network of *habitants* at mid-continent, many of whom built connections with US officials like William Clark or William Henry Harrison and also maintained trade or family ties with Native communities. These *habitants* could have circulated information regarding Atlantic events in the 1790s. Émigrés leaving France and journeying to the Illinois country, Louisiana, or New England also carried news with them that could then have circulated to Native populations. Some of these, now exiled, had themselves been active, prominent participants in the French Revolution.

American historians have closely attended to the ways in which Native peoples reacted to and challenged the American Revolution, particularly the ways in which Native communities asserted their own independence against the alleged "patriots" by rejecting Anglo-American pretensions to their land. The Declaration of Independence (1776) had explicitly defined Native peoples as "merciless Indian savages" in its 24th paragraph and the Articles of Confederation (1777), and later the US Constitution (1787), similarly put forward the conception that Indians remained alien to the US Republic and its citizenry – a legal stance that remained in place until the passage of the Indian Citizenship Act (1924). It is notable that, for the most part, Indigenous resistance in the 1770s and 1780s did not take the form of directly co-opting the rhetoric of Anglo-American political union.[18]

After the Treaty of Greenville, the Shawnee veteran Tecumseh emerged as one of the most visible Native leaders in the Ohio River Valley region in the early 1800s – and it is important to note that Tecumseh had refused to sign the Treaty of Greenville. His resistance to American expansion could be potentially read as part of an early nineteenth-century moment when ideas circulated by the French Revolution and the Haitian Revolution may have carried more possibility and political utility to Shawnees, Miamis, Lenapes, and other Native communities than the American rhetoric of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" (a happiness that was a euphemism understood by Anglo-Americans to represent the Lockean

18 It was not until the Cherokee Constitution, adopted by the Cherokee Nation in 1827, was written that a Native council produced a record inspired directly by the United States Constitution. Drafted on 24 July 1827, the Constitution used the formulation and language of the US Constitution ratified in 1789. Notably, the Cherokee document incorporated and made explicit the restrictions embedded in the US model in order to exclude enslaved and free people of African descent from the body politic of the nation. T. Perdue and M.D. Green, *The Cherokee Removal: A Brief History with Documents*, Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's Press, 1995.

pursuit of property). Among the key concepts that Tecumseh put forth was his revival, by 1808, of the possibility of an intertribal Native federation that would put to rest long-standing rivalries between Native peoples in the Great Lakes and Mississippi valleys in favour of a united resistance. Though Tecumseh did not explicitly use the language of a "Republic of Indians", it is useful to consider how the innovation and political force of Tecumseh's project becomes clearer if read in these terms.

The recognition of inspiring deeds and ideas of Native peoples should not be approached through a frame that makes such concepts reactive to or intelligible through Eurocentric principles. Doing so only undermines the very innovation of the project that individuals like Tecumseh engaged in. We can, without reinforcing a Euro-American gaze, interpret the actions of Nativist leaders like Blue Jacket (the Shawnee who tried to build a confederation in the 1780s) and Tecumseh (who followed Blue Jacket in the early 1800s) as part of a transatlantic and global continuum. The French Revolution created a historical moment that radiated like a shock wave around the world, creating new tools and new difficulties for political elites everywhere by displacing traditional hierarchies and monarchs in favour of the people, initially defined as all people as put into practice by the ascent to power of the Girondins. What if we considered the possibility that the universalism of this French Revolutionary moment (which notably was never part of its American sister republic's world view) was in dialogue with and possibly inspired by the political universalism that Indigenous leaders were themselves championing throughout Indian Country? Taking seriously the invocation to look eastwards as well as westwards we must, at the very least, contemplate the multiple ways in which ideas flowed around the Atlantic.

