



**CRITICAL
RACE
CONVERSATIONS**

A Folger Institute Fiftieth Anniversary Project
Supported by the Mellon Initiative in Collaborative
Research

[Watch the full series](#)

Race in the American South

Description: Dialogue with Miles Grier, Robbie Ethridge, Liz Ellis, and Owen Williams

February 23, 2021

OWEN WILLIAMS: Welcome to Critical Race Conversations, a series hosted by the Folger Institute with the support of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. I am Owen Williams, associate director of scholarly programs at the Folger Institute. We're delighted to gather so many friends, old and new, for these conversations. I would like to take just a moment to introduce the series and our moderator for today's event. This series of free online sessions features scholars who are offering new insights into the prehistory of modern racialized thinking and racism.

WILLIAMS: Our speakers are acknowledging deeper and more complex roots to enduring social challenges and conducting more inclusive investigations of our contested pasts, all with the goal of creating a more just and more inclusive academy and society. The Folger Institute is providing the framework and platform, but as is our practice, we turn to scholars across disciplines and career stages to lead discussions from their own experience and expertise. We recognize that we should allow others who are more knowledgeable about the field of critical race studies to create the conversations. We have much to learn.

WILLIAMS: In these critical race conversations, we are actively experimenting with new technologies and new ways to foster dialogue and present content, just as so many of you are in your own classrooms. For this session, our speakers welcome live tweeting with the #FolgerCRC and comments posted in the YouTube live chat. You may also post questions via Twitter or the live chat and we will relay as many of these as possible to the moderator in the time we have. I remind you that this session will be recorded and posted on the Folger's YouTube channel as soon as it is processed with closed captioning enabled and available verified transcript will be uploaded next week. Please contact the Folger Institute with any questions or concerns.

WILLIAMS: Today's session on Race in the American South stands in for a symposium that the institute's scholarly programs had planned to offer in

partnership with the University of Alabama on early modern intersections in the American South. That program has been rescheduled for the spring of 2022 where one of its organizers will moderate today's conversation. Heather Miyano Kopelson is associate professor of History at the University of Alabama and a former Folger fellow. She is currently writing *Speaking Objects: Indigenous Women and the Materials of Dance in the Americas, 1500 to 1700*. Today's conversation will introduce some of the many things that that symposium will explore in depth next spring.

WILLIAMS: These include viewing the American South through the presence of race, enslavement, and indigeneity in the centuries surrounding the arrival of Europeans and Africans to the Americas. It will ask about the particular ways that members of indigenous, European, and African cultures interacted with each other and fundamentally reshaped their respective world views in light of often painful realities that still resonate today. Without further ado, I give you Race and the American South. Heather, please take it away.

HEATHER MIYANO KOPELSON: Great. Thank you very much, Owen. I am speaking to you from the University of Alabama and an institution built upon unceded Muskogean territories. The institution's occupation of this land colonizes and erases ancestral cultures and ways of knowing and being among others. Those are the Choctaw Peoples and the Creek Confederacy, a ratio of the neighboring Poarch Creek Indian Nation has been countering through education and outreach. Thank you to all involved in making this event possible, including everyone watching. I'm going to briefly introduce our panelists in the order that they'll offer their initial comments and then we'll get right to it.

KOPELSON: First, we'll have Miles Grier, who is an assistant professor at the City University of New York Queens College. Two of his notable articles include "Staging the Cherokee, a fellow, an Imperial Economy of Indian Watching", published in the *William & Mary Quarterly*. And then "Black White" published in *Shakespeare Text*. He is one of the editors of the acclaimed *Early Modern Black Diasporas Studies, a Critical Anthology*. And his book *Inkface, a Fellow and The Formation of White Interpretative Community*, which is forthcoming from the University of Virginia Press analyzes how mobile, unpredictable folk methods of racial categorization preconditioned and prompted experts who enshrined a system of stable races and statues and naturalist tables.

KOPELSON: Then we'll have Robbie Ethridge, who is professor of anthropology at the University of Mississippi. In addition to editing four anthologies and writing numerous articles and book chapters, she is the author of *Creek Country, The Creek Indians and Their World, 1796 to 1816*, and the Mooney award-winning book *From Chicaza to Chickasaw, the European Invasion and the Transformation of the Mississippian World, 1540 to 1715*. She's best known for her work on the 16th and 17th century colonial disruptions in the American South and the resultant shatter zone that transformed the Southern Indians.

KOPELSON: Her current research continues this examination as she reconstructs the 700-year history of the precolonial Mississippian world, it's, the restructuring of native societies that occurred as they became an instrumental part of a colonial South. Third, we'll have Liz Ellis, who's an assistant professor of history at the New York University. Prior to joining NYU, she was a BERA post-doctoral fellow and a visiting assistant professor at the McNeil Center for Early American Studies at the University of Pennsylvania.

KOPELSON: Her current book project examines the histories of the smaller native nations of the lower Mississippi Valley. Her research is broadly focused on the formation of native nations in the early southeast and the ways that indigenous people shaped and limited the extent of European colonization. Liz also writes about contemporary indigenous issues and political movements. She is a citizen of the Peoria tribe of Indians of Oklahoma. All right, Miles, if you'll get us started.

MILES GRIER: Thank you, Heather, for the introduction and hello to Elizabeth and Robbie, nice to see you both. Thank you to Owen and Justine and Ben at the Folger for putting this together and I [CLEARS THROAT], excuse me, greet you from the land of the Susquehannock. This is something I just began to look into more recently. It turns out that right outside my window, Northern Boulevard Street that I walk down every day in Queens was a site of a battle between the Susquehannock and the Dutch. Not exactly outside my window, but the same street so it's an education that I continue giving myself. Okay, [CLEARS THROAT], excuse me.

GRIER: So my remarks today are called Early Modernity as a Check on Southern Exceptionalism. The U.S. South has become exceptional in history of race. Every American historian of race returns to the Virginia Slave Codes enacted over a century from 1660 to 1750 to describe what they call "a hardening" of racial categories. This metaphor of hardening serves to establish the times when and the places where race is and isn't when all the conceptual premises have been articulated and ratified.

GRIER: Anything before this moment or outside of the U.S. South becomes suspicious as not really race, possibly even a phobia, religious persecution, or cultural chauvinism, but certainly, certainly not race. But the social beast of race is not the same as the object of academic discipline. So what if rather than looking at the U.S. South as the location of racist consolidation, we treated the south as a prism through which other iterations in other times and places might become visible to us.

GRIER: So for example, please share. Yes, okay and fullscreen. There we are. Okay. For example, what are we to make of the Virginia legislator's attempt in 1692 to prevent the proliferation of multiracial children. That is awfully small. I will read that to you.

