

The Dream and the Looking-Glass:

Race and Rhetoric in William Apess and Martin
Luther King

Elisabet Engsbråten



A Thesis Presented to the Department of Literature, Area
Studies, and European Languages

30-Point Thesis

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the MA Degree

Spring 2017

**The Dream and the Looking-Glass:
Race and Rhetoric in William Apess and
Martin Luther King**

© Elisabet Engsråten

2017

The Dream and the Looking-Glass: Race and Rhetoric in William Apess and Martin Luther King

Elisabet Engsråten

<http://www.duo.uio.no>

Print: Reprosentralen, University of Oslo

Abstract

This thesis analyzes and compares the rhetoric of two non-fictional texts composed 130 years apart. These texts, although produced in different contexts, address a similar audience and confront similar problems. The first text, “An Indian’s Looking-Glass for the White Man,” is an essay written by Native American activist William Apess in 1833. This relatively unknown text confronts racism against Native Americans in antebellum America with mainly religious arguments and portrays it as hypocrisy. The other text is “I Have a Dream,” Martin Luther King Jr.’s famous and celebrated speech given at the March on Washington in 1963. King also confronts racism, more specifically segregation and institutional racism against African Americans, in a post-slavery context. The focus of the analyses and comparison is the ways in which the authors make use of majority values and ideas, including the typical rhetoric of the white majority, in order to confront racism and attempt to eliminate dichotomous racial thinking and majority white hegemony. Through their participation in dominant discourse, the two authors seek to dramatically alter that very discourse. They utilize positive aspects of American and Christian discourse, including the idea of liberty, in order to resist a negative aspect: the idea that race determines value.

The comparison between these two texts shows how the two authors’ rhetoric is both similar and different in their participation in and resistance to the dominant discourse. Where relevant, I include historical context in my comparison. The texts employ somewhat different rhetorical strategies, which include rhetorical questions and anaphora. I argue that the texts, despite their sometimes different approaches, are both persuasive and flawless in their argument. King’s speech is known for its major impact; it was not only persuasive, but timely. In contrast, the initial impact of “An Indian’s Looking-Glass for the White Man” is not known. Apess has sometimes been dismissed as an assimilated Native American and his rhetoric as condemnatory, but I argue that his essay is persuasive and an important contribution to resistance against racism in the United States. Apess’s apparent lack of impact is not simply due to the author’s hostility or flaws in his argument.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Nils Axel Nissen. I want to thank him for his constructive and insightful feedback on both the content and the language of my thesis. His feedback, as well as his confidence in me, have kept me motivated and optimistic.

I also want to say thank you to my parents, my sister, and my friends for cheering me on.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The Looking-Glass: William Apess’s “White” Rhetoric	11
2.1	The “Indian”: Apess’s Identity and Consciousness.....	11
2.2	The White Man: How Apess Addresses a Privileged Audience	15
2.3	The Preacher: Confronting Christian Hypocrisy	18
2.4	The American: Purifying the Values of the Union.....	24
3	The Dream: King’s Unifying Rhetoric	31
3.1	Still Slaves: Speaking When He is “Not Supposed to Speak”	31
3.2	“For Whites Only”: Appealing to White Supremacists.....	35
3.3	“All of God’s Children”: King’s Anti-Racism Theology.....	39
3.4	The Promissory Note: Demanding the Freedom that Was Promised.....	43
4	Conclusion	47
	Works Cited	53

1 Introduction

William Apess, a Pequot Native American, was “the earliest producer of Native American writing in resistance to colonialism, and he remains one of the most powerful literary writers—although he was not a novelist or a poet” (Krupat 75). He is known for his understanding of Christianity “as incompatible with any form of race prejudice” (Baym, “William Apess” 499). His sermon-like essay “An Indian’s Looking-Glass for the White Man” (published in 1833) is still a relatively obscure text. Being somewhat familiar with the aspect of American history relating to race struggles and their effect on discourses up until today’s continued tensions, I concluded, after my first reading of the essay, that it was ahead of its time in the way that it argues convincingly for the equality of all races. Using mainly religious arguments, Apess argues for equality on the basis of beliefs, ideas and values that are already accepted as quintessentially American and Christian. He alludes to American equality and liberty, as well as Christian brotherly love and unity. Since the essay is addressed to white American Christians, Apess’s argument surfaces as a confrontation with hypocrisy. His argument is pioneering and ahead of its time in light of the history of continued brutal racism and white domination for more than a century after his death. Slavery was not yet abolished in his day. As Maureen Konkle writes,

Many activists—white, African American, and Native alike—observed at the time that the similarity between plans to colonize African Americans and to remove Indians from the East was obvious and that the supporters of removal and colonization justified both plans in the same way: African Americans and Native peoples were ontologically different from whites and therefore must be “removed.” (115)

But Apess—making use of the very ideas that his intended audience would strongly identify with—challenges assumptions about Native American identity and reveals racial equality as something inevitable, as something that should already have been realized given the foundations of American culture and religion. His argument is essentially that all races are equal and that the evidence for this equality already exists in American society.

Having analyzed Martin Luther King Jr.’s “I Have a Dream” in a linguistics course, I was familiar with the text itself. But after reading Apess’s essay, which deals with a slightly different aspect of racism in American history, the influence and persuasion of King’s speech became increasingly interesting. Despite the continued difficulties for African Americans

since his day, King's speech is considered an important and defining event and is widely known and celebrated for its content, form and delivery. Since the speech was delivered in 1963, the phrase "I have a dream" is "probably now as well known as any phrase of comparable length in modern history" (Leith 199). In this sense, the speech forms a stark contrast with Apess's texts. Little is known about the original impact of Apess's essay, while King's speech played a role in the passing of the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act (Sundquist 1) and was, in King's own words, part of "the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation" (qtd. in Sundquist 1). The speech was heard throughout the world, and generally acknowledged (although probably not by the majority of America's segregationists) as timely, convincing and powerful. In his book *King's Dream*, Eric J. Sundquist points to the impact it continues to have today, through Martin Luther King Jr. Day as a federal holiday, the repeated use of the speech in schools and higher education, as well as continued cultural evocations of "the dream." These are just a few features of its national and global impact. The impact of the speech seems unmatched. However, King faced many obstacles and sacrificed his life for his opinions. In their texts, both King and Apess—who both belong to racial minorities—willingly face the challenge of appealing to the privileged majority. Their arguments foreground ideas and ideals that are inseparable from what American culture and religion claim to be. Without denying its originality, we may say that King's speech simply seeks to reinforce or reinvent the promises and goals of the Founding Fathers, Abraham Lincoln and Christian doctrine.

Apess's text may be productively compared and contrasted with many other works of American literature. The racist attitudes that Apess and King confront are different in some ways and the arguments are produced not only in two different contexts, but also more than a century apart. Although the two texts both explicitly confront racism in a similar manner, they are also very different. The connection between them is not necessarily inevitable. My questions since reading "Looking-Glass" for the first time have been connected to why the text is not better known and why it does not seem to have had more proven impact. This aspect corresponds to a notable difference between the texts; namely their effect and influence. As a twenty-first century reader, my reaction to "Looking-Glass" is to embrace Apess's ideas about equality that are now commonly taken for granted. Although his argumentation has the cultural and religious characteristics of the time in which it was written, it is pioneering and compelling and leaves modern readers with questions about why it does not seem to have had much immediate impact. Here the comparison with King's speech shows a stark contrast, and this is why I have chosen "I Have a Dream" as a point of

comparison. These differences between the two texts seem productive, as I want to highlight “Looking-Glass” as a compelling text with persuasive potential. The contexts of the two texts are therefore important factors, but I am also interested in the rhetoric of each of the two texts in order to highlight the quality of the argument. It may perhaps be argued that the historical setting of King’s speech provided the necessary momentum and contributed to its impact and canonicity, but may also cause us to underestimate its persuasive and well-chosen words. Rhetorical analysis can highlight the ways in which the two texts are different or similar in terms of their rhetorical techniques. This analysis will of course not disregard context, but will take as its starting point the authors’ choice of words as the chief means to persuade.

Both texts seek to persuade their audience or readers. Being similar in genre, both texts are explicit about their purpose and confront racism in American society. In both texts, the means to achieve this seem to be religious arguments and allusions as well as language or rhetoric that invokes American values. These aspects will be the focus in this thesis. King is known for his activism and commitment to nonviolence, and “Apess was the earliest producer of Native American writing in resistance to colonialism” (Krupat 75); in other words, an activist writer. Relying on collectively valued sources such as the Bible and the Founding Fathers, both authors attempt to reinvent or purify American ideals and religion; ideals that claim to endorse liberty and equality and religion that claims to be compassionate.

Edward J. Gallagher points to the heavy condemnation in “Looking-Glass” and argues that Apess “is a gadfly with a vengeance, a gadfly on a menacing mission.” But I want to argue that Apess and King are on a similar mission, and that Apess’s confrontation is not simply condemnation, but rather an attempt at being constructive, however unsuccessful his essay may have been at the time. Here Apess’s strategy might be compared to Jonathan Edwards’s in “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God”; Apess “hopes to terrify his readers or listeners with their own mortality, in order to extirpate the evil principles that reign over them” (137). In the case of Apess, I argue that the extirpation is a rhetorical strategy and that his condemnation and confrontation have a goal, demonstrated through his strategic selection of biblical citations that endorse equality and love among all “nations.”

The texts that I have chosen are persuasive texts, and therefore rhetorical analysis seems to be an appropriate approach to examine them in depth. Rhetoric may be defined as “the art of persuasion” (Toye 2) and provides tools for the analysis of persuasiveness according to rhetorical principles and techniques. Rhetoric is perhaps most associated with oratory, making “I Have a Dream” an obvious fit for rhetorical analysis. As mentioned above, Apess’s essay has the characteristics of a sermon, an oral genre, but was apparently a written

publication. Rhetoric also encompasses writing (Toye 4). My analysis will focus on identifying some figures of speech and attempting to determine their meaning and function, and comparing the two texts. The two texts have different positions in the analysis. There is much research on King's speech. Here I will rely on other scholars and their analyses to a larger extent. As already indicated, the starting point has been the texts' persuasiveness through the use of the ideas of the white majority. I have limited the rhetorical analysis to these aspects, not focusing much on—for example—the aspects of King's speech that appeal to the African American members of the audience. In the case of "I Have a Dream," I have narrowed the analysis even further by focusing mainly on aspects that seem comparable to the rhetoric of "Looking-Glass." For Apess's essay, there is less available scholarship. For this text, my analysis will be more independent, and a closer reading.

King's speech addresses an actual audience, and Apess uses words that imply a specific audience. The question of implied audience is very important, as both texts are explicitly confrontational towards white racists. The implied audience is similar in both texts, although "I Have a Dream" addresses the American nation as a whole. To specify, those who need to be persuaded are the members of the white audience who still believe that their white identity makes them superior to African Americans, and they are therefore perhaps the main implied audience of the speech. To a large extent, both texts make use of similar ideas. But the style and rhetoric of the two authors seems different. For example, King's speech is known for its anaphora (especially the phrase "I have a dream") and countless and complex allusions. Apess's most utilized technique is rhetorical questions. In the main chapters, I will discuss the purposes of these and other types of rhetorical devices, how they may strengthen or perhaps weaken ethos, logos and pathos, and therefore affect the persuasiveness of the text. How well do they persuade their white audience or readers? The comparison of a well-known text and an "overlooked" text helps identify strategies that seem to have an effect, as well as the significance of context.

The influence of King's speech has been and continues to be immense. It has been analyzed and used for many purposes. Eric J. Sundquist has written a thorough analysis of the speech. He shows that "King in no way rejected American foundational values. Rather, he purified and consolidated those values by insisting that only when the revolutionary rights they guaranteed were shared by Americans of all colors, creeds, and nationalities would they truly *be* America's foundational values" (10). His speech alludes to the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Bible and African American tradition. The impact and persuasive effect of the speech has been attributed to both internal and

external factors. As Sundquist's book explores, it contains appropriate metaphors, figures of speech and use of biblical knowledge; it borrows and adapts known phrases; it has poetic formulations and structures. The delivery of the speech highlighted King's religious authority; his tone of voice was unique; the geography of the event was important and symbolic; and his audience was large. Other contextual factors include King's fame as an activist, the work of the civil rights movement and increasing resistance among African Americans to Jim Crow and segregation, the March on Washington as a large event, King's previous sermons and speeches, as well as his integrity and uncompromising commitment to non-violence.

There is less scholarly material available on Apess and "Looking-Glass." According to Sandra Gustafson, scholarship on Apess has "taken shape around the problem of understanding Christianity" and has often focused on the tension between his Christian discourse and his hybridity as a Native American. Barry O'Connell has provided important background on Apess and his style. Randall Moon describes briefly how Apess in "Looking-Glass," among other texts, uses the language of the dominant culture and white Americans to confront their treatment of Native Americans. Moon is particularly concerned with how little attention Apess's writings have received.

Regarding "Looking-Glass," Gallagher has stated that (apart from himself) "only Patricia Bizzell comes near to treating the sermon as a whole." This seems to be somewhat accurate, although other scholars (e.g. Konkle, Krupat) have analyzed many aspects of it. Arnold Krupat, for example, points to irony as a rhetorical device throughout the essay. Renée L. Bergland actually analyzes a large portion of the essay along with more of Apess's writings. Gallagher's analysis goes through all parts of the essay, but his main focus is to point to and argue for Apess's vengeance-motivated condemnation. Again, the contrast to "I Have a Dream" is noticeable, as its persuasiveness and rhetorical brilliance has been analyzed thoroughly by many scholars.