Information about politics in Europe had long circulated among Native communities, irrespective of whether settler colonists chose to believe that their Indigenous neighbours were cosmopolitan or not.[19] The flow and transfer of information came in many forms, ranging from Indigenous travellers going to and returning from Europe, exchanges made by individuals of European and

19 Examples of Native North American parsing of European dynastic rivalries date back to the sixteenth century, in the era of Spanish, French, and English presumptions to the southeastern coastal regions controlled by Algonquian-speaking and Timucuan/Apalachee communities. D. Richter, "Tsenacommacah and the Atlantic World" in: P.C. Mancall (ed.), *The Atlantic World and Virginia, 1550–1624*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007, pp. 29–65, at pp. 36–41. During the Seven Years' War, French officers worried about how the assassination attempt on Louis XV might be considered by Native men allied to French forces, indicating the continued circulations of information regarding European politics, Crouch, *Nobility Lost*, p. 99.

African descent with Indian communities, diplomatic encounters in urban settings, as well as in the circulation of texts. The Shawnee leader Blue Jacket (Waweyapiersenwaw), who preceded (and later mentored) Tecumseh in building confederacies among Lenapes, Potowatomis, Odawas, and Ojibwes, was connected through trade and kinship to French mercantile networks and British officers.[20] Through his French-Shawnee wife and his British-educated sons, Blue Jacket was well positioned to receive information of events taking place in France from 1789 onwards. Tecumseh's father was Shawnee and his mother may have been Creek; even if she was not, Tecumseh's parents had spent considerable time with Creeks at the village of Tukabatchee. During Tecumseh's earliest years, delegations from Creek villages reached out to forge independent diplomatic ties with the Spanish in Havana, making 19 visits to Cuba between 1763 and 1776. There were among the Creeks ties that may have influenced Tecumseh in his youth and he certainly later made overtures to attract different Creek communities as allies.[21] From 1791 onwards, the struggle to overturn a slaveholding empire in Saint-Domingue undertaken by the men, women, and children held in bondage ushered in a wave of émigrés fleeing (often with their human property) to Charleston, Philadelphia, and other American cities, many of them carrying their own interpretations about French (and French imperial) political thought and transformation.

Exposure to information regarding the French Revolution took an even more direct form in the waning years of the eighteenth century when Girondin envoys from the Hexagon arrived in the new United States, ostensibly to strengthen ties with a sister republic but also to explore the potential to reforge associations with Native communities. These individuals held mandates

20 The former secretary of the National Assembly, Constantin-François Chasseboeuf, comte de Volney, travelled through Virginia, Kentucky, and the Wabash River region, and as well as Canada and the Genesee, Mohawk, and Hudson River valleys in 1797. Volney to Abbé Grégoire, 20 January 1797, in: A. Deneys, H. Deneys, "Six Lettres Inédites de Volney à Grégoire", *Dix-Huitième Siécle* 23 (1991), pp. 233–245, at p. 237. Volney also met the Miami leader Little Turtle (viewed by Tecumseh as an accommodationist) at Philadelphia in 1798, Calloway, *The Victory with No Name*, p. 158. On Blue Jacket's family, see C.G. Calloway, *The Shawnees and the War for America*, New York: Viking, 2007, pp. 87–88.

21 Saunt, *West of the Revolution*, pp. 192–199. On Tecumseh and kinship, see S. Warren, *The Worlds the Shawnees Made: Migration and Violence in Early America*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014, pp. 16, 209–210; L.K. Spero, "'Stout, Bold, Cunning, and the Greatest Travellers in the America': The Colonial Shawnee Diaspora", Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2010, p. 429; R.D. Edmunds, *Tecumseh and the Quest for Indian Leadership*, Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1984, p. 19.

to probe and mend kinship and diplomatic associations with the Ancien Régime's Indigenous allies. The goals of Citoyen Edmond Genet and his peers are typically read through the lens of US federal involvement in French Revolutionary conflict, and there is no doubt that Genet made life complicated for US officials.[22] However, we should consider as well that Genet and his subordinates, André Michaux and Michel Ange Bernard de Mangourit, sought any way to promote the revolutionary cause. Michaux's instructions from Genet explicitly encouraged him to foment an uprising against Spanish rule by Anglo-American and Native residents of the Mississippian region, joining them together in "une Legion Independante et Revolutionnaire" (an independent and revolutionary legion) with officers commissioned from Native communities as well as from the expeditionary force to be commanded by George Rogers Clark.[23] Operating out of Charleston, South Carolina, and in search of promoting the cause, Mangourit published in late 1793 English translations of some of Genet's letters in the local papers as well as disseminating the new French Constitution of 1793.[24]