GRIER: Described as that abominable mixture and spurious issue which hereafter may increase in this dominion as well by Negroes, Mulattoes, and Indians marrying with English. It's at the bottom of this more visible version. The solution that they offered was a sort of racial hygiene. Quote, "It is here by enacted that for the time to come, whatsoever English or other white man or women being free shall intermarry with a Negro, Mulatto, or Indian man or woman, bond or free, shall within three months of after such marriage be banished and removed from this dominion forever."

GRIER: Colonial Virginia then established as an adulterated zone of white ethno reproduction. This has become the global reputation of this hemisphere, a result of the mass mediation of the Abolitionist Movement and of the ways that the American South became depicted through the televisual aspects of the Civil Rights Movement. However, the plantations were not the first zone conceived of a zone of White ethno reproduction.

GRIER: Consider the way Shakespeare imagined late Imperial Rome in his first tragedy Titus Andronicus of 1594. In that play, a nurse enters carrying the illegitimate child of Rome's pale gothic empress and a Black Moor who entered Rome as a prisoner of war. The nurse refers to the child as "a joyless, dismal, black, and sorrowful issue, here is the babe, as loathsome as a toad among the fair-faced breeders of our clime."

GRIER: The same term "issue" appears in the London Theater a full century before the Virginia legislators use it. In one sense, that's unsurprising since issue didn't have only the sense that we have now of a print edition, but did refer then to children. But it is intriguing that this term actually does begin to already take on this print connotation when the child is Black.

GRIER: The nurse uses the language of print to describe the child, "the empress sends it to thee (the Moor) by stamp and by seal and bids thee christen it with thy dagger's point." The child seems not a person at all, but a page imprinted by a father's inky black complexion. The same language of an indelible imprint upon the child characterizes the laws around racial inheritance in Colonial Virginia. But most important, the nurse suggests that the space of Rome is a space of a particular kind of reproduction.

GRIER: Generation, reproduction, is supposed to be the making of copies of "fair-faced readers of our clime, our zone, our polity." Finally, Titus presages the spatial logic of racialized slavery and freedom. The 1691 statute decrees that any Negro, freed, must be sent out of the country within six months. Moreover, it calls for the banishment of however English or other White man or women being free shall intermarry with a Negro, that they will be banished after three months forever.

GRIER: The dream of this space of endless White reproduction is of course not attainable. There cannot be empire and a monoracial polity. There cannot be

militarized manliness and conquest without encouraging the displays of power that include the taking of conquered women, forcing them to become readers for the conquerors. The hope then is to ignore, to outlaw, to banish, so as to maintain at least the fantasy that Imperial projects of racial dominance actually contradict and undermine even as they succeed.

GRIER: There is no legitimacy for non-White children. By definition, they must be adulterated, impure, unchosen. And White adults who partner with non-White others, all out of Whiteness. Again, this too was predicted in Titus. Tamora is described as “inamorous fetters to Aaron, that is enslaved to Aaron,” though both he and his child as Black are also constantly referred to as slaves. And this is interesting for the child since his mother of course is White and the Empress of Rome.

GRIER: Tamora is already a captive and exile, but she is killed at the end of the play like a gothic prostitute. Titus does not venerate her as a native-born Roman queen. He kills her with as much impunity as he killed... Forgive me, there is an error here. Oh, no. Her White son. I was like... Aaron’s son doesn't die. Right. Her White son who was a war captive who has not married into the Roman aristocracy.

GRIER: There's no way to banish someone from this zone of White reproduction than to kill them, that is a permanent dispatch. So before we think of the South of this exceptional location of racism in the history of the world, it is important to think about how this place and whatever was achieved there was being dreamed up for centuries. Virginia would appear to be one of the locations in which the English tried out what they'd been experimenting with in their head, on paper, and on stage. And I just wanna give one final example of that.

00:15:15]

GRIER: Some of you will be familiar with Thomas Harriet’s brief and true report on the new found land of Virginia, 1588. And I wanted to point out this map of the arrival of the English. You'll see the ship here. And I'm not certain if you can see there are little small images of native people at different moments. But there are more ships than there are native people. [LAUGH] So it gives the impression that the land has sort of already been cleared to be this White ethno space. [CLEARSTHROAT]

GRIER: And I want to add that even rhetorically, Harriet’s report as many scholars have pointed out, it begins with the commodities that are for sale in this new land. It's only in the final section that you get any sense that there are people already living there. And then they are depicted as peaceful, as sparse, and also as eager for conversion.

GRIER: So it's this sort of interesting tension between there aren't that many of them, they're ready to be converted, but by the way, before we go, let me give you a report on the defenses that their town have and their weapons. Like, well, why

would you even need to talk about that unless of course you do expect resistance? So this is part of what I mean about, you know, as early as early as 1588, the kind of dreams of a possible space for White profit, White conquest, and White reproduction are already ready. And I think looking through the prism of the South allows us to actually see England itself as a racialized space. Thank you.

ROBBIE ETHRIDGE: Okay, I guess I'm up next. And I would also like to extend my thanks to Heather and the folks at the Folger for putting this together. This has really been a fun project. And like Miles, I would like to acknowledge that the indigenous lands from where I'm coming from, I'm in Oxford, Mississippi, these are the former lands of the Chickasaw Indians. When I think of race and the early modern South, I don't think in terms of European racial categories and prejudices or ideologies because I'm kind of coming at this from a native perspective.

ETHRIDGE: And so I don't think in terms of White, Black, native, and so on. I try think about how Native people understood others, you know, they really start to recognize outsiders from their own groups and people who were not of them. And they definitely had strong ideas and opinions about the character of those others. But they didn't not think in terms of the racial categories as what Europeans thought. They're just missions of who belonged, were rooted in things like kinship, township, qualities and, you know, things like that, but not skin color, religion, or places of origin.

ETHRIDGE: Having said that though, there's no doubt that Native people in the early modern South came up against the ideologies of Europeans and the consequent prejudices and discriminations that accompanied those. And this is an intersection that really interests me: how did Europeans conceive with Native people at the time and how did these misconceptions shape those interactions between the natives and the newcomers? And I think Miles was getting at some of that with his earlier comments. And in addition, as historians such as Christina Schneider and Clay Miles, and others have shown, some segments of native societies by the 19th century have adopted European racial categories along with prejudices and discriminations that came with those categorizations, that yeah, owning African slaves and so on.