Apess compares—even identifies—Native Americans with the Jewish nation. Less explicitly, but nevertheless clearly, King compares African Americans with the Israelites of the Old Testament by alluding to the exodus from Egypt and the exile to Babylon (Miller, Sundquist). In King's case, the comparison is not based on the same type of theory of heritage, but on the tradition from the time of slavery when slaves found comfort in the stories of the enslavement and freedom of the "people of God" (e.g. through songs and spirituals), along with the freedom promised in the Christian faith (Sundquist). In other words, both authors make use of the biblical tribes of Israel and the idea of the "people of

God” in their rhetoric; an important similarity that shows how the two texts make use of the language of the majority.

Gallagher shows how Apess both condemns and includes his audience in order to confront hypocrisy. He confronts—even belittles—they with questions and direct address. Gallagher gives a detailed analysis of the language used in the text, which is useful when studying the text in depth. Gallagher’s argument is that the main goal of the text is to condemn rather than trying to convince. In contrast, my argument is that Apess is sincere in attempting to change the attitude of white Americans. Barry O’Connell writes that “[m]any assume a Christianized Indian is no more than a concert to Euro-American ways,” but “neither Euro-Americans nor Native Americans have available some culturally unmixed terrain on which to move or any pure medium free from the effects of the other” (“Introduction” lv). O’Connell indicates the necessity for Native Americans to make use of Euro-American forms if they wanted to influence “white” discourse, which in turn would hopefully influence the treatment of Native Americans. Based on the words that Apess uses in “Looking-Glass,” O’Connell argues that “[f]or a Pequot to convert to Christianity is not, in this understanding, to take on white ways but only to claim one of her rights as a human being” (“Introduction” lxvii). This had an important aim:

Apess seems clearly to have understood that his people had to be made visible to whites, that their marginalities should not be disguised. White people had to see that they were responsible for the history Indians were living. Christianity was a faith that could be offered to Indians because it affirmed their equality with all other humans. Those who employed Christianity otherwise, who patronized or humiliated Indians, could only be false prophets. (O’Connell, “Introduction” lxvii)

This argument shows similarities with Sundquist’s interpretation of “I Have a Dream.” Hitherto no one seems to have made a connection between the two texts in scholarship. But Maureen Konkle has shown that Apess’s “essay bears evidence of his contact with African American and white antislavery writers in his refutation of color as the signifier of difference and inferiority” (114). In other words, Apess’s struggle and work was connected and similar to that of those African Americans (and white Americans) who had fought to abolish slavery and that enabled King to work for further freedom in the twentieth century. Konkle describes “Looking-Glass” as a “meditation on the politics of skin color as a signifier of ontological difference and inferiority—for Native peoples and for all ‘people of color,’” and compares the opening of the essay to the opening of abolitionist David Walker’s *Appeal* (116). The

similarities to the abolitionists include both the effort to de-essentialize color as an identity and the double standards of white supremacists:

Like the African American and white antislavery writers active at the time, Apess indicts Christians for failing to act in accordance with their own theology. The conditions on reservations are the results of Christians' actions, he reiterates, actions that whites make on the pretext of Native difference, on the evidence of the color of their skin. Apess points out that white Christians' invocation of color as the signifier of difference reveals the hypocrisy of their professed interest in improving Indians' lives. (Konkle 117)

In this thesis, I hope to show some rhetorical aspects of King's speech that have already been analyzed in a new light by comparing them with similar ones of the less dealt with essay that was written more than a century earlier. In the case of "An Indian's Looking-Glass for the White Man," the aim is to give a rhetorical analysis of the essay and the comparison with "I Have a Dream" will function to highlight further its persuasive potential.

Gustafson, quoting Edward Said, argues that Apess participates in "the conscious effort on the part of colonized peoples 'to enter into the discourse of Europe and the West, to mix with it, transform it, to make it acknowledge marginalized or suppressed or forgotten histories'" (34). In "Looking-Glass," Apess, writing both as colonized and on behalf of the colonized, participates in the discourse of the West; certainly by calling into question the identity categories that have been defined and essentialized within the discourse, but also by "mixing with it" through identifying with the white majority and their ideas. Patricia Bizzell analyzes the essay as a *jeremiad*, which "typically invokes the audience's cherished values and prophesies dire consequences for the community if these values are not served" (36). In contrast to the less hopeful European jeremiad, the American jeremiad "clearly intends to spur people to action and imagines that a better civil state can be achieved" (36). The arguments of these scholars seem to emphasize "Looking-Glass" as a text that is well constructed, clever and full of potential, but Apess lacked the audience that King and other civil rights activists had been able to gather through the years. King wrote that "Without the presence of the press ... there might have been [an] untold massacre in the South" (qtd. in Sundquist 38). Apess indicates that Native Americans are increasingly seen as valuable human beings; that they are "ingenious" and "men of talents" (156), but perhaps their "untold" sufferings were not understood by enough of those who continued to tolerate their oppression.

The thesis has two main chapters; one on each primary text. The first is devoted to

Apess's essay. There is some focus on context. The contextual aspects that I have found most important for the goals of the thesis are the situation of Native Americans in Apess's day (including the attitude of the white majority), Apess's biography and style, as well as the American religious tradition. These will each have some focus in the analysis, functioning together as factors that are relevant for the understanding of this particular text. The analysis is a close reading centered on figures of speech and allusions that have a rhetorical function and how these and the rhetoric of the essay as a whole are persuasive in the nineteenth-century American context. Here I will give attention to the hopeful aspects of the essay, which do not seem to have given enough attention in scholarship. In the second chapter, I will include some of the aspects of how King's speech has been analyzed and how it may originally have been understood and received. An important aspect here is the context, as its difference from that of "Looking-Glass" is important for the comparison of the two texts. I will rely on previous research, mainly Eric J. Sundquist's thorough analysis, to further analyze the text by elaborating on some of the figures of speech and other rhetorical techniques that work to persuade by drawing on American and Christian ideas. Here, my analysis in the previous chapter on Apess's essay will function as means to highlight the persuasiveness of "I Have a Dream" with regard to King's employment of majority discourse and appeal to the white audience. Finally, in the conclusion, an extended comparison will be made between the two texts. Here the focus is how the analyses in the two chapters can illuminate the difference in impact and persuasion, and whether this could be explained with focus on stylistics and rhetorical strategy, on content and appropriate arguments, or on context and the timeliness of the texts.

As I discuss in the two chapters, the two texts have their differences. As titles for the two chapters I have chosen "The Looking-Glass" and "The Dream." In my research and analysis, these have seemed descriptive for the two texts and emphasize both their differences and similarities. Apess's use of "Looking-Glass" in his title introduces the underlying "mirror" metaphor throughout the essay that I discuss in the next chapter. His overall strategy is to reveal to the white reader his or her racist actions and attitudes in order to create awareness and inspire change. In King's case, the famous "I have a dream" anaphora emphasizes his strategy, which is similar to Apess's, but that seems to go even further in expressing optimism. Equality is the collective American Dream for the future. Racism is wrong and segregation is undesirable, but the contrasting "dream" is alive and achievable through unity. My aim is not to argue that the two texts are totally comparable or that the comparison can reveal their overall persuasive potential. But I see the comparison as

productive; especially in showing the persuasive potential of “Looking-Glass.”

2 The Looking-Glass: William Apess's “White” Rhetoric

Modern readers' fascination with William Apess's essay seems to be linked to the sense that the author writes ahead of his time. Barry O'Connell points out the striking modernity of the essay: “This voice, and the consciousness of the nature of Euro-American racism it expresses, could have been heard in the 1960s or 1970s, possibly in the 1990s, but it would surprise many people ... to discover that it spoke in the first third of the nineteenth century and in New England” (“Introduction” xiii). The essay, published in 1833, is clearly written in conformity with the cultural and religious conventions of the antebellum context, but its sound argument reveals an author as insightful as any serious participant in twenty-first-century conversation on identity politics. Aware of the radicalness of his rhetoric in “An Indian's Looking-Glass for the White Man,” Apess remarks: “I presume that this kind of talk will seem surprising and horrible” (156). O'Connell wonders: “From what sources or experiences might Apess's consciousness have come?” (“Introduction” xv).

2.1 The “Indian”: Apess's Identity and Consciousness

Most of the information that has been uncovered on Apess stems from the active years of his life, that is between 1829 and 1836. O'Connell states that “[h]istorians know something about these years in Apess's life but almost nothing beyond what appears in *A Son of the Forest* ... or in the short account of his life included in *The Experiences [of Five Christian Indians of the Pequot Tribe]*” (“Introduction” xiv). In other words, a comprehensive answer to O'Connell's question is probably not available to us. But I would suggest that his hybridity and his multifaceted experiences are important contributions to his enlightened outlook. According to the categories created by the society in which he lived, Apess is at least four things. Firstly, the William Apess that the readers encounter in his writings may in many ways appear “assimilated,” and therefore seemingly living up to the ideals of the “white man's burden.” He speaks the language of the white man, and worships the same god as the white man. We learn from Apess's autobiography, *A Son of the Forest*, that his grandfather was white (3), and that Apess spent much of his life among whites. He has much in common with white Americans, and he even struggled with the idea of identifying as a Native

American. His “subjectivity had been molded by white paranoia of the Native Other” (Moon 50).

Secondly, Apess is an “Indian”—the oppressed, the colonized. The Apess of “An Indian’s Looking-Glass for the White Man” does in no way hide his background, and he identifies as a Native American. While many phrases in the essay function to highlight the similarities between Apess and his white readers, he also refers to the oppressed Native Americans as “my brethren” (155). At times, he seems somewhat distant from the suffering Native Americans that he describes, but he then includes himself other places in the text, e.g. when he states that “we who are red children have had to suffer” (156). He has bravely come to identify himself as an “Indian,” even though he previously had “thought it disgraceful to be called an Indian” (“A Son of the Forest” 10). Apess had to overcome “his own internalization of the dominant culture’s phobic stereotypes of Native Americans in order to construct a more stable and coherent self, one that could then identify with and embrace a group that he had earlier feared and despised [i.e. Native Americans]” (Moon 50).

Apess declares, “I am satisfied with the manner of my creation—whether others are or not” (157). Randall Moon calls this a “note of defiance and self-affirmation, characteristic of elements of the minority discourse found in slave narratives of the Nineteenth Century” (49), indicating that Apess was inspired by these and the abolitionist movement. Moon also compares Apess’s mission to former slave Frederick Douglass’s effort to confront hypocrisy in Christianity (49). Apess’s fight against racism is in many ways similar to the resistance against slavery. It also seems that he found encouragement in that movement, and identified with African Americans. Arnold Krupat suggest that Apess may have known abolitionists Frederick Douglass and David Walker, and there is evidence that suggests he gave sermons and lectures on the issue of slavery (80, 88).

As mentioned in the introduction to this thesis, Maureen Konkle argues that “Looking-Glass” is undoubtedly inspired by antislavery writing, and that the opening resembles David Walker’s *Appeal* (114, 116). Apess’s connections in the anti-slavery movement must have been a source of inspiration and support. However, seeing “Looking-Glass” in the context of a society that had not yet abolished slavery, reminds us of the extent of the racist attitudes he tried to confront. In many ways, African Americans and Native Americans were fighting the same fight. Their confrontation was essentially a resistance against racism and colonialism. But a society that is already convinced that color is “a signifier of ontological difference and inferiority” (Konkle 116) may not be ready to reconsider as many as two of those signifiers and accept all colors as equal to white.

Apess is an American—the third category that he belongs to, where his “whiteness” versus his “coloredness” is not necessarily a deciding factor. A definition of an American is never stable, but there are hints of Apess’s Americanness in the essay itself. He writes in English, the language of the Euro-Americans; he alludes to language similar to that of the Declaration of Independence with phrases such as “the laws of God and nature” (159), and he echoes nationalism when he implies a desire for “peace” in the entire “Union” (161). According to Cheryl Walker, although Apess reserves the word “nation” for ethnicity, he “consistently speaks of his ‘country’ as the United States of America” (46). He shares the general American belief in liberty and opportunity.

The fourth aspect of Apess’s identity, his identification as a Christian, is allowed no uncertainty in the essay. He speaks as an ordained Methodist minister and a converted man. He demonstrates thorough knowledge of theology and the Bible. “A Son of the Forest” reveals that Apess’s faith is genuine, gives him “light and happiness” (25), and is unaffected by the inconsistencies and hypocrisy that he sees among many white Christians. “Looking-Glass” was published as a conclusion to a collection of conversion narratives in “The Experiences of Five Christian Indians.” Perhaps being a Christian and a preacher is what Apess identifies most as.

To return to O’Connell’s question about where Apess’s consciousness might have come from, hybridity and complexity seem to be important contributions to his profundity and unique perspective. As Patricia Bizzell points out, Apess is a “transcultural individual” with a “new multiracial consciousness” (34-35). As I have indicated in the paragraphs above, he can easily argue for his inclusion within many (or none) of nineteenth-century New England society’s identity categories. He is white, but only partly; he is an “Indian,” but not wholly; he is a Christian, but not according to any conventional definition; and he is American, but not in the most typical sense. Apess’s gray area experiences would undoubtedly lead to confusion, and as his autobiography shows, ambiguity between identifying as “white” and “Indian.” Perhaps he had a greater need than most people to create his own definition of himself. Commenting on Apess’s autobiography, Cheryl Walker writes, “Caught between two cultures, William Apess emerges ... as a man in search of both an identity and a community” (45). However, ultimately the multiplicity of Apess’s subjectivity seems to give him the advantage of an outsider’s perspective. Barry O’Connell describes him as “a man who refused to be extinguished and who understood that he could not live on unless his people also did” (“Introduction” lxxvii). “Looking-Glass” mimics and engages

with “white” rhetoric, but the author’s unique ability to portray the situation from an outsider’s point of view makes his argument sober.