Mangourit also hoped to appeal directly to Native communities and this gives us insight into how revolutionary rhetoric was translated to Native audiences. In his instructions to his American agents, William Tate and Samuel Leroi Hammond, Mangourit requested that they disseminate news of a new France to the Indigenous residents who had first forged their bonds of alliance and conflict with the Ancien Régime. What is especially remarkable is how Mangourit rooted his explanation of revolutionary social reorganization in France to potential allies among the Choctaws, Chickasaws, Cherokees, and Upper and Lower Creeks as revolutionary France's embrace of Native Americans' own practices.

---

22 On French migrants in the era of revolution, see, e.g., F. Furstenberg, *When the United States Spoke French: Five Refugees Who Shaped a Nation*, New York: Penguin Books, 2015; B. Van Ruymbeke, "Refugiés or Émigrés? Early Modern French Migrations to British North America and the United States (c.1680–c.1820)", *Itinerario* 30 (2006) 2, pp. 12–32. On Genet and his peers, see Blaufarb, "The French Revolutionary Wars", p. 148.

23 "Mémoire pour servir d'Instruction au Citoyen André Michaux, Agent de la République Française dans l'État de Kentukey [sic] et Sur le Mississippi", in: *Correspondence of Clark and Genet: Selections from the Draper Collection in the Possession of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, to Elucidate the Proposed French Expedition under George Rogers Clark Against Louisiana, in the Years 1793-94*, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1897, pp. 992–993.

24 R. J. Alderson, Jr., *This Bright Era of Happy Revolution: French Consul Michel-Ange-Bernard Mangourit and International Republicanism in Charleston, 1792–1794*, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2008, pp. 33–34.

> The French left your lands [. . .] why! [. . .] their Chief sold them to the King of Spain without their consent [. . .]. They felt they were free as the Indians. Their nation felt this – she punished the guilty Chief. She wished to be guided by her elders like you. She reclaimed the rights of man you enjoy [. . .]. The rights of man are equality, liberty, security, and possessions [. . .]. The French Nation upon reclaiming her sovereignty from the hands of a usurper, declared there could be no law without consensus of all expressed freely and solemnly. Henceforth the Indians will have nothing to fear from the Europeans of France, for the most sacred law among the French is to respect the laws, customs, and property of Indians and all free peoples.[25]

If Toussaint L'Ouverture could claim a role as the true heir of the French Revolution, pursuing "the triumph of liberty and equality", and extending the rhetoric of the *Rights of Man* to its furthest logical conclusion (full emancipation), Mangourit's interpretation of the French Revolution's roots placed the genesis of the revolution's ideals in Indian Country. According to his explanation, Indians had shaped the very heart of emerging, radical French political thought.[26] He used the language long associated with American borderlands, speaking of "chiefs" and framed this in a Rousseauian lens of natural law, rights, and governance. Mangourit's emphasis on consensus-based governance is intriguing, since he could have simply enumerated the failures of the recently fallen monarchy without giving Native peoples credit for inspiring French regime change, of wanting to be "guided by her elders as you are".

If a version of Mangourit's framing of revolutionary events passed in text or by word of mouth to Creeks, Cherokees, or Shawnees, we might then consider how these ideas influenced Nativist thinking, including Tecumseh's: how to create a politics both innovative and of renewal to inspire their followers.