ETHRIDGE: And so, you know, even though you can say Native peoples did not carry those racial categories with them until into the 19th century, they still came up against them and they had to deal with them in many varied ways. I just want to talk a little bit about the conception of, you know, the American South, how do we think about that? And again, from my point of view, my conception of the American South does not conform to the general thinking about the South as a region.

ETHRIDGE: Obviously the idea of the South is not an indigenous one, but rather an imported Euro-American one. However, you could still see some racial coherency even in precolonial times. And Liz, if I can have that slide of the Mississippi world.

So this map is a map of the Mississippian world as it was at the time of around 1540, at the time of the Hernando de Soto expedition.

ETHRIDGE: And the line you see here, this is actually the path of Hernando de Soto and I tried to map out this Mississippian world based on the de Soto documents and also very much on the archeology. So you can see there's many places that Soto did not go, but that we still know about from the archeological context. And as you can see from this map, it's pretty much the Mississippian world in 1540. By Mississippian, I mean, that's the term that the archeologists give to this precolonial era that dates from about 900 AD to about 1600 AD.

ETHRIDGE: And this world was, well, it shows some regional comparency. And actually, largely conforms to what we think of as the American South. I should mention that in earlier times before 1540, there were Mississippian policies up the Mississippi Valley. But in 1540, this was pretty much the Mississippian world. But that regional comparency derives from an environmental fact, and that is that foreign agriculture underwrote these policies.

ETHRIDGE: And foreign agriculture required specific climactic and environmental factors that more or less were found only in the American South and parts of the Midwest. When I say foreign agriculture, clearly other people across the Americas grew corn, but in the Mississippian world, these were hierarchical large communities and policies that depended on intensive foreign agriculture. And to grow as much corn as they needed to sustain these policies, that could only really be done in the American South and parts of the Midwest.

ETHRIDGE: So basically until roughly speaking, one does not find these Mississippian mound builders north of modern day Virginia and Kentucky. So it's not an exact overlay, but it's pretty close. Yeah, but having said that, again, even though native peoples did not concede of the South as we're talking about it today, the Euro-American's political, social, and economic traits that came to define the American South clearly had an impact on indigenous life. This includes things like the importation of Africans into race-based slavery, the plantation, system, economic caste system and the power of Southern elites.

ETHRIDGE: The sexual divide between the north and the south. And certainly, the beginnings of the cotton boom and subsequent landgrab of the 19th century which led to Indian removal. So if I could get to that next slide, Liz? So what you see here is the American South in 1700 and as you can see it is transformed. All of those policies that existed in the precolonial Mississippian world are now gone. And they've been replaced by-I mean, people didn't disappear. But what happened is the people restructured their lives, restructured their policies, restructured much about their political life and economic life to live in this expanding European world.

ETHRIDGE: And this is when you got the formation of the more better-known Southern Indian groups such as the Choctaws, the Creeks, the Chickasaws and so on.

Those group didn't those groups formed in the – those people didn't encounter – the crucible of colonization. And so, you know, although many people of the South do not think in terms of Southern, their lives were impacted by the emergence of this American South.

LIZ ELLIS: Okay, great. Thanks so much. I'm really excited to join you all here this afternoon as well and thanks for setting me up so well, Miles and Robbie. I'm joining y'all from Lenape Homelands where it's currently finally stopping snowing a little bit. And I do wish we could be in person, but I'm very grateful to Owen and Justine and all the folks at the Folger Institute for having me and thanks, Heather, for facilitating this conversation.

ELLIS: So I'm a historian who works on the 17th and 18th century southeast. And specifically, I'm now finishing up on a book on the lower Mississippi Valley, so the region that's currently Mississippi, Louisiana, and Eastern Texas. And my work focuses on smaller native nations in this region. So as Robbie, you know, sort of showed you in that first map, there are some larger sort of cultural groups and then we looked at that second map and I will pull this back up and show you the smaller region that I'm talking about.

ELLIS: But my work specifically focuses on smaller indigenous polities in the region. Let me start up this again. Okay, so if you can see down in the lower Mississippi Valley, groups that are labeled as the Biloxis, Bayogoulas, 1Chawashas, Taensas, those sort of groups. And I am primarily interested in my work in the process of indigenous nation building, so how and why some of these nations chose to remain as smaller groups, what that means for how people think about belonging to a nation, about who constitutes them, and about how these different nations exercise power.

ELLIS: I keep saying smaller groups, that's because in the late 17th and the early 18th century, much of the native nations who inhabited this Gulf South region were smaller in size, so I'm talking about 200 people to 3500 people as a region. So all in all, in this lower Mississippi Valley region, there's a little less than 20000 people who belonged to these smaller groups at the turn of the 18th century. And I tell you this because one of the things that I think is really important to understand when we think about the early South and when we imagine in particular the French empire and the Spanish empires in the south, is that there's just not as many European settlers as I sometimes think we like to imagine.

ELLIS: So at the height of French empire, Louisiana, lower Louisiana only contains 4000 French settlers or European settlers. This is a super small number of people to be complaining this huge region. And the reason that I talk about this and I am thinking about power and the limits of empire and the demographic make up of the South is I think it's really important to remember that when we think and talk about the early modern South and the ideologies and sort of intellectual currents of the people of this place, most of the south is comprised of native people at this point.

ELLIS: And so it's really important to think as, you know, Robbie has gestured at, as Miles is talking about, not just the currents of European racial thought that are in process of formation during the 17th and 18th century, but also indigenous framings of who belongs, who's excluded and how to think about physical and social difference. So I wanted to open this conversation by making kind of two points. The first of which to echo Robbie is to sort of say that race is not the primary way that native people think and talk about difference or about belonging in their societies.

ELLIS: And this remains true until the end of the 18th century in most cases. So native people have diverse and concrete ways of thinking about who belonged and who was part of their families, their wider kinship networks, and their nations. Many native Southerners, like people who would become Cherokees, Choctaws and Creek or the Muscogee's during this time period trace descent through matrilineal networks, so basically by the mother instead of by the father as is more common in European societies at this time period.

ELLIS: And what this means, for example, if there was a woman within the Creek nation who had a child with someone who is not Creek. And this could be someone who is Choctaw or this could be someone who is English, that child would be regarded as belonging to and part of the Creek nation. There's actually a really cool example of just this phenomenon working in the era of the American Revolution for this Creek leader named Alexander McGillivray. So his mother's from the influential Wind Clan within Creek society, his dad is Scottish, and he's regarded as belonging fully to Creeks.