In decoding persuasive appeals, identifying the implied author is useful (Toye 43-44). Apess’s own suggestions about who he is are important. I have already shown some aspects of this role, but more can be said. As said in the introduction, the focus of my analysis of “Looking-Glass” is the way in which Apess makes use of American ideals and religion in order to persuade the white readers, and ultimately to resist racism. However, an important aspect of Apess’s essay is his perspective as not only a Christian American, but as Native American. The essay does not conform uncritically to the rhetoric of white Americans, but tries to alter it by exposing the brutality and injustice of oppression and white domination. Apess describes the suffering of the Native Americans, partly as experienced firsthand by the author, making the white readers aware of inhumanity. The text offers a unique look from a Native American perspective, “translated” and crafted so that the white audience will understand. As Barry O’Connell suggests, Apess’s “childhood experience gave him intimate knowledge of the undersides of the big houses of the powerful and respectable” (“Introduction” lxxv). His stories are “from the inside” to a certain degree and therefore credible. Although his ethnicity might be a challenge to his persuasion, it also seems to be an advantage for the development of his ethos.

O’Connell argues that “[w]hat makes Apess especially remarkable are the elements he chose to express his place in American society. Evangelical Christianity is the most prominent of these, but always modified by his half-taunting, half-ironic ‘Indian preacher.’ This qualifier acknowledges his status in white eyes as an exotic curiosity and as illegitimate” (“Introduction” lxxv). Sam Leith points to the quality of being trustworthy as an important aspect of ethos. And “[h]ow you present yourself . . . is the foundation on which all the rest is built. It establishes the connection between the speaker and the audience, and it steers how that speech will be received” (48). Apess’s presentation of himself is undoubtedly dual; he is the preacher, the light-skinned and “civilized Indian” on the one hand, and the suffering native on the other hand. The latter is probably, as O’Connell argues, something that is evidently working against him, and rather a problem than an advantage. However, it does seem to fit well with the idea of being trustworthy, and may be a contribution to his credibility and authority. As a Native American, Apess has experienced both firsthand oppression and the consequences of oppression, and he has witnessed the damage it has done among his relatives. He contributes to his argument by exposing a brutal reality the white readers may tend to close their eyes to. While much of the essay confronts racism explicitly,

Apess lets the suffering of the Native Americans speak for itself. There is no need to stress that suffering is unwanted and bad, but Apess lays the situation out so that the readers can no longer pretend they are unaware, and at the same time he provides “proof” that the things he describes are true. This happens as early as his second paragraph, where he suggests that “a gentleman and a lady, of integrity and respectability visit these places” (155). As a pathos appeal, the readers are invited to go and see the situation for themselves, and they are told that the things they would witness would stir their emotions.

Beyond having the quality of being someone who has suffered and who knows the brutality of racism firsthand, Apess’s point of view is significant simply because it is Native American. He does more than show the situation from the Native American perspective, and function to give the “white man” an idea of the experience of the oppressed. Apess’s racial background has the potential to make the essay more effective as means to challenge the readers’ perception of racial identity. The author’s obvious intellect and artistry could function as an example of the humanity and capability of Native Americans. The skeptical readers would probably be more inclined to believe a white man with a similar argument, rather than the illegitimate “Indian preacher”; but on the other hand, the words of the essay itself reveal—if the readers are willing to acknowledge it—that he is indeed legitimate and knowledgeable. As a Native American, Apess is one of the “speechless” members of American society. He is not one of those who are normally allowed participate in the public discourse. Apess defies these expectations, creates his own voice and—as Arnold Krupat points out—assumes the role of a “public intellectual” (75).

2.2 The White Man: How Apess Addresses a Privileged Audience

If white readers had to some degree acknowledged Apess’s legitimacy as a preacher, it would likely be due to his Biblical knowledge and religious rhetoric. This is of course connected to the very reason why Apess writes and is able to write his critique: New England society had fallen short of “Puritan ideals” (Bizzell 37). “Looking-Glass” belongs to the deliberative category of rhetoric, as it “attempts to persuade the audience to a specific course of action” (Toye 13). Apess wants his readers to change their behavior and for their action to be consistent with their ideals.

The problems that Apess faces in addressing white Americans are easily pinpointed. Firstly, he is writing to members of a society where racism is more or less the norm. Perhaps

this is most clearly indicated by the legality of African American slavery. But the power of racism was far from being only a legal struggle. “The intellectuals of the society—ministers, academics, writers and journalists, politicians, and what passed for scientists in that time—not only defended slavery and Indian removal but were busily spawning articulations of racial and cultural superiority in every form and forum” (O’Connell, “Introduction” lxxvi). In the essay, Apess explains and describes the consequences of racism, and more specifically the oppression and the suffering of those who are not white. Other aspects of the problems that Apess deals with can be derived from the text itself. His implied readers are characterized by a sense of entitlement and have feelings of superiority, and this is paired with religious pride and the conviction that they are God’s people. They are white Christian Americans who are directly or indirectly participating in or allowing the oppression of Native Americans. What is notable about the essay is that Apess is consistently convinced that these problems are in conflict with the ideals of New England society. In other words, he tells his readers that their actions are wrong according to their *own* ideals. Apess uses not only the language but the precepts of the dominant culture and white Americans to confront their treatment of Native Americans. His advantages here are that the readers’ professed religion affirms compassion and reconciliation, and that their nation prides itself on freedom and equality.

Randall Moon launches the phrase “writing white” in reference to Apess’s strategy to “write within the bounds of a dominant discourse,” and how he “resists the hegemony of such a discourse while still writing within it” (52). Edward J. Gallagher discusses Apess’s gradual move from writing white to writing “mixedblood,” and suggests that “Looking-Glass” is where he stops writing white—where he finally criticizes white values. My reading of the essay is that Apess is still writing white, in the sense that he is writing for a white audience, and that he himself seems to embrace many of the values of his white readers. His acceptance of these so-called “white” values is not uncritical, however. He is now making use of many of these to make his argument and solve the problems he sees around him. And not only is he pointing out the wrongness of racism, but he is contributing to the reinvention and purification of American values.

The most notable rhetorical strategies of Apess include visualizations, reversal of roles and labels, biblical allusions and citations, allusions to commonplace American discourse, a large number of rhetorical questions—including ones where Apess plays the role of an “earnest enquirer after knowledge” (Murray 61), different types of direct address, and repetition of important words and concepts. But ultimately the essay is concerned with

persuasion through shared values. “The speaker and the audience may hold polarized positions, but the attempt to win the listeners over must depend on some notion of ideas held in common” (Toye 51). Apess’s essay is clear about who its intended addressees are, but there is much to be found between the lines. The essay often implicitly appeals to the white majority and the New England Christian, and it explicitly confronts and criticizes the same people. The reasons for why Apess chose to “write white” seem obvious. What the readers would discover, however, is that the author is more than an “appropriated” native and a successfully colonized “Indian.” He is a genuine professor of the Christian faith, who realizes and exploits the advantages of being able to consider himself one of God’s children along with his “white brothers.” As a member of “white culture,” he has now decided to argue, based on the culture and religion that he and his readers have in common.

The essay resembles a sermon, and shares some characteristics with the style of Jonathan Edwards in his now most known sermon “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God.” Edwards hoped that “the use of this awful subject may be for awakening unconverted persons in this congregation” (qtd. in Cady 62). Similarly, Apess’s implied audience are “unconverted” in terms of racism. Renée L. Bergland compares Apess to Jonathan Edwards in that he “hopes to terrify his readers or listeners with their own mortality, in order to extirpate the evil principles that reign over them” (137). Both Edwards and Apess use biblical allusions and quotations, and like Apess, Edwards “shared a wide context of understood reference with his hearers” (62). He is arguing as a Christian American, but the most important aspect of his essay is the fact that this is what his readers also identify as. “The wise persuader starts from one or two commonplaces he knows he has in common with his audience – and, where possible, arrives at one too” (Leith 66). Apess is very much a Native American, but the Native American language and culture were in many ways opaque to the white Euro-Americans and Native American literature was mainly oral. Any attempt at persuading whites and confronting their racism would have to be conducted in English and make use of American and Christian concepts. Apess combines his (lack of) ethos with his contextually appropriate words, and communicates with the “colonizers” from the perspective of the colonized.

I have identified four types of precepts that Apess’s implied readers claim as their own: love, unity, liberty and equality. These very much overlap and could also be described in either more broad or clearly differentiated terms, but they help highlight aspects of Apess’s rhetorical strategy. For each of these values, Apess indicates reasons why these are important and that they are part of the dominant discourse. And for each of these, he also points to the

hypocrisy of the white readers, who claim to live by these ideas while doing the opposite. Apess, as he surfaces in the essay, is consistently convinced and confident that racism—and the racism in his context in particular—is in direct conflict with Christianity and with everything that the Union claims to be. Although his disadvantages in facing his readers (i.e. being both Native American and anti-racist) are significant obstacles to persuasion, Apess's advantage is that he “simply” needs to prove their hypocrisy. He utilizes his “Looking-Glass” in revealing to the readers that their actions are contrary to their “truths.” A looking-glass, a mirror, is particularly powerful as it simply displays things that already exist and can show reality in a new light. This is a device implicitly at work throughout the whole essay. This underlying metaphor seems to have an effect on all of the three persuasive appeals. It strengthens his ethos, because the author can act as a kind of neutral demonstrator or fellow onlooker; it emphasizes the logos in his argument, because the mirror shows the readers things that they themselves would label as unjust; and finally it stirs emotions (pathos) through making the readers aware of suffering among Native Americans and simultaneously the readers' own hypocrisy and participation in oppression. The looking-glass does not always display what the readers might expect, and sometimes it functions to reverse the dominant discourse or confuse the roles and labels that whites have invented. Throughout the essay, whites are shown as respectable and compassionate Christians, selfish hypocrites, civilized Americans, brutal colonizers, and pagan savages.

2.3 The Preacher: Confronting Christian Hypocrisy

To repeat: the four values that I have picked out as part Apess's strategy are love, unity, liberty and equality. All four are tied to the dominant discourse, but (for the sake of structure) I have linked the first two more closely with the Christian aspect of his argument and the latter two with the characteristics of nineteenth-century American identity. A key sentence in Apess's religious argument appears in the form of a rhetorical question. Having pointed out that “everybody that is not white” is seen as inferior, he asks “if the word of God justifies the white man in so doing” (158). Here is the core of Apess's conviction and rhetoric: that this imbalance is quite the opposite, namely contrary to “the word of God.” The combination of Apess's confidence in the validity of his argument and the implied readers' intimate knowledge of Christianity make his essay potentially powerful. His means of reasoning are in line with the Puritan tradition, where the “word of God” is the fundament in society. When he

uses theological arguments his logos is strong. The advantage is that he can refer to old (written) ideas from sacred texts that the readers see as authoritative.

The first biblical quotes that Apess uses are seven instances where the word “love” is used. First by Jesus himself, and then by his apostles in their Epistles. Taken together, these work to describe what love should look like for the Christian: It is equally important to love “thy neighbor” as “thy God” and it should be done in “deed” and not “word.” The last two of the seven quotes are more forceful in that they address those who do not love but hate their “brother.” Those who claim to love God but hate their brother are liars, even murderers. In other words, whether Apess’s readers consider Native Americans “brothers” or “neighbors,” and whether they have physically murdered them or intangibly with their attitude of hate, they need to examine themselves to know whether they have “the spirit of Christ” (158). What precedes these seven quotes is an inquiry: “Let us see if [Christian ministers] come anywhere near [Jesus Christ] and his ancient disciples” (157). Having presented these quotes, along with more biblical references and his own reasoning that contrasts with the commands about love with racism, Apess has presented his perhaps most powerful logos tool. He presents the answer to his inquiry, and indicates that the majority of white Christians are hypocrites: “If you can find a spirit like Jesus Christ and his Apostles prevailing in any of the white congregations, I should like to know it” (158). He continues his reasoning, but has here already shown the seriousness and spiritual implications of racism. The white congregations as a whole are—contrary to what they claim—not anything like Jesus Christ and his apostles.

Before Apess begins his explicit quotations from the Bible, he has already alluded to it, and perhaps most notably God’s creation of humankind. First, he brings attention to the quantity of people with “skin of color.” If these are “disgraceful to God, it appears that he has disgraced himself great deal—for he has made fifteen colored people to one white, and placed them upon this earth” (157). The readers are confronted with the possibility that their beliefs about “colored people” are contrary their god’s intentions. Apess’s statement draws a conclusion that perhaps may seem blasphemous to the readers. But Apess is willingly resorting to extreme language to amplify his point. Arnold Krupat labels this as “ironic discourse,” which Apess uses throughout the essay to “induce the sort of shame in his audience that might produce a revolution in its moral feeling, and, so, in its future behavior” (85). In other words, his shaming of the readers is in line with the overall purpose to change their attitude.