---

25 "Les français ont quitté votre pays [. . .] pourquoi! [. . .] leur chef les vendit au Roi d'Espagne sans leur consentement [. . . .] Ils ont Senti qu'ils étaient libres comme les Indiennes. Leur nation la Senti – elle a puni Son chef coupable. Elle a voulu être comme vous conseillée par ses anciens. Elle a repris les droits de l'homme dont vous jouissés [. . . .] Les droits de l'homme, sont l'égalité, la liberté, la Sureté et la propriété [. . . .] La Nation Française en reprenant Sa souveraineté de mains d'un Roi qui l'avait usurpée, a declare qu'il ne pouvait éxister de loix que par la volonté de tous ses membres exprimée librement et Solomnellement. Desormeis les Indiens n'auront rien à redouter des Européens de la France, car la loi la plus Sacrée parmi les français commande le respect pour les loix, les coutumes et les propriété des Indiens et de tous les peuples libres [. . .]". F.J. Turner (ed.), M.A.B. de Mangourit, *The Mangourit Correspondence In Respect to Genet's Projected Attack Upon the Floridas, 1793–94*, Washington City, 1898, p. 623. Translation by author.

26 L'Ouverture quoted in C.L.R. James, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*, 2nd Edition, New York: Vintage, (1938) 1989, pp. 197–198. See also N. Nesbitt, *Universal Emancipation: The Haitian Revolution and the Radical Enlightenment*, Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008.

Leaders like Tecumseh rejected the Anglo-American construction of belonging that oppressed Native polities in favour of exploring new and sophisticated sociopolitical models.[27] What is certain is that the creative destruction of Europe's old order by France's revolution released internationally a political energy that changed every imperial calculation and inspired both the furtherance of revolutionary universalism and resistance to it in equal measure, sometimes within a single leader's mind. Political leaders took what they could fashion to their own use. The energizing effect of overthrowing of what had always been (in this case, the French monarchy) as well as the requirement to adapt to a challenging new situation and to try and shape it acted as the threads that bound Indigenous, African-descended, and Euro-American visionary leaders alike. This was the conscious purpose of revolutionaries as dissimilar as Thomas Jefferson and Napoleon and Tecumseh. The Mangourit connection is a tenuous one but suggestive of the ways in which, read through a French Revolutionary lens, figures like Blue Jacket and, later, Tecumseh could rationalize the radical reorganization of power hierarchy as a return to ancient Indian tradition. Even the Nativism of the later eighteenth century described by Gregory Evans Dowd could be considered in relationship to the complete revision of religion in the service of the state that featured in the French Revolution.[28]

Tecumseh's powerful physical presence and political goals resonated clearly with friends and foes alike. William Henry Harrison, the federal governor of Indiana territory, famously noted that the Shawnee possessed "one of those uncommon geniuses who spring up occasionally to produce revolutions and overturn the established order of things".[29] Harrison did not use such a term as "revolution" lightly when writing to the secretary of war, William Eustis, when he made this assessment in 1811. His statement was an explicit recognition of the extraordinary threat that Tecumseh posed to United States interests through the Shawnee war chief's project of "reimagining history and identity", in what Americans knew as the Northwest territory.[30] Tecumseh recognized the intertribal and intergenerational divisions that Anglo-Americans exploited among Indians and, critically, countered this not only by calling for pan-Indianism (a tactic that had precedents dating back to the seventeenth-

27 Warren, *The Worlds the Shawnees Made*, p. 18.

28 G.E. Dowd, *A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745–1815*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992, pp. 139–147.

29 William Henry Harrison to Secretary of War William Eustis, 7 August 1811, in: *Messages and Letters of William Henry Harrison*, Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Commission, 1922, p. 549.

30 Warren, *The Worlds the Shawnees Made*, p. 17.

century Narragansett chief Miantonomi) but also, as Tecumseh had stated in his address to Harrison, by achieving singular Indian purpose by endeavouring "to level all distinctions" and "to destroy the village chiefs, by whom all mischiefs are done. It is they who sell their lands to the Americans [. . .]. In the future we are prepared to punish those chiefs who propose to sell land to the Americans".[31] The levelling impulse could be interpreted as a flattening of intertribal distinction or it could have been Tecumseh's intention to engage in a radical social reorganization akin to that which had taken place, albeit briefly, in the French Revolution.