ELLIS: So that while, and he becomes super powerful in part because he's accepted in both societies, right, the patrilineal descent lets him make inroads with the English, the matrilineal kinship networks let him exercise a power and authority within the Creek nations. And so while English outsiders, English diplomats write about him as a half-breed, people within his own nation would not use this kind of Harry Potter-esque languages of mixed bloods or, you know, partial make ups to talk about his ways of belonging. He was simply Muscogee, right, it's more important that he is from the town of Coshatta for example than that he, you know, had a father who was not from immediately of in this nation.

ELLIS: And so I wanna just show you a couple of images to think as well a little bit about physical, how native people used physical difference to mark insiders and outsiders before I return to some more of this. So I wanna look at a couple of images of physical difference here. These are from a variety of time periods and actually, Miles set me up perfectly by referencing Harriett before this. And I'm just gonna show you a couple of images that I want you to kind of look at what stands out to you about how these native people look different. They're all different time periods, all different parts of the South.

00:31:20]

ELLIS: The point here is emphasize the physical appearance of diversity among native people in this region. So this first image is from 1590, it's near, you know, what's now North Carolina, and this is actually an image that's from an engraving done by Theodor de Bry, but based on the observations of John White who was an Englishman who traveled to Rowanoak in the 1580s. I'm using a German colorized print of this because it was clear and high-resolution, but I think what's important is to notice the amount of body paint, the unique hairstyles in this image.

ELLIS: This second image, despite it looking perhaps like a grade school drawing, this was done by a French engineer in the early 18th century. This is a man who was traveling through Natchez, which you can actually see one of these mountains which is a holdover from Mississippi and cultural practices. In the middle, these are women of different social classes within Natchez. You can see them marked by tattooing, by distinct forms of dress, and hairstyle. This third image is unattributed, it's from the 1740s in Northwestern Louisiana, it's probably of a Caddo man. Again, you can see how different the hairstyles and the body paint is here, the markings, the clothing.

ELLIS: And finally, and I'll tell you why I'm moving so quickly through these in just a minute. The final image I wanted to show you, similar time period, again, early 18th century, this is from 1736 and this is actually by a baron from Hanover who ends up traveling to Georgia during this time period. And he visits with Yuchi people who are affiliated with the Creek Nation. And you can see that he's really struck in his depiction, both by this hairstyle, you can see the cropped bit of hair at the top of this man's head as well as the extensive tattooing, paint, and clothing are the things that he's highlighting with his use of color in these images.

ELLIS: Okay. So what I wanna say really quickly about why I'm focusing on these, you know, physical differences and the way that native people are presenting themselves with their dress, with their hairstyle, with all of their other personal choices, is that native Southerners had certainly very distinct from European ideas about adoption and the ability of outsiders to belong to native societies. So what I mean is that native people often believed, and this is not true in all cases, not everyone can become part of a native society, but that outsiders who either married into other native nations, who migrated to become part of native nations, or who were captured and integrated as adopted could become fully part of those societies regardless of their original ethnic origin, the languages they spoke originally, or sort of their upbringings.

ELLIS: And this is really important. Anthropologists and historians sometimes call this fictive kinship or the building of outsiders into parts of society. And this is a helpful way to translate this, but it also kind of doesn't make a lot of sense within an indigenous worldview, it would be a bit like if I adopted a child and proceeded for the rest of my life to call him my fictive son, it would just sound a little weird to most people. Native people really did believe in the ability to take outsiders and to make them kin and make them part of their society. And the ability you transform

people's dress and physical body paint, hairstyles, to make them present as part of the nation is part of this process of transforming outsiders into people that belong.

ELLIS: Alongside of course learning to speak other languages, learning different kinda of customs. And so I'm dwelling on this because this kind of is at fairly fundamental odds with the very rigid ways we come to think about race and identity in the South in the 19th century, to again gesture to this fluidity and to the little bit of flexibility, basically that race has to be made, it doesn't come out as this hard thing, you know, in the 17th and the 18th century.

ELLIS: And actually, this is maybe an aside, but I think one of the really beautiful things about the malleability of this system is that it also lets people who are gender non-conforming, who we might think of as two-spirits, so that's a global term for queer indigenous today, or people who are non-binary to remake them and refashion themselves into identities that fit within the nation. So basically, there's a lot of flex within these southeastern indigenous systems of belonging. And again, I'm talking really broadly here as a way to make sense of all of these super different and diverse societies that I just highlighted. But there are more sort of similarities through here across native nations.

ELLIS: Okay. So because this is all about relationships, native people would not have been able to make sense of all of the phenomenon of spitting into a tube to determine if they're Native Americans, you know, to do a run through a 23andMe test as we might today. They wouldn't even really have been able to think in terms of skin color as the defining factor in the 17th and the early 18th century. This is something that has to be learned. So this brings me to my second point and I'll finish up here, which is that none of the diverse peoples of the South would have conceived of themselves as Indians.

ELLIS: Again, at least until the latter part of the 18th century. This is a racial term that has to be made through the process of colonization, slavery, and settler ideologies. Again, European slavery as practiced in the southeast, and here I mean the enslavement of both indigenous and African peoples within the South is key to creating these Southern notions of race. And so coupled with this, European ideologies that lumped various native nations together as Indios, salvage, Indian, or other terms work in tandem with native people's own mobilizations increasingly of race and the language of redness.

ELLIS: And here I'm thinking of George Milne and Nancy Shoemaker's work on the creation of native ideas about race. To create indigenous notions of native identities as a unified category. This is all just to say that I think we really need to historicize the way we think about race in the early modern South and to pause and remember that race was not primarily how native people define themselves as belonging.

KOPELSON: All right, well, thank you very much for the three of you. There are some questions that I've been thinking about, but first I wanted to give the three of you a chance to respond to each other if you'd like to do that.

GRIER: Well, I'm burning with a question if neither of my colleagues-I mean, I had the longest time to think so... As I was listening to both of you, I was sort of thinking two things. One, is it possible for us to get away from an intellectual history of race, right, as in what were people thinking, right? And maybe get to a more material history of what do people do with race? And what I'm thinking, especially after Liz's presentation is I do think of race as being about kinship and belonging, European race, right?

GRIER: And I'm wondering for example if the reason that European race has to be more impermeable, right, more restrictive, has something to do with economic systems, right, you know, so it's like well, if I have an economic system that's based on private property and I want my property to go to my legitimate heir, then I have to have a system that says you can't be the legitimate heir, right?

GRIER: But they're both still about kinship and belonging, you know, so for me at least, whether the language of race is used or the idea of race is in place is not as crucial to me as like the fact that both of these do the same work. So I don't know, it's just what I was sort of starting to think as I listened to the both of you, I guess there's sort of two questions, one is European capitalism one of the reasons that, you know, and the European concession of property one of the reasons for this difference in the permeability of kinship? One.