Having shown that people of color are a larger a part of God’s created humanity than white people, Apess alludes to the wording of the creation account in Genesis. It would be

commonplace for the readers that when creating humankind, God had said: “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness” (*King James Version*, Genesis 1.26-27), and that his creation “was very good” (Genesis 1.31). In other words, man was created in “the image of God.” And now Apess asks whether it is a disgrace for a white man “to eat, drink and sleep with the image of God, or sit or walk with them” (157). The question is rhetorical, but the expected answer is “no”; the white readers believe in the sacredness of their fellow Christians as God’s creation and know that they are to love them. Apess’s next rhetorical question therefore becomes compelling: “Or have you the folly to think that the white man, being one in fifteen or sixteen, are the only beloved images of God?” (157). Apess implies the inevitability of non-whites’ inclusion in the divinely created humankind. His argument here seems bulletproof. His readers would have to find their own evidence in the book of Genesis in order to prove that non-whites are not made in “the image of God,” and “after his likeness.” Towards the end of the essay, Apess returns to the “image” allusion and the idea of likeness to God. In his praise of people who resist racism and promote equality among people of all nations, he says that the “principle” of such people “is like its God” (160). Here Apess concludes his essay with a description of those who are the *true* image of God—his true representation. He has purified and reinvented the idea, and the “image of God” no longer refers to whites, but to those who oppose racism.

Brotherly love is not reserved for the white man, and Apess seems ready to refute whatever counterarguments the readers may have. In his penultimate paragraph, Apess returns again to the concept of brotherly love by alluding to the quintessential example of selfless love among humans: the good Samaritan. With few words, Apess creates a dense allusion. According to the Gospel of Luke, the story of the good Samaritan was told by Jesus as a response to the question “who is my neighbour?” asked by a lawyer (Luke 10.29). Similar to the lawyer, Apess’s readers might try to think up excuses to exclude colored people from their responsibility to love. But Apess wants to emphasize that those who actively love their Native American neighbor are like “the good Samaritan, that had his wounds bound up, who had been among thieves and robbers” (160). The nationality of the Samaritan is significant for the interpretation and application of the story. Bizzell describes Apess’s reference as “an apt allusion, since the point of the Good Samaritan story is usually adduced to be that the Samaritan’s actions are praiseworthy precisely because he helps someone from an ethnic group other than his own, and between which and his own there is enmity” (40). As an important contribution to Apess’s logos, this allusion emphasizes simultaneously the importance of empathy and the argument that nationality does not

determine a human's worth. The good Samaritan cared for his neighbor of a different nationality and who was considered an enemy. The man had—much like the Native American nation— “been among thieves and robbers” (160). The readers might recall from their religious education, that Jesus concluded the conversation with these words to the lawyer: “Go, and do thou likewise” (Luke 10.37). Apess both reinforces and expands the readers' idea of Christian love.

Though it is not completely separate from the love aspect, Apess also deals with the concept of unity. More specifically he is addressing the Christian idea of a new humanity where all men are equal. In other words, unity requires equality. I have chosen to categorize the religious aspect of equality as unity, because Apess is concerned with pointing out the spiritual implications of the readers' disregard for equality. With their racism towards their Native American brothers, they are causing division in a family of believers, and disregarding the idea that “man was made for society” (160). In the very first sentence of the essay, addressing his “fellow creatures,” he establishes the equality of “the Indian” and the white man. Both are headed the same way (“to the grave”), i.e. they are equally mortal; they both have the same God as their “maker,” and “preserver” and are ultimately not in control of their fate; their abilities are equal, and finally, they are judged by the same God “who will show no favor to outward appearances, but will judge righteousness” (155). To emphasize this unity, Apess addresses his readers as “my brethren,” “my white brother” and “friends” throughout the text. Although he also creates some distance, e.g. when he writes, “Let me ask you, white man ...,” it seems that this is done mainly when he is dealing with their hypocrisy. Gallagher argues that the distance grows between Apess and the reader in the course of the text, and that the use of words like “brethren” is ironic. But I would argue otherwise and point out that although Apess seems milder at the beginning, the way he addresses his readers varies throughout the text. The readers are both beloved “brethren” and the prejudiced “white man.” His changing use of modes of address may also be a strategy to undermine the tendency to categorize people. The purpose of “brethren” is probably not primarily ironic—although it might have an ironic effect as well. The main purpose seems to be to remind the readers that he is equal with them through addressing them as family. Throughout the essay, he reverses the roles and plays with visualizations that “turn the tables,” but ultimately he is not attempting to argue for the superiority of colored “nations” or some kind of reversed racism, but rather for the equality of all nations.

By his use of “brethren,” Apess also addresses his readers in the same way as St. Paul did in his epistles. Besides strengthening Apess's ethos by highlighting his authority as a

preacher, it also further emphasizes the fact that they are fellow believers, who have received their salvation from the same God. He explicitly stresses this when he asks: “did not he who completed the plan of salvation complete it for the whites as well as for the Jews, and others?” (158). The ideas of salvation, offered to all nations, i.e. both the white man and the “Indian,” indicates that their God views them as equal. Apess asks rhetorically, “Did you ever hear or read of Christ teaching his disciples that they ought to despise one because his skin was different from theirs?” (158). Once again, Apess shows that he is confident in his argument, as if he is telling the reader: “Feel free to test my statement, show me the Bible references.”

In the same paragraph, Apess points out that Jesus and his apostles were Jews and “certainly were not whites” (158). The Jews and Jesus were colored, in other words, while whites were initially the non-Jews, the non-believing pagans, the Gentiles who “sacrificed their children to dumb idols” (158). In Apess’s looking-glass, the whites are the barbarians and the idol-worshippers—clearly invoking typical white colonialist perceptions of Native Americans. But the significance of this reversal is greater. By reversing the roles and displaying whites as an initially pagan or savage race, Apess is showing that they have not always been considered God’s people. He uses the basis of their sense of superiority to prove that they are not inherently entitled to the privileges and advantages that they now have. And because even the son of God was colored, Apess’s white readers are “not indebted to a principle beneath a white skin for your religious service, but to a colored one” (158). According to Edward Blum and Paul Harvey, Apess was “the first American explicitly to criticize the whiteness of Christ and its links to American racism” (14). Apess challenges the readers’ idea of a white Christ and makes it an important part of his argument that the Christian religion is incompatible with racism.

Having reminded the readers that Jesus and his apostles were colored, he then asks, “is religion not the same now under a colored skin as it ever was?” (158). He then deals with the issue of division and inequality in depth. To continue to emphasize that equality among whites and Native Americans is biblical, he quotes St. Paul’s letter to the Colossians: “Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian or Scythian, bond nor free—but Christ is all and in all” (158). This citation becomes especially powerful, as Apess has previously compared whites to Gentiles. The insinuation is perhaps that they were once inferior to the Jews, but Christ then made them equal. Therefore, now that they have become wrongly “superior” to the Native Americans, they need to do what they can to treat them as equals. Here he does not relent in his accusations of hypocrisy. Having quoted St.

Paul's unambiguous words about equality and abolishment of human hierarchy, Apess forcefully asks, "why is all this distinction made among these Christian societies?" (159). In other words, why are their lives inconsistent with their religion?

Apess has quoted St. Paul to establish that there is no longer any distinction between men and that there are not categories such as a "Barbarian" anymore. He then uses the word "barbarian" to draw the connection to the readers' context. He asks "is it not the case that everybody that is not white is treated with contempt and counted as barbarians? (158). The readers are shown more of their inconsistencies with the Bible.

To even further emphasize the absurdity of racial categories and undermine the color signifier, Apess elaborates his white/Gentile comparison. He states once again that in biblical times, whites and all who were not Jews were heathens and Gentiles. He adds that "according to the writings of some, it could not mean the Indians, for they are counted Jews" (159). Apess is referring to the theory of the Ten Lost Tribes (of Israel). Sandra Gustafson suggests that Apess's connection between Jews and Native Americans was a successful strategy that produced results for the Mashpee community (49). In her article, Gustafson writes about Apess's general interest in the Ten Lost Tribes theory and how this theory that Native Americans had an Israelite heritage both fascinated him and benefitted him in his resistance work. Apess utilized the theory in order to provoke a different perception of colored skin, by likening Native Americans to Jews and thereby Hebrew prophets, and also Jesus himself (as in "Looking-Glass"). It does not seem clear whether Apess actually believed this connection to be accurate or if he simply took advantage of it for rhetorical purposes. I want to argue for the latter; that here this is mainly part of his appeal to his white addressees, his effort to alter their view of race by directing their attention to a non-white race that was already held in high esteem. "Apess invokes the Israelite-Identity theory to reverse evangelical discourse about 'heathen' Indians" (Gustafson 42). It is part of his "extended play on the idea of skin and colour" (Murray 61). He has already hinted at this in the previous paragraph. Now he develops this idea further in his deconstruction of skin color as a signifier, and reverses the racial superior/inferior dichotomy with his rhetorical looking-glass to challenge the readers' perspective. Simultaneously, it is, as Gustafson suggests, an attempt at strengthening his "prophetic authority" (45) and therefore his ethos.

At the end of the paragraph, Apess writes: "you may ask: Who are the children of God? Perhaps you may say, none but white. If so, the word of the Lord is not true" (159). Again, Apess draws a conclusion that shames his readers, but that has a purpose. The statement also functions as another demonstration of his confidence and ability to prove his

argument; a contribution to his ethos in other words. It also strengthens the effect of his next biblical citation, “God is no respecter of persons” (159), and it might amplify the effect of his allusion to the good Samaritan towards the end of the essay.

2.4 The American: Purifying the Values of the Union

Apess, who is speaking to his readers not only as a Christian but as a fellow American, alludes to and utilizes American commonplaces in the essay. These are effective for the persuasion of this particular audience, and part of the solution to the problems that Apess addresses. But they also enable him to deal with some of the roots of these problems. Less than sixty years before Apess wrote the essay, the Declaration of Independence stated the inevitability of equality according to “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”; that “all men are created equal” and that they have “certain unalienable Rights” such as “Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness” (“Declaration of Independence”). In other words, the Union had explicitly declared itself as a country of liberty and equality. On the other hand, this did not include Native Americans—labelled in the Declaration as “merciless Indian savages” (“Declaration of Independence”). The doctrine of Manifest Destiny, “which received its first full articulation in Apess’s lifetime,” justified “the removal of the Indians west of the Mississippi” (O’Connell, “Introduction” xvii). As O’Connell points out, the root of the problem also includes:

The Puritans’ earlier “errand into the wilderness” ... the countless renovations of the idea of Euro-Americans as God’s chosen people with an exceptional and virtuous mission in the world ... Euro-Americans’ aggressions against Indians ... as illustrations of the inevitability of a superior civilization ... [and] the construction of the particular ideological history that has shaped “America” as a virgin land settled by God’s chosen people, mostly Anglo-Americans. (“Introduction” xvii)

The paradox is obvious, that the Euro-Americans, who asserted that liberty and equality are “self-evident,” denied their non-white inhabitants the same rights. The Declaration of Independence demanded freedom from King George III, because of his “injuries and usurpations,” which, ironically, read strikingly similarly to white offenses against Native Americans: “He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people” (“Declaration of Independence”). Apess’s text defies this paradoxical ideology through both making use of and subverting the binaries of colonialist discourse.

In the 1830s, “most writers were silent about the forced removal of southeastern Indian tribes from their homelands to territory west of the Mississippi River as permitted by the Indian Removal Act of 1830” (Baym 457). In other words, Apess’s struggle is lonely. At best, he is faced with the attitude that “American destiny plainly required a little practical callousness” or “the worst kind of sympathy: a lament for ‘vanishing’ Indians” (Baym 457). Apess’s mission to alter this discourse becomes both challenging and complex. Not only is he representing the rarely acknowledged Native American perspective, but also breaking the general silence on the issue. He asks: “did not this bad principle proceed from the whites or their forefathers?” (156). Furthermore, he defies the “savage” label, resists speechlessness, points out the paradoxes and inconsistencies of American beliefs, and attempts to purify these while still preserving their positive aspects.

One positive aspect that Apess makes use of is liberty. The problem addressed is the plundering, removal and “near-genocide” (Baym 457) of Native Americans, which conflicts with the generally accepted American assertion that everyone is entitled to liberty. As mentioned above, Apess may appear to the readers as a successfully assimilated Native American. He may be seen as yet another evidence of Manifest Destiny and the superiority of Euro-American identity and culture. On the other hand, as a member of this new nation, he is entitled to the same liberties as white Americans. And he makes use of his liberty to confront the racism of his fellow Americans.

Apess is explicit about the brutality and injustice of colonialism:

Can you charge the Indians with robbing a nation almost of their whole continent, and murdering their women and children, and then depriving the remainder of their lawful rights, that nature and God required them to have? And to cap the climax, rob another nation to till their grounds, and welter out their days under the lash with hunger and fatigue under the scorching rays of a burning sun? (157)

With these rhetorical questions, Apess gives a short but detailed and pathos-filled description of negative aspects of liberty—liberty that is polluted by a sense of entitlement and superiority. This perversion of liberty continues in a former colony that practices colonialism “at home.” Apess is essentially asking whether Native Americans, the so-called “barbarians,” have done anything as barbaric as what the white colonialists have. To emphasize the cruelty, and appeal to the readers’ emotions, he includes their exploitation of African American slaves portrayed through powerful imagery. The question form—perhaps a way to make the accusations friendlier—functions to show the white reader their own reflection as a nation in

Apess's looking-glass. They confronted with a new but accurate perception of their country's history.