The violence of the American Revolution and its aftermath shattered the old order of Shawnee social hierarchy and political leadership; without this tremendous and negative remaking of the Shawnees' world, a figure like Tecumseh would not have risen to the prominence and position of influence in his own community. Like many of the most radical members of the French National Assembly, and distinctly unlike the most prominent thinkers of the American Revolutionary elite, Tecumseh was prepared to continue to destroy the old order within his society if it would serve the purpose of achieving pan-Indianism. And while his rhetoric (as recorded) relied on the familiar tropes of Indian speech, such as references to kinship that appeared in a speech to the Osages, "Brothers, we all belong to one family", it is worth contemplating if Tecumseh simultaneously gestured towards an interpretation of the ideal of fraternity, as an essential feature alongside liberty and equality, which had been embedded in the language of the French Revolution.[32] Some among the nascent French republicans had pushed for the granting of citizenship to progressive, non-French men of the Enlightenment in 1792; many American Indian nations (including the Shawnee) had long-standing practices of adoption and fictive kinship to strengthen their communities in time of crisis.[33] Unlike the 1792 proposal, Native communities that practiced adoption did so irrespective of race, gender, and religion. Tecumseh's appeal to "brotherhood" among the Osages could thus simultaneously gesture towards deeply held, Nativist restoration of tradition and a profound radicalization of the current political universalism.

31 Tecumseh to William Henry Harrison in: E. Eggleston and L.E. Seelye, *Tecumseh and the Shawnee Prophet*, New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1878, pp. 182–186. See also H. Adams, *History of the United States of America During the First Administration of James Madison 2*, Vol. 6, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1890, p. 87.

32 A.S. Greenberg (ed.), *Manifest Destiny and American Territorial Expansion: A Brief History with Documents*, Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's Press, 2012, pp. 57–58.

33 On adoption, see, e.g., D.K. Richter, "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience", *The William and Mary Quarterly* 40 (1983) 4, pp. 528–559.

Respatialization also encourages moving past the traditional orientation of American history on an east-to-west axis to consider different directional approaches that invite tracing the impact of the Haitian Revolution (let alone the French Revolution) on expressions of Nativism emerging in Indian Country. Such work has been limited due to the strong focus on considering the American Revolution's importance to Indigenous communities. Just because Anglo-Americans like Jefferson refused to publicly acknowledge what Michel-Rolph Trouillot calls "a history of the impossible" in Saint-Domingue did not mean that this information would not or did not enter into Indian Country.[34] When Tecumseh stated that he "levelled" the chiefs, he had also said, "you wish to prevent the Indians from doing as we wish them – from unifying and considering their land as the common property of the whole [. . .] this land that was sold and the goods that were given for it, was only done by a few".[35] Land redistribution and equitable resource management shaped questions for the most radical thinkers in the American, French, and Haitian revolutions. Though drawing from an older consideration of property that circulated among Native communities, which delineated boundary lines that could also be used commonly, Tecumseh had, in 1807, stated in regards to US presumptions, "[t]hese lands are ours: no one has the right to remove us because we were the first owners."[36] As historian Allan Greer notes, Tecumseh was a man "who knew how to talk to colonizers, but who also was bold enough to reject their territorial assumptions".[37] Three years later, Tecumseh's phrasing transformed this idea into a reflection of land held by the people for all the people.[38]

Literary scholars have probed the multiple registers in which prominent Native individuals operated, in order to parse the ways in which individuals like the Mohegan minister Samson Occum could navigate the settler colonial world in terms familiar to Euro-Americans without diluting or abandoning the precepts essential to Native communities, be they Mohegan, Haudenosaunee,

34 M.-R. Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1995, pp. 73, 82.

35 Eggleston and Seelye, *Tecumseh and the Shawnee Prophet*, p. 183.

36 Tecumseh quoted in J. W. Powell, *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institutions, 1892–93*, Part 2, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1896, p. 684.

37 A. Greer, *Property and Dispossession: Natives, Empires, and Land in Early Modern North America*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018, p. 310.