GRIER: And then two, is our historical imagination maybe impeded by looking for like when a fully color based, biological idea of race comes into play, you know what is that really what we wanna know? Sorry, the question was a little long, but that's the question. [LAUGH]

ETHRIDGE: Liz, do you want to tackle that first?

ELLIS: Nice, I like that approach, Robbie. Sure. No, Miles, I mean, I think you raise a couple of really important things. The first of which is that as we, right, all hopefully increasingly know, race is not just about your skin color, right? It's all about all these other constructions and exclusions and other kinds of processes. And, you know, I think your question gets at some of the messiness of this early period because I think specifically for indigenous people, there's a lot of fighting, I mean, at least within sort of French administrative apparatus about what to do with native women who have been enslaved, taken, made part of French families, should they be able like you're saying to inherit property? In some cases, yes, in some cases, they're specifically excluded in different parts of the French empire.

ELLIS: In some cases, they vanish, you can see it in the archival record where they're first listed as an Indian slave and then they're listed as marrying this man

and they've become wife. And then their children are only listed as French or settlers, right? So there is different kind of erasures, forcible inclusions, forcible exclusions within this process. And certainly, early French and sort of settlers and I guess, I hate to call them explorers, but people stomping through indigenous homelands in the South write and sometimes describe native people as having fairer skin or darker skin or looking and presenting in different ways.

ELLIS: They're actually very fixated on are these people Christian, are they not Christian? Which I think is common across the southeast. But to your question about European capitalism, I do think that the creation of Indian in particular, which will in the 19th century become more conflated with these concrete ideas of race really emerges out of the creation of this system of slavery. And so to be able to enslave someone, you have to think about them as part of this larger group of barbarians as opposed to people of individual nations who your own nation may or may not have a relationship with.

ELLIS: So, certainly, I mean, I think that it would be wonderful to have more of these conversations in sort of the same vein as this growing fellowship on racial capitalism, right, in the larger American context. But yeah, I think that you're exactly right and I think that both of these are really important facets. Robbie, do you have something you wanna add?

ETHRIDGE: Yeah. So when I think about all this, you know, everybody around the world has different ways of categorizing who belongs and who doesn't belong. And um it shouldn't you get surprised that Europeans have a different, you know, system than we do and kinship always figures into this. One thing that strikes me about the European perception is that it becomes coupled with the doctrine of White Supremacy. Now, Indian people, trust me, the Cherokee, you know, 17th century Cherokee, woman or man, thought they were human and everybody else was not. So, you know, this kind of idea of ethnic supremacy was, again, not an unusual thing. But what's interesting to me what happens is that European conceptions of race, which is coupled with White supremacy it becomes powerful through capitalism and through, you know, the you know the the nascent capitalism that starts in Europe, right?

ETHRIDGE: And then of course then gets, you know, instantiated or operationalized in colonialism. And so, you know, those two things go hand in hand and that to me it's, you know, there's probably something there how capitalism and White supremacy develop together, you know, and then you have to have these hardened racial categories in order to maintain that power structure that accompanies capitalism. So those are just some thoughts on that. And, you know, one thing, Miles, I think that your work is telling us especially is that when Europeans got here, they didn't follow these full-blown, you know, hardened racial categories, that takes a couple of hundred years to develop, right, as capitalism develops, as those power structures get hardened and, you know, in place so that, you know, Europeans have the economic power, they control the economic power, let's face it.

ETHRIDGE: You know, and even if you were a part of that and definitely instrumental in that during the deerskin trade and even the Indian slave trade. But at some point, they lose that edge, you know they're no longer becoming instrumental to them. Commodity is a commodity becomes land and you know, then they're not useful to the machine at that point.

GRIER: I would just add a little... I think that the fluid, hard, dichotomy potentially gets us in a trap. So I think what actually White supremacy is, is I get to decide as a White person when it's fluid, when it's changeable and when it isn't. You know, and I think that maintaining that ability to turn it on and off is actually the key. And not sort of oh, when it's fluid, it's okay, you know, that's sort of the French version. We're not racists because we believe everyone can become French, right? It's like why would everyone want to become French? You know, but like that's their version of egalitarianism, right?

GRIER: And they don't seem to get, right, that that was actually the tool of their Imperialism, you know, was cultural assimilation, and so yes, it's fluid and flexible and anyone can become French, but it was actually still racism, exploitative. So I like to think that White supremacy, to use your term, always has to keep both options open because it needs both.

KOPELSON: Liz, did you want to pose any questions or direct comments?

KOPELSON: Okay.

GRIER: Unless we have a vote for the Q&A.

KOPELSON: All right. Sounds good.

GRIER: I mean, I have another question, but I will defer to the fans. [LAUGH]

KOPELSON: Well, then, maybe you can do the thing where you work in the question as you're answering something else. All right. Well, "so you've been all talking in different ways about these different conceptions of human difference among natives, among Europeans, and how they interact, how they affect each other. And so I was wondering if maybe you could speak a little more directly, perhaps especially Miles, if you have ideas about how for instance Black Africans had their conceptions of human difference changed in return in these interactions with Europeans and natives."

GRIER: I was hoping you wouldn't ask me that, Heather, I thought where's this question going? Uh-oh, I'm not ready to answer that. Yeah, I, you know, I... As, you know, I'm not an Africanist, and so I'm not as certain about that. But it's a question that I want to know, you know? My hypothesis would be that in the same way that I was sort of saying if you got this concession of private property and then it's got to

go to my first son, then those kinds of anxieties produce a system that will regulate it.

GRIER: So I mean, my guess would be that perhaps African aristocracy might have had something that parallels or that might seem racialized to us. But yeah, I don't know. I want to know more.

00:49:39] **KOPELSON:** Well, and also if we're talking about the importance of economic power, right, that's going to make a difference in who gets to influence other people with notions of anything? Liz or Robbie, did you wanna say anything?

ETHRIDGE: I would say that we do know a little bit about, at least in the native South, native Southerners, now those conceptions may have changed, it's important to remember that, you know, Liz points out the fluidity of these categories so that if you are a member of a group, it's very exclusionary, right? And I mean, you could be fully adopted as a member of that group and you become full-fledged citizen of that group. However, if you're not a citizen of that group, right, then there was, you know, a lot of animosities and hostilities towards you.

ETHRIDGE: It wasn't that friendly place where everybody's getting along. And those stations and hair and tattoos, those are vitally important because if you see someone on a trail and, you know, you would know who they were by their hairstyle, right? You know, a lot of these folks were multilingual, so it wasn't even the matter of did they speak your language or not? It was things like these visual cues, like hairstyle and tattooing or language of course played into it. At least, I'm talking about the very early period, you know? Now we do move with a transformation from these Mississippian qualities into the colonial world, we do get these coalescent societies which are made up of a lot of these people, right, coming together, not so much for Liz's group that she's studying down the Gulf Coast, but like the Cherokees and the Creeks and so forth.