At the beginning of the essay, Apess has already given a detailed and current description of the bad conditions on Native American reservations. He starts these paragraphs with what seems to be an appeal to the white man's ego—the rhetorical figure *comprobatio*: “Let a gentleman and lady, of integrity and respectability visit these places” (155). He then states that “they would be surprised” (155). The complimentary wording seems appropriate at the beginning of the text, where the author would likely want to establish ethos and his good intentions. In these paragraphs Apess seems to give the readers' the benefit of the doubt and addresses them as fairly innocent and unaware. He assumes that they are people of integrity and respectability—compassionate people that would not witness the suffering on the reservations without emotion and pathos. The description reveals that the liberty that the white American readers may take for granted is not offered to Native Americans. Apess lists four reasons why the reservations are “the most mean, abject, miserable race of beings in the world—a complete place of prodigality and prostitution” (155). At least three of the reasons are the result of white supremacy: Native Americans “are made to believe they are minors and have not the abilities given them from God, to take care of themselves”; white agents are “unfaithful, and care not whether the Indians live or die” (155-56); and, finally, Native Americans “have no education to take care of themselves” (156). The readers, so far not direct targets of any accusations, may be starting to understand that the source of the suffering can be traced back to white Americans, and that perhaps American laws are not in agreement with the laws of God and nature.

Apess addresses a specific liberty to demonstrate the inequality between whites and people of other races. This is the issue of marriage, and more specifically intermarriage between races, which was particularly controversial in Apess's day. First, however, he makes an important contribution to his ethos and his objective point of view. He emphasizes, being a married man, that he is “not looking for a wife.” In other words, he is not making his argument with some hidden personal motive. Having established that he is sincere and trustworthy, and emphasized that his Native American wife is “of the finest cast,” Apess argues that Native Americans should have the same liberty to choose their partners as whites.

Apess portrays inequality as hypocrisy. He implies that the “laws of God and nature” entitle both the white man and the Native American to equality. He specifically points out the hypocrisy that, while Native Americans are seen as “ingenious” and “men of talents” (156), they are not given opportunities and education. Instead, they are despised and excluded.

Although “many say that they are willing” that Native Americans should enjoy their “rights and privileges,” they are “not protected in [their] persons and property throughout the Union” (156). To highlight the right to equality, he begins to de-essentialize skin color as a distinction and an inferior identity. One of his strategies is to reverse the roles: “I would ask you if you would like to be disfranchised from all your rights, merely because your skin is white, and for no other crime” (156). In other words, what if the whites were the oppressed? Here, Apess contributes to his *logos*, and the argument that racism is not a valid attitude.

The “play on the idea of skin and colour” (Murray 61) continues. Apess asks the readers to visualize “all nations together” (157) and imagine all national crimes written on all skins in the world. Not only would the whites be very few among all other “nations,” but they would have most crimes of them all. Then follows the detailed description of what Euro-Americans collectively have done to both Native Americans and African Americans. Apess points out the absurdity of racism by implying: “if you want to talk about one race being worse than another, then let us do just that.” It should become clear to the readers that white skin is no better than colored skin. Apess is bold in his accusations, but he does not dwell on this image. His overall intention does not seem to be condemnation of the white “nation,” or to argue that they are inferior. His aim seems to be to provoke humility.

The word “principle”—a “moral and intellectual” quality (Krupat 84)—is repeated throughout the whole essay. Racists are described as “unprincipled,” and having “no principle,” a “bad” or “corrupt” principle—even “black principle.” He stresses that principles are more important than skin color, and he then reminds those “who profess to have pure principles” need to pair them with “example,” i.e. with something concrete. In other words, the problem is once again hypocrisy. Towards the end of the essay Apess returns to principles. In his concluding paragraphs, he hopes that his hypocritical readers have realized “how deep your principles are” (160). Their principles, that are perhaps initially “pure” and good, are only “skin deep.” Edward J. Gallagher argues that Apess leaves no opportunity for conversion—that Apess’s conclusion does not invite the readers to change. I would argue that he actually does try to inspire a change in their attitude, rather than just condemn them. The essay’s rhetoric is mainly deliberative rather than epideictic or forensic. True to the conventions of the American jeremiad, which “clearly intends to spur people to action and imagines that a better civil state can be achieved” (Bizzell 36), Apess offers hope and redemption. Throughout the essay, he has used different strategies to reveal hypocrisy, to argue that racism is wrong and to explain why the readers should love their Native American “brethren.” Now he asks them to remove the “impure black principle.” In the tradition of

Jonathan Edwards, the sermon-like essay leads to “application” for the audience (Cady 62). Apess expresses his faith in the readers’ ability to resist racism: “I believe there are many who would not hesitate to advocate our cause” (160). He even names examples of people who already do this, people who are modelling brotherly love and resisting racism, and adds that “they are to be praised and valued” (160). Here Apess praises the “noble spirits” who resist racism and the subjugation of Native Americans. He adds that such people “promote the happiness of mankind” (160), a kind of reiteration that non-whites are equal members of American society and that the true advocates of “Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness” are those who promote these for all of mankind, without regard to race or color.

* * *

The last paragraph of the essay, starting with “Do not get tired, ye noble-hearted” (160), appears similar to a biblical command and functions to encourage the readers to be compassionate “good Samaritans” towards Native Americans. It includes a religious and an American element; first the promise of a reward from God and then the assurance that they will create peace in the whole Union. In the introduction to the essay, Apess asked, rhetorically and sarcastically, “is it right to hold and promote prejudices?” (155). Here, in his last sentence, he says a prayer for his readers, and prays that “the mantle of prejudice” will be “torn from every American heart” (160-61).

Although Apess’s conclusion seems positive and hopeful, his blame and condemnation of his readers may have been off-putting to many white readers. Much of his essay is an attack on an audience that has become accustomed to their superior position in society. We can assume that Apess realized that the essay failed to convince white readers, because in a later publication of “The Experiences” in 1837, Apess replaced the essay with a much shorter and less hostile text; a single paragraph entitled “An Indian’s Thought” (O’Connell, *On Our Own Ground* 161 n. 16). This text consists of some similar formulations and of many of the same ideas as “Looking-Glass,” but the tone is considerably friendlier and also seems to show an author that has become somewhat discouraged in his resistance against racism. Blum and Harvey suggest some specific cultural and religious reasons why Apess might have removed the original essay: “Perhaps he or his publisher wondered if his calling Christ a ‘colored’ man would hurt sales. Perhaps his discussion of Christ’s color and his challenge to opponents of interracial marriage cut too close to the core of white supremacist spirituality and sexuality” (14). In “An Indian’s Thought,” Apess still asks his readers to

change their behavior into “works of righteousness,” but his last sentence, “Judge ye, what that is” (161 n. 16), implies that he is aware that they cannot be forced to change and that he ultimately leaves it up to the reader to decide what is right.

3 The Dream: King's Unifying Rhetoric

The starting point for this thesis is the similarity between Apess's and King's texts, but the most notable differences, as mentioned in the introduction, are the two different contexts. Not only is King's speech focused on racism against African Americans rather than Native Americans, but it was delivered 130 years after Apess's text was published. What is perhaps most striking, in the light of this time span, is the persistence of racism in American society. The struggle of Apess, abolitionists and other activists had undoubtedly produced results—most notably the abolition of slavery—but the racism in King's day was remarkably similar to what these previous generations struggled to resist. As discussed in the previous chapter, Apess's struggle was in some ways linked to the abolitionist movement. King's indication that 1960s racism in the United States is a form of continued slavery points to the similarity. The focus of this chapter is the rhetorical strategies in King's "I Have a Dream" that appeal to the white majority, and especially the aspects that are comparable to Apess's approach in "An Indian's Looking-Glass for the White Man."

3.1 Still Slaves: Speaking When He is "Not Supposed to Speak"

Just as Apess's consciousness seems influenced by his complex identity and limitations as a Native American, King's activism and rhetoric reflects the struggle of being an oppressed African American. According to W.E.B. DuBois, the experience of being an African American creates a double consciousness:

a sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness—an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (qtd. in "African American Rhetoric" 11)

A society that generally views African Americans through the eyes of the white majority, not only creates a struggle in the daily lives of African Americans, but makes the resistance against racism, and King's mission, especially difficult. But King does not try to separate the two "warring ideals." On the contrary, he defies this struggle and tries to unite the two. Similarly to Apess, he embraces his hybridity. His speech addresses "our nation" (1395);

King is both black and American and refuses to make a distinction between the two identities.

The challenges that King faces are similar to those of Apess. Both authors resist racism with their words, and they both have the disadvantage (or advantage) of being members of the minorities that are the targets of racism. Throughout American history, African American voices have been suppressed. This has affected the way that oratory has developed. “Historically, black orators have instructed black folk about *how* to speak when one is not *supposed* to speak” (“African American Rhetoric” 4). This would impact the development of African American rhetoric. The rhetoric of “I Have a Dream” is a good example of a speech that simultaneously demonstrates the speaker’s credibility or ethos and delivers persuasive logos. Here we may see similarities with Apess’s essay. As discussed in the previous chapter, Apess’s argument for the equality of all “nations” is grounded in mainly biblical arguments that are reliable and provable to the implied readers. King does a similar thing. His speech is filled with rhetoric that strengthens his credibility and ethos, and that demonstrates that African Americans are equal to white Americans. The speaker is a preacher and an American who is well educated, articulate, peaceful, and most importantly, he embraces his white “brothers.”

An important aspect of the context of “I Have a Dream” in contrast with Apess’s context is that slavery had been abolished. King takes advantage of this in his speech, and is able to rely on the success of the abolitionists and on lawmakers’ decisions to a larger extent than Apess. However, racism has continued in the form of Jim Crow laws and segregation, and as King emotively points out, “one hundred years later, the Negro still is not free.” (1395). The struggle of David Walker and Frederick Douglass continues in a different context. In fact, the struggle had been so long-lasting, that a tradition had developed in African American resistance. Elizabeth Vander Lei and Keith D. Miller point to King’s speech as part of the tradition of African American rhetoric. The speech “is the product of African American rhetorical traditions of ceremonial protest and jeremiad speech-making, rituals that had crystalized long before King was born” (84). “I Have a Dream” was a part of both the celebration of the Emancipation Proclamation—as King indicates in his introduction—and a protest against current racial injustices:

Following the Civil War, African Americans annually commemorated the Emancipation Proclamation while continuing to protest deeply rooted and legally enforced racial discrimination. Because emancipation from legalized slavery did not free African Americans from the effects of racism, the events

associated with these “freedom” holidays continued to be both celebrative and protest-oriented. (85)

Speech as resistance was not a new concept and many rhetorical aspects of “I Have a Dream” rely on decades of oratory. King knows the history of protest and resistance, and is not unaware of the obstacles that his movement continues to face. The difficulties were amplified by the lack of support from the government (Sundquist 33-34) and from the violent methods of other African American resistance fighters, including the Black Power movement and Malcolm X. King seems aware that his ethos is vulnerable and that his portrayal of himself as credible is crucial, because of his disadvantage as an African American who is “not supposed to speak” and who might easily be dismissed by white supremacists as a revengeful rebel. In contrast with these expectations, King speaks with authority and eloquent words, paired with a commitment to non-violence and a flawless argument. These strengthen the ethos of the implied speaker. The implied speaker is radical, and not only because he resists widespread racism, but because of his readiness to reconcile with repentant racists. This aspect appears to be a potentially effective strategy to persuade white audiences, but it also seems to be King’s genuine belief that reconciliation is the only way to equality and freedom for African Americans.

Being very much aware of the violence against blacks and especially civil rights activists, including himself, King refused violence no matter the cost and the provocation. Sundquist describes King’s unwavering belief in non-violence:

When his own home had been bombed just five days earlier ... King dispersed an angry mob bent on revenge by insisting that they put away their weapons and love their white enemies. Rather than white blood, black blood was to be shed—not submissively, not uselessly, but in order to break the white man’s spirit, disgrace him before God, and lead him to salvation. (122)

If the audience knows King’s story and is aware of his radical attitude, they may already be inclined to listen intently. As Miller and Vander Lei point out, the March on Washington was a celebration, rather than simply a resistance protest. The event was peaceful, without the civil disobedience that sometimes characterized the movement. This peacefulness seems to have highlighted King’s message of peace, and seems to serve as a demonstration of the peacefulness of a society where African Americans are equal to whites. But the words of the speech itself are also unambiguous in this regard.

King’s ethos strengthened through a sort of interruption in his speech—a lengthy direct address to his fellow African American activists:

But there is something that I must say to my fellow people, who stand on the warm threshold which leads into the palace of justice: In the process of gaining our rightful place, we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds.

Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence. ... (1396)

Although this part addresses African Americans, it functions as a sort of demonstration for the white hearer, and an assurance that King is not revengeful or violent. The purpose of his address is not to condemn or retaliate, but to deliver a serious argument with “dignity” and “discipline” (1396). This contribution to ethos is infused with pathos-boosting imagery, such as the metaphor “the palace of justice” (1396), emphasizing the beauty and harmony of a desegregated society. The antithesis with the phrases “*rightful place*” and “*wrongful deeds*” (1396, emphasis added) is also an important figure of speech. King’s logos is highlighted in that freedom and justice for African Americans is the rightful place for them; and his ethos is strengthened by the acknowledgement that certain types of resistance or ways of relating to whites are wrongful. Then, with yet another metaphor, King emphasizes that it would be wrong for African Americans to quench their legitimate (rightful) and intense “thirst for freedom” by drinking from the wrong “cup,” that is to hate rather than to love.