38 Juliana Barr offers a consideration of the assertion and recognition (or lack thereof) of Indian boundaries in the early Americas in "Geographies of Power: Mapping Indian Borders in the 'Borderlands' of the Early Southwest", *The William and Mary Quarterly* 68 (2011) 1, pp. 5–46, at pp. 8–10.

or beyond.[39] Our access to Tecumseh is entirely through transcription provided by others, copied down at times by individuals opposed to the Shawnee's projects, like William Wells (son-in-law of the accommodation-minded Miami chief Little Turtle and translator to William Henry Harrison). Returning to the language purported to have been Tecumseh's allows us some insight into the unique ways in which he bridged tradition and innovation. Engaging in this work is all the more important in light of the aggressive ways in which Anglo-Americans sought to frame Tecumseh, his reputation, and the language associated with him after the Shawnee's death. American observers drew correlations between his actions and those of Napoleon in calling him both "the Indian Napoleon" and "a Red Hannibal-Napoleon".[40] Authors like Benjamin Drake, writing *The Life of Tecumseh and His Brother the Prophet* (1841), and B.B. Thatcher used these terms to reinforce the notion of a vanishing, noble Indian. But their recollections were also rooted in collective, if subordinated, memories of Tecumseh's successes and threat to the United States. As with William Henry Harrison's statement regarding revolutionary leadership, perhaps we should revisit these expressions and look beyond their racialized stereotype to what they revealed about unspeakable Anglo-American fears. In aligning Tecumseh with Napoleon, Anglo-Americans not only drew a correlation between the Shawnee leader's military genius and that of his French counterpart but also implicitly connected Tecumseh to the legacies of the French Revolution. Tecumseh and his brother Tenskwatawa, the religious reformer, based inclusion for heterogeneous Native populations at Tenskwatawa's villages on the basis of fictive kinship – a fictive kinship that could become the grounds for a type of utopian citizenship, rooted in brotherhood and property held in common, in this "Republic of Indians". Tecumseh, like France's revolutionary armies under generals like Napoleon and the African-descended, former aristocrat Thomas-Alexandre Dumas, carried forward the expansionist vision of this unifying utopia to other Indigenous communities. From his modest roots and his rise based on strategic acumen and personal magnetism to his ability to seize and

39 A. Calcaterra, *Literary Indians: Aesthetics and Encounter in American Literature to 1920*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2018, pp. 73–81.

40 Benjamin Drake named Tecumseh "the Indian Napoleon" and this term was picked up by B. B. Thatcher's phrase "the INDIAN BONAPARTE" (caps in original). See G. Sayre, *The Indian Chief as Tragic Hero: Native Resistance and the Literatures of America, from Moctezuma to Tecumseh*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005, p. 269; B. Gilbert, "The Dying Tecumseh and the Birth of a Legend", *Smithsonian Magazine*, July 1995, https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/the-dying-tecumseh-97830806/ (accessed 5 December 2018).

capitalize on a revolutionary moment, Tecumseh resembled Napoleon's ascent to leadership as well.

In conclusion, I offer some suggestions to tie these strands together and demonstrate some contemporary queries that arise from respatializing the French Revolution and bringing this moment into dialogue with Indian Country, particularly connected to the ways in which France's revolutionary-era rejection of Indigenous legacy has perpetuated certain kinds of violence. Bureaucrats in both the waning years of the Ancien Régime and also in the era of the French Revolution silenced Native voices and Native presence in France and through this erasure, allowed a particular type of settler colonial violence to move forward through space and time in ways that we can trace in France today. Despite the wealth of Native American sources – textual, visual, and material – that resides in state archives in France, attesting to two centuries of sustained contact and relationship, the indexing of these sources in the archives erroneously reaffirms that these materials are the property of the European state that claims to have exclusively produced them – a point that effectively erases the dialogic exchange embedded in the maps, *plans* (site surveys), treaties, and speeches that was so central to their creation. More troubling, a number of these sources remain in institutions that came into being in order to effect imperialism: for instance, early modern military maps that relied on Native knowledge to be made are, to this day, under the control of the Ministry of Defence and this unproblematically reaffirms their service to the French state and to a natural, linear progression that still undertakes the work of imperial expansion that began in the monarchy and continues through today's Fifth Republic.[41]