ETHRIDGE: And one of the big questions that we haven't been able to answer just yet is what were those people together given the animosities that existed in the precolonial world, what drew them together and what was the glue that held them together? Because even in a coalescent society, they still understood themselves to be separate, like for the Creeks, Liz mentioned McGillivray because he, you know, his main loyalty to his town that was shot up, everybody still had their identities tied, at least in these cases, to specific towns in the colonial period, right?

ETHRIDGE: And so we don't really understand what the glue was that held them together despite these differences, right? So.

ELLIS: I think to build on these and take it in a different direction, I think one of the things that really happens by the beginning of the 19th century is this category of either Indian or thinking of themselves as Redmen does become something that's meaningful. And not just from the outside as a thing of exclusion, but as a way of

thinking about and sometimes providing the language for multinational native organizing resistance movements, things like Pontiac's, the war called Pontiac's.

ELLIS: But I think there are some traces of native people adopting, using, and articulating these ideas about sameness, sometimes based on language of red which is Nancy Shoemaker points out does not necessarily mean skin color. Robbie's actually the expert on this, but red had like significant ceremonial meanings and, you know, connotations within southeastern indigenous societies. But there are a couple of examples from the lower Mississippi Valley in the 1720s where both Natchez people and Taensa people draw on this language of redness to unify their polities.

ELLIS: I mean, to Robbie's point about, you know, what holds people together, which looks like something new, it looks like something that didn't exist even 20 years before that point, but as native are thinking strategically about how do we resist colonialism, how do we push back against this Southern influence? They take some of the tools, some of the ideas, and they formulate new ideologies. One of the things that I think is really important to keep in mind and that maybe helps, you know, give some of the context for why we're seeing these terrible fights today within Indian country, within tribal communities over what to do about Black members of nations, right, and so I'm thinking here Cherokee Freedmen, I'm thinking here of people who have historically been excluded because of the currently existing racism within many native nations, including my own, I don't mean to call out Cherokees here.

ELLIS: But I think that a lot that comes into play in the early 19th century as both the U.S. Federal Government fixes Indian policy more aggressively to be exclusionary and to include these ideas about savagery, race, civilization, and as Blackness and anti-Blackness really in the South and the sort of expansion of what we think of as becoming that, you know, iconic 19th century plantation slavery moves into native homelands. You see things like within the Cherokee constitution in I think it's 1827, um, where Cherokee people begin to explicitly exclude people of African descent from becoming full citizens and holding positions of power within the Cherokee Nation, right?

ELLIS: And this represents a change. And so as Robbie's saying, there are ways that native societies are super-exclusive and that people think about who gets to come in and who is definitely not part of the people. And increasingly in the 19th century, the language of race is applied both externally from the U.S. Federal Government and then internally as native people try and use these settler ideologies to make their ways of belonging legible to the outside state. This is all to say this stuff did not originally exist as sort of racial categories and there's this complicated process and the way we think any way today about, you know, indigenous people and what constitutes someone who is able to be enrolled within the native nation has a lot to do with this process of forming race and these logics of exclusion that get us to where we are today.

ELLIS: But it's a long process, as I think we're all saying.

GRIER: Heather, if I could add just one little note. The one thing that came to me as I was listening, and it's so interesting to me, the parallel sometimes between trans-shipped Africans and so what I heard from Liz and Robbie was sort of a move from ethnic affiliation, you know, my tribe, my town, my, right, to a kind of pan-ethnic identity that's really strategic to resist this force. And, you know, historians like Michael Gomez, you know, have talked about that among diasporic Africans, you know, a move from I'm Igbo, you're Fula, you know, to like we're all Black now, you know?

GRIER: And that's sort of I was hearing from you all. And I think also the sort of fascinating Black native alliances that occurred, especially in the Caribbean, you know, maroon communities. So it definitely seems that as I continue learning more about it, I'll be interested in where the part of the reason for some of these affiliations was both strategic, and I mean, Black native affiliations, but also that maybe they had similar systems of kinship to begin with and that's why it was a little bit easier sometimes for these multiracial maroon communities to emerge. You know, most famously the moment when Dessalines, right, announces the founding of Haiti and the big mystery that historians always, you know, ask is how does he know the Arawak name for this island, you know, and why does he choose that when he declares the founding of a Black republic?

GRIER: So like those are the mysteries and those are the interesting things to me.

ELLIS: I do just wanna jump in and say, yeah, I think you're right about this like, you know, move towards Indian and indigeneity a thing that's meaningful, though no one would have used the word indigeneity really any time before the past like maybe two decades. I think still, if you asked a native person in the mid-19th century and the early 20th century, like identify yourself. I mean, to Robbie's point, it's remarkable the endurance of these and individual clan-level affiliations and the way that people present themselves as those are the most meaningful. I think most people would still first identify, and this is true today, by their own nation and then secondarily, but yeah, it's not one or the other, right?

ELLIS: We're layering these ways of identifying in this Southern colonial society.

KOPELSON: Right, well, this question takes up some of these, well, actually, a lot of these points about categories of difference and how flexible or not they are. And so if there are these, you know, there are ways for outsiders to become citizens of a group and then as Robbie said, that that's also very exclusionary of everybody who's not in that group, could either Robbie or Liz talk more about in this area, do we have native peoples who have permanent hierarchies and permanent underclasses? You've both mentioned the practice of enslavement of native peoples as well as of

Africans. But in terms of, you know, these native conceptions of difference, are the societies ones in which there are these permanent underclasses?

ETHRIDGE: I'll speak to that first and then I'll let Liz pick it up. There's quite a lot to think about, kind of you know separately and chronologically, But the early period, you know, when Hernando de Soto comes through and he sees this fully functioning Mississippian world, yeah, so those are, what, archeologists call them chiefdoms, that's an archeological term for a specific kind of polity and there's basically two ranks of people, there's the elite class, not class, the elite lineages and the non-elite lineages. And they did maintain a lot of distance socially, economically, and so on. And these, the elites are the ones who lived on top of the mountains basically.

ETHRIDGE: These chiefdoms varied in how much control the elites had, you know, some of them were highly centralized and some of them were more what they call hierarchies, right, where the power was more diffused amongst the lineages. But so in the Minnesota comes through, yes, very much, you know, ranked societies and you were born into those lineages, these were, you know, ascribed statuses. And no, you could not move from one, effectively, from one through to another. However, having said that though, the group transitions say when one chief or chieftain has died and another one is coming up, there was a lot of ambiguity in who was next in line.