Another quality that King shares with Apess is that he contributes to the persuasiveness of the speech simply by being a member of a racial minority himself. Simply by speaking and thereby revealing his intellect, he challenges the preconceived idea of the black man who is “not supposed to speak,” and consequently resists the speechlessness that racism has caused for African Americans. He implicitly defies essentialism and stereotypes. In the continued struggle for racial equality, King participates in a new version of the abolitionist movement—the continued struggle for freedom from speechlessness. “As a vital dimension of abolitionist discourse ... black speakers advanced the antislavery cause while providing through the sheer act of public speaking the warrant *for* black public speaking” (“African American Rhetoric” 5). The speech is resistance in itself, and King’s ethos is strong in many ways. He speaks as a proud member of American society; he is unusually bold, as a black American who puts his life in danger for all African Americans; he already has a position as a known and respected activist, and like Apess, he assumes the role of a public intellectual. In contrast to Apess, King is, both before and after “I Have a Dream,” a

well-known leader; not just in churches, but as the face of a resistance movement and as a grassroots leader. In other words, many of his advantages are text-external.

3.2 “For Whites Only”: Appealing to White Supremacists

Given the context of King’s speech there is no doubt about its purpose, although it is less explicit in criticizing the details of racist society than “Looking-Glass.” As part of the March on Washington and the civil rights movement in general, “I Have a Dream” serves as a continued effort to resist segregation and racism in American society. What is special is the event’s scale and therefore the largeness of the audience. But the problems addressed, as they surface in the speech, have similarities with the problems in Apess’s context. America is still not living up to its ideals. Slavery has been replaced by Jim Crow. Violence has not ended; it simply looks different. To use Barry O’Connell’s description of the problems that Apess dealt with, King also faced “renovations of the idea of Euro-Americans as God’s chosen people with an exceptional and virtuous mission in the world” (“Introduction” xvii). The passing of the Civil Rights Act as late as the year after the March on Washington indicates the pressing need in 1963 for explicit laws that protected African Americans from discrimination.

The problems that King addresses are results of white supremacy and hegemony. As his invocation of Abraham Lincoln implies, King raises the concern that even though slavery was abolished a century ago, the same problems persist in the form of segregation and other manifestations of racism. It becomes evident that King’s implied audience very much includes those who deny these issues and defend the status quo. King’s own reference to signs that state “for whites only” (1396), reminds us of the prevalence and the institutionalized nature of racism in the 1960s. The references and allusions to slavery are therefore important and enable King to argue against segregation.

King’s audience consists of both black and white Americans (as well all other Americans listening). Sundquist describes the speech’s effect on the two groups:

Blacks heard a black man whose courage, dignity, and eloquence gave them hope few had ever known. Whites heard a black man, standing before them as their equal, preaching to them in the name of brotherhood and justice. All heard words rivaled only by those inscribed on the marble walls of the Lincoln Memorial rising in the background. (55)

At the March on Washington, King had the attention of the nation, and white supremacists were confronted by his words, whether they were persuaded or not. For African Americans, the event “fulfilled a two-fold purpose: It celebrated the one-hundredth anniversary of Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation, and it protested ongoing racism in American society” (84). The African American community would, in other words, embrace and celebrate American values and tradition, but also protest the lack of their fulfillment. This protest-oriented aspect of the event and of King’s speech would naturally be directed at whites. In African American rhetorical tradition of ceremonial protest, “speakers [often] relied on the jeremiad. The jeremiad fit ceremonial protests because it too framed dissent within a celebration of past promises and hope for future fulfillment of them” (Miller and Vander Lei 87).

The jeremiad aspect of King’s speech highlights the similarities with “Looking-Glass,” where Apress adopts a similar strategy and functions as a prophet (or preacher) who uses his words to confront the hypocrisy of white Christians.

In a jeremiad, the speaker adopts the stance of a prophet-outcast, evoking Old and New Testament prophets such as Moses, Elijah, Jeremiah, and John the Baptist. These prophets went into the wilderness to discern God’s voice and returned to communicate that message to the rest of the community. In African American jeremiads, the speaker signals his position of alienation through metaphor and scriptural allusion rather than through social isolation. (Miller and Vander Lei 87)

David Howard-Pitney describes the threefold structure of the African American jeremiad. It includes firstly “a consideration of the freedom promises in America’s founding documents”; then “a detailed criticism of America’s failure to fulfill this promise”; and lastly “a prophecy that America will achieve its promised greatness and enjoy unparalleled happiness” (qtd. in Miller and Vander Lei 87). “Thus in a jeremiad, orators follow the structure of promise, failure, and prophecy of future greatness found throughout the Bible” (Miller and Vander Lei 88). Although this particular type of jeremiad belongs to the African American tradition and King’s speech undoubtedly functions to encourage African Americans, the purpose behind the March on Washington and the words of the speech show that “I Have a Dream” is predominantly intended to appeal to whites. Its poetic and eloquent words, and its sermonic style function to strengthen King’s persuasion. As discussed in the previous chapter, the sermon was a familiar genre with a long tradition in the United States.

The jeremiad was not only well known in African American tradition, indicating that African American discourse was not so different from the discourse of the white majority.

Although it addresses the whole nation, “I Have a Dream” is a speech that resists racism and it functions as an appeal to whites, both as an encouragement to those who already oppose racism and as a way to persuade white supremacists and segregationists. King called for purification of American values (Sundquist 10). King’s resistance is not against everything in the dominant culture, and most importantly—as is the case with Apess’s essay—not a resistance against American values and ideals. If Apess in his essay is (as Randall Moon suggests) “writing white,” King is to an extent “speaking white.” As Miller and Vander Lei show, his speech is not entirely a speech that appeals to whites, as it occurs in a long tradition of African American rhetoric that is clearly meant to move and encourage a black audience. However, although the aspect of the speech that is adapted to “white” speech overlaps with the African American aspect, this functions to persuade the white hearers. King’s persuasion is based on ideas that are seen as being both American and Christian. Applying Moon’s words about Apess’s writing strategy to oratory highlights the similarities with King’s rhetoric. King speaks “within the bounds of a dominant discourse” and “resists the hegemony of such a discourse” (Moon 52) while speaking within it. As Richard Toyne argues, effective persuasion makes use of “ideas held in common” (51). The implied audience of “I Have a Dream” is the whole nation, but to focus on his attempt to persuade white Americans, the implied hearers are segregationist, or at least whites who allow segregation or ignore its evils. At the same time, the audience consists of free Americans who believe in liberty, and who are either Christians themselves or influenced by Christian ideals such as brotherly love.

These “ideas held in common” are important both for King and the audience (the nation). In his speech, King reveals that America is not living up to these common ideals. He also redefines these and cleverly describes what they should actually look like in American society. King is perhaps less explicit than Apess in his description and condemnation of racial discrimination. He seems less concerned with describing the problem and more focused on the alternative—making the speech very hopeful as a whole and quite different from the first part of “Looking-Glass.” However, the similarities can be highlighted by pinpointing King’s use of the four values that I identified in Apess’s “white” rhetoric: love, unity, liberty, and equality. King implicitly points to hypocrisy in that he appeals to the audience with the ideas that they claim to live by. As Apess did, King has a firm belief that racism is in conflict with these Christian and American values. The hopefulness of the speech shows that he has faith

in his audience and their ability to change (perhaps more than Apress) and therefore the focus is on what these values should look like in America's future.

The phrase "I have a dream," used as anaphora (with nine repetitions), has become interchangeable with the speech as a whole. Although this phrase was likely not initially part of his written speech (Sundquist 1), it serves as an appropriate and comprehensive title. To portray the struggle for equality as a dream, and more specifically a collective American dream, highlights King's attempt to unify the American nation. The purification and reinvention of *true* American values is a collective hope and effort, "deeply rooted in the American Dream" (1397). The speech functions as a call to the fulfillment of the dream, which—as long as racism exists—is unfulfilled for all Americans. King's "I have a dream" anaphora, and its emphasis on desegregation as a collective and achievable dream is consistent with the speech's unifying rhetoric.

King's resistance is against Jim Crow society and post-slavery institutionalized racism. His appeal to white supremacists, as a speaker who is "not supposed to speak," makes use of the positive aspects of this society. Given the extent of institutionalized racism, it may seem difficult to pinpoint such aspects, but King's points to good reasons why racial equality should be seen as inherently American. This view contrasts with the rhetoric of black nationalism:

In general, this rhetoric is informed by a conviction that the dominant white culture of the United States is fundamentally corrupt and that integration into such a culture would be dangerous and self-defeating, even if it were possible ... It does not ask whites to change, but rather, assuming that white attitudes toward blacks will remain unchanged, it demands that black reassess their relationship to whites and to white culture. ("African American Rhetoric" 14)

King's different approach shows his similarities with Apress, who, despite his potentially condemnatory words, seems to believe in the goodness of white Americans and their ability to change for the better. When the rhetoric of "I Have a Dream" is contrasted with black nationalism, the hopefulness of King's resistance shows that it is expectant of a future where there is peace among blacks and whites. Moreover, integration into the dominant white culture is not necessarily bad, as long as the dominant culture is reformed or purified and becomes what it claims to be.

3.3 “All of God’s Children”: King’s Anti-Racism Theology

In comparison with “Looking-Glass,” King’s speech may appear secular, and not necessarily to be conveying a religious argument. But King’s Christian faith and his minister background is not only manifested in his style; it is also the basis for his opposition to racism. King had already established his view of segregation as both un-American and un-Christian (Sundquist 77). The first part of “I Have a Dream” stresses the American aspect of King’s argument, but he gradually introduces religious language, starting with “the solid rock of brotherhood” (1396). In “Looking-Glass,” Apess challenges his readers to prove that the words of the Bible are incompatible with their racist views and actions, and King is equally confident that both black and white Americans are God’s children. The main thread running through King’s argument is that in true Christian brotherhood there is no racism and no segregation. Sundquist points out that biblical language was familiar to the audience, and describes well the normality of Christianity in King’s day,

when school prayer had not yet been declared unconstitutional, when the words “under God” had just been added to the Pledge of Allegiance in 1954, when two years later Congress would make “In God We Trust” the national motto, and when it was in no way curious, but perfectly normal, for the narrator of *The Great Emancipation March on Washington*, one of the recordings released immediately after the event, to say: “Perhaps not since men turned their ears to the preachings of a mere carpenter, two thousand years ago, have the words of humble men reached so many with such force and meaning.” (Sundquist 107-8, incl. quote from Ralph Cooper)

This highlights the importance of the religious aspect of King’s persuasion in “I Have a Dream,” and why his logos assumes biblical knowledge. American society was still predominantly Christian, and racist practices, including segregation, were still—as in Apess’s nineteenth-century New England—often supported by religious arguments. In 1958, a trial judge found an interracial couple guilty of “miscegenation” and stated: “Almighty God created the races white, black, yellow, malay, and red, and he placed them on separate continents ... [showing] that he did not intend for the races to mix” (qtd. in Sundquist 82). The statement is an illustrative example of religion’s role in American society’s racial tension—even in the administration of justice—and shows the significance of King’s Christian figures of speech and biblical allusions. Although conveyed less explicitly in “I

Have a Dream” than in Apess’s essay, King’s belief is essentially that this kind of religiously motivated racism is not justifiable. For a Christian, in other words, racism is hypocrisy.

But King’s speech was produced in a more secular context than Apess’s essay, which, in contrast, employs unambiguous Christian arguments from beginning to end. Well aware that his audience is not all Christian, King moderates his religious language, and the religious aspect of his argument is more implicit than the political aspect. Like Apess, he quotes and alludes to the Bible, but utilizes it in his argument in a way that includes non-Christian members of the audience. He limits his references to deity to the more universally applicable “God,” rather than using, for example, “Jesus Christ,” which Apess uses several times. But King was a minister and an experienced preacher, and those who were familiar with the sermon genre would recognize this. In contrast with Apess’s essay, “I Have a Dream” contains less explicit sermon-language, and has fewer similarities with the style of Edwards’s “Sinners.” However, it is worth adding that the implied speaker of “I Have a Dream” is no less concerned with “converting” his audience. Like many African Americans, and Apess, King believed that racism and segregation conflicted with the teachings of the Bible. As “I Have a Dream” seems to indicate, he is so convinced of this that he uses the Bible as means in his effort to persuade a whole nation.

There are some similarities in the way that Apess and King deal with the idea of unity and more specifically Christian unity. The segregationist argument that God created races to live on separate continents and never mix is fallacious according to both Apess and King. As discussed in the previous chapter, Apess argues for the equality of all races by alluding to the biblical account of creation among other things. His assessment is that, since God has created all races, they should all be seen as equal. In his speech, King assumes this belief implicitly in the phrase “all of God’s children” (1397) —a phrase that presupposes that blacks are indeed the children of God. The phrase could be an allusion to the idea that through faith, all of humanity can become children of God, as in the words of St. Paul in the letter to the Galatians in the New Testament: “For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3.26). In the very same chapter, St. Paul writes: “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male or female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3.28), which King seems to allude to in his concluding words: “all of God’s children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics” (1398). By using similar words to those that Apess quotes from St. Paul’s letter to the Colossians, King reminds his Christian audience that God has united all races, nations and denominations. Keith D. Miller points out that “[m]any of those who heard ‘I Have a Dream’ had read the

Bible repeatedly and carefully” (409), and those who had read carefully the words of St. Paul might have recalled that he declared that the bond-free dichotomy did no longer apply. King also alludes to this unity with phrases such as “white brothers” (1396) and indicates that the only rightful relation between races is “brotherhood” (1396).