In addition to the recasting of colonial material as being about French – as opposed to Indigenous – history, France has retained, at best, a sporadic and highly selective collective national memory of its first early modern empire in North America. Put simply, the modern French Republic continues the policies of the 1791 National Assembly in that it does not acknowledge an archival or material responsibility to the descendants of Native American communities. Indians are not included in an idea of France and the consequences of this omission have come up repeatedly in recent years. When France rebuilt its ethnographic museum, the Musée du quai Branly, which opened in 2006 as the signature cultural legacy of President Jacques Chirac, the new displays stripped museum objects of their provenance and context, flattening the ways in which Odawa or Kanien'kehá:ka or Shawnee materials came to be in French hands in

41 C.A. Crouch, "Surveying the Present, Projecting the Future: Reevaluating Colonial French *Plans* of Kanesetake", *The William and Mary Quarterly* 75 (2018) 2, pp. 323–342, pp. 340–341.

the first place, and housed them in a building that architect Jean Nouvel designed to echo Joseph Conrad's novel *Heart of Darkness* (1899).[42] And this issue of silencing the Native past has repeatedly arisen as well in the continuous trafficking of Indigenous American art and artefacts through French auction houses. The auction houses (and the French judicial system) deny any responsibility to critically assessing the free market sale, rather than repatriation, of Native American sacred and community objects, based on the argument that federally recognized Native American nations have no relationship to France, no legacy in France, and thus no legal rights in seeking restitution of these items.[43] On 14 November 2017, the French newspaper *Le Monde* obtained a communiqué from within the French Ministry of Culture that proposed, among other things, to reduce the archival mission of the ministry "to those archives essential for future generations" without any indication of which repositories, or which sources, might be deemed essential. Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy, scholars who authored the 2018 report commissioned by French President Emmanuel Macron to weigh the question of returning indigenous objects in French collections, focused on items of West African provenance, not Native North American, in their consideration of the parameters of colonialism.[44]

This French reconsideration of archives and "future generations" is poignant, given that Haudenosaunee communities to this day maintain that the most important actions are those taken "to the benefit of the coming face" (meaning future generations) – American Indians are not likely to be among the future generations that the Ministry of Culture considers when reducing materials. We need to consider that respatialization means more than just adding geographic locales but changing an entire mindset. Archives are tangible places

42 J. Chaplin, "Vive la différence? Le musée du Quai Branly", *Common Place* 7 (2007) 2, http://www.common-place-archives.org/pastimes/200701.shtml (accessed 1 September 2017); M. Kimmelman, "A Heart of Darkness in the City of Light", *The New York Times*, 2 July 2006, https://www.nytimes.com/2006/07/02/arts/design/02kimm.html (accessed 14 November 2017).

43 H. Keeler, "Indigenous International Repatriation", *Arizona State Law Journal* 44 (2012) 2, pp. 703–802; C.B. Graber, K. Kuprecht, and J.C. Lai (eds.), *International Trade in Indigenous Cultural Heritage: Legal and Policy Issues*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2012.

44 C. Fabre, "Musées, archives, spectacle vivant … : les pistes de réforme envisagées pour la culture", *Le Monde*, 14 November 2017, http://www.lemonde.fr/culture/article/2017/11/14/les-pistes-de-reformes-envisagees-pour-la-culture_5214495_3246.html (accessed 14 November 2017); F. Sarr and B. Savoy, "Rapport sur la restitution du patrimoine culturel africain. Vers une nouvelle éthique relationnelle", November 2018, http://restitutionreport2018.com/sarr_savoy_fr.pdf (accessed 29 November 2018).

of cultural observation. When researchers consult materials in these spaces, they have the potential to shift the meaning of that material to create or to restore cultural memories. Respatialization invites an act of disputation, a generative reconstruction in the service of fresh perspectives and, ideally, necessary reconciliations. Tracing and articulating the connections, ideas, and spaces of the French Revolution to Native communities and exploring the ways in which the various architects of that revolutionary moment have since excluded Native peoples can lead us to a richer understanding of this history, its continuing violences, and its unfulfilled potentials. Embracing respatialization's possibilities of past recovery and present action may help to preserve the fragile legacy of these sources by rightfully restoring Indigenous North American voices back into France itself.