ETHRIDGE: And that is in part because these lineages, they were mapped-well, I think they were mapped lineal, but they did, you know, you could trace back certain generations, so there was always contenders to the so-called throne, right? So but you still had to be in that elite, that elite group, those elite lineages. That changes though and we see that change dramatically when the Europeans get here. And the archaeology tells us that, you know, prestige goods, let's say guns, European things and whatnot start being found everywhere, right, with everybody, and not just with the elites. So that tells us that that that hierarchical organization declines.

ETHRIDGE: What replaces it? We've always said egalitarian systems that replaced it. Um, my own suspicions that's not quite right because we do see sort of clans, like the Wind Clan with the Creeks for example have more prestige and they seem to take the leadership roles even in historic times. But it's definitely not the same as it was when Soto saw. Like, those chiefs that Soto saw were being carried on litters and they were considered divine, they were considered gods, McGillivray was never a god. No one ever called him a god, or even, you know, even related to the gods.

ETHRIDGE: He had no special communication with the gods, he was, you know, a man who rose to power through his influence and, you know, decision making. So, you know, was that your question? So there's a transition, right, between the Mississippian world and the colonial world. And Liz's deals with those smaller groups down on the coast and those were, you have a better sense how those were organized politically than we do these large coalescent societies. Were you there?

ELLIS: [LAUGH] Yeah. I mean, I think to sort of build on what Robbie's saying, the answer is in part that this is a little all over the place because again native nations are so diverse in their social organization and their political theories. Even within the smaller groups, the smaller nations that I focus on in the lower Mississippi Valley, some of these are much more hierarchal where they talk about having elite rulers who are continuing these traditions of using monumental earthworks in their sort of presentation of status. There are others that are very egalitarian. I think the one thing that's true across the board is if that captives are integrated into society, they're very often occupy the very lowest social rungs.

ELLIS: And so you can be living with the people, but also fundamentally excluded from belonging in society. I think one of the things that's important here though is that unlike later articulations of fundamentally U.S. slavery, the children of people born of captives within these societies typically are not treated as outsiders, they're able to become within a generation parts of these societies. So obviously it's not the same as having full autonomy and freedom and these relationships can be deeply coercive, but there's a different kind of way in which people are excluded and then perhaps forcibly included.

ELLIS: That being said, I mean, there are some really great accounts of sort of early French travelers interacting with-I'm thinking of one where a bunch of French folks are coming down the river and they're greeted by a Bayougoula diplomat who's missing half his scalp, so this is someone who was captured, taken, brought into the Bayougouls as an outsider and who has now come to serve a position as a diplomatic emissary for that nation and is the person responsible for building these external relationships. So there is some flex. I think the final thing I'll say to answer this question is where I can see status differentiation most clearly is with refugee groups who are seeking sanctuary with other native nations in the south.

ELLIS: So in Robbie's work, she talks a lot about how the arrival of European colonial forces, the remaking of this Mississippian world creates tons and tons of migrants, so people who sometimes flee, people who sometimes pursue different economic opportunities. And frequently you can see in the documents that when groups of native people come and they seek refuge with other native nations, and this is actually something that native people do very regularly, they tend to give refuge to outside groups for short periods of time, sometimes for longer periods of time, sometimes these people stay and integrate, sometimes they move on.

ELLIS: But actually, the practice of sanctuary in the South is a very, very old one. But frequently when these outside groups arrive, they defer to the group who they are staying with. So that their leaders will individually meet with outsiders, they will govern their people autonomously, but the refugee group will defer to the leadership and to the practices of the people who are there in terms of land use, in terms of thinking about, you know, the political initiatives, that sort of stuff. And with this is always the ability to pick up and move again.

ELLIS: But yeah, I mean, it's not like everything is egalitarian across the board and there's endless potential, but there is a lot of flexibility, again, within the sort of transformative ideologies of the Mississippian and post-Mississippian South.

KOPELSON: Great, thank you. And I know for some of our listeners that may be familiar information, but for others it might be newer, so thanks for taking us through that. And now that actually addresses the next question that came up from people listening about what happened to people who didn't belong and so you've addressed that in a number of ways. And so I'd like to move onto the next question just because we have such a limited time that's come in, "which is how does the language we have to talk about these categories and processes reinforce a Eurocentric mode of understanding?"

KOPELSON: Liz, you look like you've got-

ELLIS: Yikes, yeah, oh man. [LAUGH] What a question. I think one of the things that I wrestled with a lot is ways of thinking about nation because I think so often in our modern context, we think of this as meaning hard bordered exclusionary nation states which have different logics of citizenship, subjecthood, belonging, right, these very different ideas. And at the same time, I think one of the things that Native American and indigenous studies demands of people who work on native people is accountability to contemporary political context, communities, and sort of ethics of research.

ELLIS: And because so many native nations in this country are still fighting to be able to exercise the inherent sovereignty that comes with preexisting in the United States as nations who's homelands are currently occupied, there is also an imperative to stress in ways that are legible to a general public the power, the sovereignty, the nationhood of native people. And so that's something that becomes very difficult. I think, too, you know, using this language of sort of race and racial ideas of indigeneity, perhaps buries us as much as it provides clarity in terms of thinking about native ways of being and belonging.

ELLIS: It's, I mean, I think the basically the ideologies of either blood based citizenship and inclusion or exclusion have so saturated the premises that if I said to you something like, you know, "I think it would be really great if my own native nation could provide refuge to, you know, migrants from across the Americas and nationalize foreign citizens," most people would look at me and be like, "That sounds bananas, Liz, what are you talking about?" But that would be a much older practice of thinking about nationhood, including, and belonging.

ELLIS: I mean, again, for me, a lot of this comes back to thinking and writing about nation is really challenging because I both know that it's not true, it's not an indigenous word, it's not true to the way that native people would have explained this, but as historians, right, so much of our work is translating for our current

moment. And so I think that that's something that I always wrestle with for sure. I don't know if my fellow panelists have other ideas about this?

ETHRIDGE: I would say I feel your pain, Liz. Those categories have been found so useless, you know, they do hem you in, and they're confounding and they're restricting. And trying to think outside of them is also quite difficult though because it's part of our culture that we work with, right? So it's been a struggle. My whole career, it's a been a struggle to not feel constrained by those constructs, but I don't know what else to use. They haven't developed and Miles got to this, we haven't developed the appropriate vocabulary, the language, the way of talking about this differently, which is, you know, one thing that I've found so interesting about Miles' work is that seems to be the work they're doing, you know, is trying to think about this in ways that we can move outside of those constraints.