King’s use of the idea of the children of God does not only allude to the New Testament, but also to “the children of Israel” in Old Testament Exodus (Sundquist 108). This “built on a dominant analogy of colonial American life. Inscribed within a narrative of biblical redemption, the nation sprang from a deep identification with the Israelite experience—the belief that Americans, having fled religious persecution, were to liberate the world in fulfillment of scripture” (Sundquist 110). In other words, (white) America’s perception of itself as formerly persecuted but special was closely tied with the biblical idea of being God’s chosen people. This perception, which Apess also attempted to resist through a reversal of roles, King and other African Americans used to expose the wickedness of white supremacists. “African American abolitionist and postbellum orators frequently paralleled American slaves to Hebrews in Egypt. Phillips Brooks and other white abolitionists occasionally did so as well” (Miller 407). The audience would be familiar with Egyptian slavery and the unjust oppression of “God’s people.” The exodus analogy also functions to affirm and unite African Americans. “Within the African American tradition, the children of God were specifically something other, something greater than the white man had tried to make them” (Sundquist 109). The comparison with Old Testament Israel is an important and complex rhetorical strategy in King’s speech. In addition to the slavery in Egypt, there are also allusions to the Israelite exile in Babylon. The African American is, as King portrays it, “an exile in his own land” (1395)—emphasizing simultaneously that blacks belong in the land and that they are the undeservingly oppressed minority.

King continues his unifying rhetoric. His quotation of Old Testament prophet Isaiah elaborates and strengthens his purified narrative by maintaining that the end of racism is God’s will, and metaphorically, the end of exile and oppression, the “promised land” for American society: “I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, and every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight. And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together” (1397). King alludes to the end of the exile in Babylon, focusing not only on the state of being a slave or exile but on the promise of the return to the “promised land” and freedom. King’s hope in the future is highlighted; the passage “[i]s written in a celebratory voice, as though Babylonian captivity has already occurred and is coming to an end”

(Sundquist 131-32). Here King goes further than Apress in his use of Old Testament rhetoric. Apress reverses the idea of God's people to represent Native Americans, while King includes African Americans and then the whole nation in this analogy. His use of the Negro spiritual "Free at Last" at the end of his speech not only alludes once again to the exodus, but could also function to highlight that white and black Christians have their faith in common, and that they all desire the freedom that makes them brothers and sisters: "little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers" (1397).

Apress devotes much of his essay to arguing that love should be a priority among Christians, and stresses that Native Americans (and all people of color) should be included and loved according to biblical commands. King's strategy is to speak in a way that takes for granted that its Christian audience share this belief. He emphasizes this by portraying segregation and racism as evil injustices, which are in conflict with the type of love that biblical commands demand of "God's people." Undoubtedly seeking to stir pathos in the audience, King lists a number of injustices that will not be tolerated and concludes that "we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like waters, and righteousness like a mighty stream" (1396). The latter part is a quotation of Old Testament prophet Amos. King had previously stated that "[t]his passage might be called the key passage of the entire book. It reveals the deep ethical nature of God. God is a God that demands justice rather than sacrifice; righteousness rather than ritual" (qtd. in Sundquist 138). In other words, true Jewish and Christian love is manifested through color blind justice and the equal treatment of all races. The radicalness of King's message reveals the hypocrisy of those who defend their racist views. And the radicalness is emphasized even further by King's non-violence attitude, that is reiterated in the speech. As already discussed, he stresses the importance of non-violence and the absence of hate. He does not spend time arguing for the importance of love, but takes this aspect even further and implies that not only should whites begin to love blacks, but African Americans love their white brothers, who may have persecuted them in the past. King makes use of the "doctrine of *agape*—the selfless capacity to love the person who does an evil deed while hating the deed" (Sundquist 117).

Sundquist's description of King's radical selflessness, as quoted above, is in line with the rhetoric of love: "Rather than white blood, black blood was to be shed—not submissively, not uselessly, but in order to break the white man's spirit, disgrace him before God, and lead him to salvation" (122). It is worth mentioning that King's ethos as a preacher was strengthened by his lifestyle, his dedication and willingness to die for the cause. However,

regardless of King's text-eternal influence, his Christian argument is persuasive in itself. The speaker is familiar with the audience's relationship with Christian values. Logos and ethos are strong because of the speaker's knowledgeable, confident, and consistent rhetoric about Christianity's incompatibility with racism, and pathos is stirred through poetic Bible quotations and allusions, including the powerful exodus and exile analogies.

3.4 The Promissory Note: Demanding the Freedom that Was Promised

Although "I Have a Dream" resembles a sermon and advances a theological argument, it is essentially a political speech. As is the case with Apeess, King sees racism as hypocritical not only for Christians, but for Americans in general. Although segregation and discrimination are a continuation of slavery and the binary thinking of colonialism, they do not correspond with America's fundamental values. King challenges the narrative of progress, and he wants the liberty and equality that Americans pride themselves on purified so that they apply to black Americans as well as whites. In the first sentence of his speech, he implies ownership and establishes that the nation is "our nation" (1395). In other words, King is not addressing a nation that he is not part of. He implicitly states that he—as well as all other African Americans—are equal members of the nation, thereby making an important contribution to his ethos as a contrast to the speechlessness that some whites might expect.

King repeatedly alludes to slavery. He relies on the thirteenth amendment and takes advantage of the claim that American society only consist of free people. At the beginning of the speech, he states that "the Negro still is not free," implying that American society is hypocritical in regard to its laws. The slavery imagery continues throughout the speech, and is paired with allusions to and descriptions of the current suffering of the African Americans, creating a combination of logos and pathos. Following the question "When will you be satisfied?" (1396) King answers, with several anaphoric sentences starting with, "We can never be satisfied as long as ..." (1396). King describes the suffering of the African Americans in the 1960s, and then changes his tone into a hopeful one. In the poem-like "I have a dream" anaphora, King quotes the Declaration of Independence to stress that its "true meaning" is lived out only if the nation acknowledges that "all men" who are "created equal" includes all races (1397).

King argues that the true meaning of the Declaration of Independence is not fulfilled until African Americans are treated as equal to white Americans. As a contrast to Apeess's

more implicit use of the language of the Declaration of Independence, King explicitly states that in writing the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence the “architects of our republic” (1395) were essentially promising freedom to all Americans, including African Americans. Using an economic metaphor, he argues that “they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir” (1395). According to Sundquist, “the overdue bill” was “the most common figure of speech” in King’s day, and was frequently used in aggressive ways (70). But King soberly explains *why* there is a “check” that needs to be cashed in, and in a hopeful and optimistic tone he elaborates the metaphor and declares that “we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation” (1395). Although the language is different, here King makes use of a similar approach as Apess does in portraying racism and the imbalance in society as hypocritical and as un-American. Speaking “within the bounds of a dominant discourse” (Moon 52), King uses the metaphor to argue for the inevitability of freedom and justice for all Americans. Rather than criticizing the ideas of the Founding Fathers, King praises the proper and good kinds of liberty and equality. Even though he does not go into detail in criticizing the wrongful ways in which these have been interpreted by whites throughout American history, his criticism is aimed at the nation’s failure to maintain them and more specifically the long tradition of reserving them only for white Americans. King’s promissory note and check metaphors function to purify the idea of freedom, and portray it as unfulfilled until African Americans are included.

In the tradition of the jeremiad, King stresses that “[i]t would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment” (1396), and not to do what is required to change the undesirable status quo that he describes. Not only will African Americans continue to suffer, but “there will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice emerges” (1396). In contrast to the classic jeremiad, however, which “prophesies dire consequences for the community” (Bizzell 36), King does not dwell long on the potential misfortunes that will occur if racism continues, but focuses on the bright future that can be realized if the nation is willing to change. In other words, he moves quickly to the jeremiad’s final structural component: prophecy of future happiness.

In King’s view, America has not yet become a democracy, and declares that “[n]ow is the time to make real the promises of democracy” (1396). The promise of liberty has not been fulfilled. At the March on Washington, King was standing in Abraham Lincoln’s “symbolic shadow” (1395). The Emancipation Proclamation explicitly stated that the freedom given to

African American's would be maintained: "I order that all persons held as slaves ... are, and henceforward shall be free; and that the Executive government of the United States ... will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons." King describes it as a "joyous daybreak" (1395) that promises freedom, which entails equality. In the tradition of African American rhetoric, King celebrates Lincoln's words, while protesting status quo. Freedom from slavery is not sufficient. King helps reveal to his fellow Americans that an African American who is truly free is treated equally and has all the same rights as a white American.

King's allusions to slavery illuminate the restrictions of Jim Crow and add pathos. The current situation indicates that most whites are either not aware of or not concerned about the suffering taking place among African Americans. The slavery allusions should remind the audience of the horrific suffering of the slaves, the other oppressed "nation" that Apress includes in his vivid description of racial injustice: Whites were guilty of robbing them "to till their grounds, and welter out their days under the lash with hunger and fatigue under the scorching rays of a burning sun ..." (157). If the audience agreed with King that the Emancipation Proclamation and Abolition "came as a joyous daybreak" (1395) and saw it as a proud part of American history, King's slavery allusions would undoubtedly have a moving effect.

King's use of America's foundational values is in contrast with that of more aggressive activists, such as Elijah Muhammad and Malcolm X. They "dismissed the Founding Fathers as corrupt or mendacious" (Sundquist 73). But whether King disagreed with some of the Founding Fathers is not necessarily relevant. His aim seems to be to make use of commonplaces that were already unifying factors in American society, as long as these did not seem to reinforce the imbalance that he wanted to put an end to. His argument is anti-essentialist; he desires to move away from division of any kind. As already discussed, his radicalness goes even further. King, as a private citizen *and* as the implied author of "I Have a Dream," is willing to forgive white oppressors and move on as long as equal rights are put into practice. This is linked to his non-violence approach, based on the Christian idea of forgiveness combined with Gandhi's protest method. King refused to do what the white oppressors had done for decades, and sought to prevent a vicious cycle of violence and hatred with the firm belief that violence could not be fought with violence. Sundquist points to the inspiration behind King's commitment to "soul force" in the form of civil disobedience and discipline rather than physical force. This includes the civil disobedience of Gandhi and Henry David Thoreau, as well as Josiah Royce's idea of a "beloved community," and their non-violence and discipline (116-19). Gandhi was already an inspiration among African

Americans, but King's Gandhian approach contrasted not only with the approach of the Black Power movement, but also with the ideas of Franz Fanon (Sundquist 120). This aspect of King's rhetoric and philosophy strengthened his already powerful political message, and it highlights his way of participating in and impacting the dominant discourse.

As already mentioned, King's rhetoric and resistance contrasts with other resistance movements: King refused to adopt the victim mentality that perhaps had led white America—a formerly persecuted nation—to oppress its “colored” citizens. He shares this characteristic with the Apees of “An Indian's Looking-Glass for the White Man,” who, although less explicitly, also expressed a desire to embrace his “white brother.” King explicitly states a longing for the day when Americans would be judged “not by the color of skin but content of character” (1397).

* * *

According to the rhetoric of “I Have a Dream,” there is no doubt that white supremacists can be seen as the problem and therefore the solution depends on whites. But King's radical message about reconciliation and non-violence also puts some responsibility on African Americans. Part of the solution is their willingness to forgive and move on. They can point to decades of American history to argue why they have countless reasons to “drink from the cup of bitterness and hatred” (1396), but King explicitly urges them not to. He implies that for “little black boys and little black girls” to “join hands with little white boys and little white girls” (1397), both blacks and whites need to be willing to take each other's hand. Sundquist argues, that “[i]t is unlikely that King converted any ardent segregationists, but he very likely touched the hearts and minds ready to be touched” (57). The movement and the moment that the speech was part of gave King's message momentum. His argument also seems flawless and his rhetoric manages to combine resistance with unity.

4 Conclusion

This thesis has focused on the usefulness of dominant discourse in persuasion and the compelling and intelligent ways in which two texts “[resist] the hegemony of such a discourse while still writing [or speaking] within it” (Moon 52). Both authors make use of the positive aspects of this discourse, such as freedom and equality, in order to resist the negative aspects, such as the idea of Manifest Destiny. More specifically, my aim has been to show the similarities between the two texts, in order to elevate “An Indian’s Looking-Glass for the White Man” and to show its persuasiveness and overlooked potential.

As I have shown throughout this thesis, the two texts have many similarities. They both utilize “white” rhetoric, that is Christian and American commonplaces, in order to confront racism and in the hope to have an impact on status quo. The problems that are addressed are similar, and have the same root: the idea that the white American is somehow superior to other races. The implied authors of the texts are also similar, in that they are both members of racial minorities, and they are both nevertheless confident in their confrontation with the white majority. They both embrace their “double consciousness.” The implied audiences of the texts are clearly similar. As I have discussed, some of the rhetorical strategies are also similar. Perhaps the most important difference is the progress that has taken place between 1833 and 1963.