GRIER: I want to second, well, third now both Liz and Robbie. For me, the key is to keep in mind and to maintain a distinction between race as a social force against which we are fighting in the present, so I mean I guess that would be White supremacy as a social force against we are fighting in the present, White racial capitalism as a social force, we are fighting against in the present, right? And the protocols of academia, right?

GRIER: And the protocols of academia are if you use a term, you must define your term. And I'm like White supremacists aren't going, "Well, since we said that race is biological, we're now hemmed in by that," and so we can't, you know, exempt OJ Simpson for a moment from being Black, I mean, you know, that famous moment when OJ says, "I'm not Black, I'm OJ Simpson." And that was factually true. I mean, that is how he was treated until he wasn't, right? [LAUGH] You know, White supremacy, White racial capitalism in the world doesn't operate according to the protocols by which we get our articles approved for publication. And so as long as we maintain the distinction between those, I think that goes a certain way 'cause it's not as important to me to make sure that the way that I use race is academically legible because after all, our academic disciplines are rooted in White supremacy, so of course what they recognize as a systematic, consistent use of race, you know, is actually I think a sort of long delay tactic, right?

GRIER: Well, it's like well, go back and define that, make sure you're being more systematic in the way you define that. It's like while you go do that [LAUGH] it keeps proliferating in the world. That's what I was sort of saying about the ideas versus the actual work that race does, you know, how it regulates, how it systematizes maldistribution, you know, like that to me is the work of race, is it determines who gets what, you know, who gets protection, who doesn't, you know, who gets land, who doesn't, you know, all those kinds of things.

GRIER: And that's what I think we should, yeah, try to fight. I see Heather has unmuted, go on.

KOPELSON: Yes, I've unmuted because we are almost out of time already. It's flown by. So the final question that I'm posing that's come in and if you could each give, you know, obviously a super brief answer which then in a year you'll be able to expand upon, two days length, is how might we constructively reshape the narrative about the South? So this is, you know, thinking about I guess from academically, but to account for these complex historical engagements of natives, Black Africans, and Europeans that shaped the region and then what are our next steps in this field, however you define the field that you are in?

ELLIS: All right, I will start and I will go really fast. The first one for me is we have to stop thinking of the South as defined by a black and white binary because there are indigenous people who have stayed and remained in the South. There are Latino folks in the south who have been there for a long time, there are Asian folks in the South. I think there's just a whole swath of people. And I think the other thing as I sort of mentioned in the first answer is that this continues to be indigenous homelands, and a lot of native people remain and are rendered illegible within our imaginings of the South. So I think those are two really important shifts that we need to make.

ELLIS: Again, a lot of the folks that I'm talking about having studied, the 17th and 18th century, are still in Louisiana and Texas and Mississippi today.

ETHRIDGE: I was going to say the exact same thing. And once you put other, sounds always has not always been a place of black and whiteness, and it's not. It never has been. And once they move beyond that, I think then the South becomes really, really complicated. And I say this all the time, once you put Indians into the equation, everything changes in terms of what our historical understanding. In terms of the next steps, I think it's we've gotta nut to crack here because we have been laboring in this field for many, many years now and most conventional histories to this day, you open them up, Indians are there, and then by the second chapter, they're gone.

ETHRIDGE: And that's not the case. Indians, as Liz just said, native people are still there today and still have an impact on our world. And so they need to look at this, you know, in a whole different way, they need to just do away with that binary and start thinking about this in a very different way, and including not just native people, but as you said, Asians and others.

GRIER: Well, again, I'm going to third my colleagues. I think that there is a sort of fantasy version of the South that is basically the same from, you know, 1840 to now. [LAUGH] And so I've seen for instance on Broadway there was a version of *A Time to Kill*, you know, the Clancy novel that became, what's his name, Sam Jackson movie, they turned it into a play. And I couldn't tell what time it was, you know, like I couldn't tell if it was the present or 1930 or 1870, like I just couldn't tell. And that's because of what Liz and Robbie just talked about, you know, there's this very

static black/white conflict, very static understanding of how racial terrorism works, like it's all very static.

GRIER: So I think the first thing is to admit that we don't know the South and that our fantasy's are blocking us.

WILLIAMS: Well, thank you all so much for that. I'm sorry, we do have to bring this to a close. But I'd like to take a moment to thank our scholars for their brilliant insights during this conversation which will help teachers and scholars at all levels trace the intersection between race, enslavement, and indigeneity in the American South. A special thanks also goes to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for their support of this series. And next I'd also like to thank our audience and the lively Twitter and chat feeds to which you've contributed. We're hoping that many of you can join us at the Folger Institute Symposium in Tuscaloosa next spring. We at the Folger Shakespeare Library ask you for your continuing support of our work, of so many audiences, of K-12 educators, and their students who are served by the Folger Education Division, to fellowships and advanced programming for graduate students and faculty run by the Folger Institute, to the award-winning productions of the Folger Theatre.

WILLIAMS: IF you are in a position to contribute, we will be grateful. Our institution was founded on philanthropy and your philanthropy will help us continue to support groundbreaking research and share with wider and more inclusive audiences just as we did today. We hope that you'll be able to join us on Monday February 8th when we'll be joined by Urvashi Chakravarty of the University of Toronto and Brandy Adams, currently of MIT and soon moving to Arizona State University for a session on race and the archive. Further details on this and other upcoming critical race conversations may be found on the Folger Institute's webpage.

WILLIAMS: And now I'd like to pitch things back to our panelists and give them the last word.

KOPELSON: All right, well, thank you. And I just wanted to invite everybody again to The Early Modern Intersections in the American South Symposium that will be held in Tuscaloosa. It really is almost exactly a year, so we try to choose the same week in the calendar. And I know we didn't get to a lot of the questions that came in, but along with my codirectors Jenny Shaw and Casey Smith who are my colleagues at the University of Alabama, we will be looking at those questions and drawing on them as we shape the symposium.

KOPELSON: So again, thank you to our presenters and I don't know if any of you want to say a word of thanks of your own.

ETHRIDGE: I'll just say thanks, everybody and hope to see you next year.

GRIER: Hear, hear, agreed. And I think that maybe the next conversation is maybe March 8th? So just for those of you want to tune into the next one. Just double check the date, I'm not sure of the date, but I know it can't be February 8th.
[LAUGH]

WILLIAMS: My mistake. It is March 8th. Thank you very much, Miles. Always ready for a correction from you.

ELLIS: Thank you all so much, this was great.