The comparison between the two texts may in some ways seem to indicate that William Apess goes too far in his employment of “white” rhetoric, that is in his aggression and hostility; that he condemns his audience in a manner that is off-putting and that the essay is not persuasive. As I argued in the first chapter, Apess makes use of the positive aspects of the dominant discourse in order to purify it and compel his readers to change their behavior—while seemingly having genuine belief in the Christian and American ideals himself. To an extent, he seems to lack an aspect of expressed faith in his white readers. Despite his mild conclusion and hopeful ending, the quantity of explicit confrontational utterances is significantly larger than the seemingly hopeful utterances that express faith in his readers. This becomes particularly visible in light of my discussion of Martin Luther King’s speech. King’s firm belief in and commitment to brotherhood, nonviolence, forgiveness and unity, seems to make his words more appealing—and perhaps especially to a white audience. White supremacists, the “vicious racists,” are given a second chance. King confronts his enemy with the same loathing of racism as Apess, but more than Apess he pairs it with the indication that

his enemies are inherently good and potentially able to love their black brothers and sisters. His explicit call to nonviolence and denunciation of hatred highlights his belief in a better future.

As I have indicated in the chapter titles, Apess's underlying metaphor of the "looking-glass" and King's "I have a dream" anaphora can hint at characteristics of the two texts and some of their differing rhetorical strategies. The title of Apess's essay indicates a certain aim. The looking-glass does not appear in the essay itself, but as I have discussed in my analysis, does point up the overall function of the essay. Apess's essay is a mirror for the white reader, as if he is revealing the racism and the hypocrisy of the white readers in order to urge them to change. King, on the other hand, approaches the desired change as something that should be America's collective dream, and that all Americans can make happen together. I have therefore indicated that the two authors employ "white" rhetoric and unifying rhetoric respectively.

Apess has sometimes been dismissed as a "Christianized Indian" (O'Connell, "Introduction" lv). But my argument in the first chapter insisted that Apess's text is a genuine resistance against racism and that it imagines a better future. In other words, Apess's confrontation with white readers seeks to persuade them to change their behavior rather than simply to condemn them. However, some factors suggest that Apess's essay might have been either too radical or too hostile for his own day. In addition to the predominantly confrontational rhetoric of the essay itself, these include lack of evidence of any initial impact and the fact that Apess replaced the essay in a later publication. Lastly, the comparison with the both the rhetoric and reception of King's speech highlights the limitations of "Looking-Glass." My analysis of "I Have a Dream" shows the persuasive potential of a text that is predominantly diplomatic and unifying. It is unambiguous in its resistance to and condemnation of racism, but King seems to assume the role of a mediator and a peacemaker with a solution, rather than solely that of the critic.

Apess's removal of "Looking-Glass" from his publication might indicate that he was aware of its lack of impact. As I have indicated in my analysis of the essay, this does not necessarily make the text less persuasive, but it may show that his argument was indeed ahead of its time. The essay does, however, seem to resonate with readers today, because Apess argues by making use of principles and shared values that nineteenth-century white Americans claimed to live by. I have argued that "Looking-Glass" is not as hostile as some scholars have claimed. Although certain factors indicate that it is condemnatory, condemnation is not the aim. My analysis of the essay has shown that the implied author

intends to persuade the white reader and expresses hope and optimism. And the essay does often appeal to the white man's ego. The last two paragraphs of the essay express confidence in the readers and a hope in future peace and equality in America.

Nevertheless, in comparison with "I Have a Dream," the tone of Apess's essay is not as unifying. His later version, "An Indian's Thought," does perhaps imply a move in such a direction, but although its tone seeks to be less confrontational, it appears to be more passive rather than more unifying. Apess, who writes in the antebellum context and more than a century before the March on Washington, naturally has a more difficult starting point. O'Connell points out the radicalness of the essay: "Apess's near complete absence from written histories and from American literature invites many explanations. A voice such as his would have been intolerable to all but a few in a culture just beginning its formative imperial adventures" ("Introduction" lxxv-lxxvi).

The abolition of slavery took place after the publication of Apess's essay and before the delivery of King's speech. This gives us important indications of the extensive challenges that Apess faces. The "dream" approach and the "looking-glass" approach respectively do not simply indicate a difference in chosen strategy. They also seem to be determined by context. King can rely on the Emancipation Proclamation and the fact that the United States has already officially rejected slavery. His expressed dedication to unity and interracial brotherhood relies on decades of struggle and resistance. Therefore, King does not (and does not need to) spend as much time arguing for the equality of the races. Some of King's audience could be said to be in need of the same convincing as Apess's audience, but the nation as a whole has developed since Apess's day. The backdrop of King's speech is the assumption that slavery and racism are evils, and that the contemporary problems it addresses are continuations of these. American society had already started its journey away from racism. This development had not been flawless, but more white Americans acknowledged the humanity of other races than in Apess's day. African American rhetoric had already mixed with the "discourse of the West" to a large extent; and although King is also in many ways fighting speechlessness, the context does allow him to speak to the whole nation.

Apess's essay works to deconstruct and point out the absurdity of the color signifier. His readers need to be convinced of the basic idea that skin color does not determine value. As one of very few Native American activists at the time, he is resisting "the ideological history that has shaped 'America' as a virgin land settled by God's chosen people, mostly Anglo-Americans, who settled ... in the name of freedom and opportunity" (O'Connell, "Introduction" xvii). Apess does not address unity to the same extent as King. This is a

significant aspect of his more “white” or “assimilated” rhetoric. The antebellum context seems to demand a strategy of this kind. “White” rhetoric dominated in society to a larger degree than in the 1960s, and national unity was a concept that was probably less easily imaginable for Apess than for King. White Americans were not used to hearing members of minorities speak on their own behalf. It would be crucial for Apess to “write white” in order to be heard and to implicitly convince his readers that he is capable of anything that a white man is capable of. The “looking-glass” seems to be an appropriate metaphor: The white man needed to see his own reflection in the “mirror” in order to be made aware of the wrongness of his attitude. The nineteenth-century white majority that Apess addresses had not yet legally accepted other races as equal. With this in mind, Apess’s “rhetorical mirror” becomes less hostile, and seems appropriate for an audience that would not be broadly ready to imagine a collective and interracial “dream” for another 130 years.

In addition to the general progress since Apess’s day, King’s advantages include the movement that he is part of—perhaps his most important momentum. He also relies on the African American rhetorical tradition, and the impact of the speech was amplified through modern broadcasting. Although I have tried to treat the speech as a text and analyze it in the same basic way as Apess’s essay, the knowledge that King improvised the last part of the speech (Sundquist 1) is significant. This improvisation may be compared to Apess’s decision to replace his essay with another text. The important difference is of course that King, with the advantage of having much of his audience physically in front of him, was able to carry out this alteration in the moment, rather than years later. This would undoubtedly affect the persuasiveness and the power of his words as he was able to get a direct impression of his audience and their reactions. In contrast, Apess, who perhaps did not deliver his text orally at all or to such a large number of white people, could only imagine his readers’ reactions.

The aim of this thesis has not been to give exhaustive analyses of either text or to suggest that my comparison reveals all their rhetorical differences and similarities. But my analysis and comparison have emphasized that both texts are persuasive. As said above, my intent was particularly to highlight the persuasiveness of “An Indian’s Looking-Glass for the White Man,” and the comparison with “I Have a Dream” has proven productive. Ethos is present in King’s informed, poetic and eloquent words, and Apess’s ethos is strengthened by his deep biblical knowledge and his “educated” language.

As shown in the two main chapters, both texts advance an anti-racist argument that seems flawless in terms of logos, and that is cleverly consistent with what the implied (white) audience would claim to believe. King shows that the “free” African American is not really

free. Apess's essay consists of arguments based on the Bible, as well as America's central values and also seems to appeal to "common sense"—for example in its use of the comparison between the quantity of "colored people" and whites. King's powerful imagery, including the allusions to slavery and the exodus, contributes to pathos. Apess's detailed descriptions of Native American (and African American) suffering and his multiple Bible quotations stir pathos, including the perhaps most important "spiritual emotions."

Regarding the federal Civil Rights legislation in 1964, Nina Baym and Robert S. Levine suggest that "the presence of such great number of Americans at Dr. King's 1963 speech, Americans of all races and political persuasions, was vivid proof that the time for such change was at hand" (1393). King seems to have had a kind of *kairos*. As Toye claims: "Without what the Greeks called *kairos*—the opportune moment—even the most technically brilliant speech will fall flat" (33). King's speech was delivered at the right moment, once again highlighting that Apess was indeed ahead of his time. What Apess is lacking is perhaps a significant rhetorical *kairos* or timeliness, including some kind of momentum, which is particularly obvious when the essay is compared with "I Have a Dream" in context. Both Apess and King were radical voices in their contexts. Apess, who writes almost a century and a half before King gave his speech, seems to have been too radical to have the same impact. The nature of pioneer work is that it is new and challenging. It is about paving a way that has not been paved before, and therefore especially difficult. I have already indicated some reasons why King's speech had more immediate impact and is better known than Apess's essay. One important factor is television; the message could be delivered to the whole nation and even other parts of the world. As King himself said: "Without the presence of the press ... there might have been [an] untold massacre in the South" (qtd. in Sundquist 38). The comparison with Apess's limited resources and media highlights further his difficulties in trying to end an *actual* "untold massacre"; the brutal removal of Native Americans.

As both the analysis of "Looking-Glass" and the comparison with "I Have a Dream" show, Apess is doing something right. Apess did have *some* success in his resistance, e.g. in his engagement for the Mashpee community (Gustafson). Krupat suggests that Apess influenced Henry David Thoreau in some ways (84, 88). Cheryl Walker suggests that Native American speeches were "delivered in many cities throughout the United States, were attended by large crowds and were subsequently both printed and reviewed in newspapers and journals, as examples of Indian oratory" (7). Although little is known about the immediate impact of "Looking-Glass," it can be seen as a contribution to resistance against racism, and therefore Apess participated in paving the way both for later Native American

activists and for activists such as Martin Luther King. The importance of Apess's refusal to remain silent on the issue should not be underestimated. His text is in itself resistance against speechlessness and Apess participates in a literary tradition that was dominated by whites. Walker raises concerns about the tendency to assume that Native American voices have not participated in the shaping of American subjectivity. "Native Americans also participated in this cultural process, sometimes in order to distinguish themselves from the invaders but sometimes in the interest of revising notions of America to include the tribes themselves. Thus, America in the nineteenth century was intercultural in significant ways" (Walker 7). The incorrect assumptions about Native American absence in cultural definition were not only made "in the nineteenth-century essentialism that demonized Native Americans as savages but also in more recent assumptions that Indians took no part in the discussions of national identity" (7). Apess was likely one of the earliest Native American participants in these written discussions.

The comparison with "I Have a Dream" has shown that much of the speech's success might be attributed to contextual advantages. It does not seem to indicate that "I Have a Dream" is any less persuasive, but rather functions to highlight the persuasiveness of "An Indian's Looking-Glass for the White Man." Apess and his writings are already being given more attention than a few years ago. But as Randall Moon argues, "it is remarkable" that Apess's work "is not better known" (45). In order to "acknowledge forgotten histories" (Gustafson 34), Apess's texts could be given more attention. The results might be significant. As my reading of "Looking-Glass" hopefully indicates, more research on Apess and his resistance writing will show not only the potential that these texts might have had, but also reveal more of Native American participation in the shaping of American discourse. All voices that have tried to resist racism are important, and texts that do not at first glance seem to have had an impact, did not necessarily fail in their contribution to the conversation.

Works Cited

- “African American Rhetoric.” *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. Vol. 1. Ed. Thomas O. Sloane. Oxford and New York: OUP, 2001. 4-18. Print.
- Apess, William. “A Son of the Forest.” *On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess, a Pequot*. Ed. with an intro. by Barry O’Connell. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1992. 3-97. Print.
- ___. “An Indian’s Looking-Glass for the White Man.” *On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess, a Pequot*. Ed. with an intro. by Barry O’Connell. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1992. 155-61. Print.
- Baym, Nina and Robert S. Levine, eds. “American Literature 1820-1865: Introduction.” *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. Shorter Eight Edition. Vol. 1. New York: W.W. Norton, 2013. 445-66. Print.
- ___. “Martin Luther King Jr.” *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. Shorter Eight Edition. Vol. 2. New York: W.W. Norton, 2013. 1393-95. Print.
- ___. “William Apess.” *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. Shorter Eight Edition. Vol. 1. New York: W.W. Norton, 2013. 498-99. Print.
- Bergland, Renée L. *The National Uncanny: Indian Ghosts and American Subjects*. Hanover and London: UP of New England, 2000. Print.
- The Holy Bible*. King James Version. Print.
- Bizzell, Patricia. “(Native) American Jeremiad: The ‘Mixedblood’ Rhetoric of William Apess.” *American Indian Rhetorics of Survivance*. Ed. Ernest Stromberg. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2011. Print.
- Blum, Edward and Paul Harvey. “From Light to White: The Place and Race of Jesus in Antebellum America.” *Historically Speaking* 13 (2012): 13-15. Print.
- Burton, Gideon O. “Silvia Rhetoricae: The Forest of Rhetoric.” Brigham Young U. <http://rhetoric.byu.edu>. Web.
- Cady, Edwin H. “The Artistry of Jonathan Edwards.” *The New England Quarterly* 22 (1949): 61-72. Print.
- “Declaration of Independence: A Transcription.” 4 July 1776. <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript>. Web.
- “Emancipation Proclamation.” 1863. <http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=34&page=transcript>. Web.

- Gallagher, Edward J. "The Rhetorical Strategy of William Apess's 'An Indian's Looking-Glass for the White Man.'" <http://www.lehigh.edu/~ejg1/Apess/Gallagher-ApessRhetStrat.html>. Web.
- Gustafson, Sandra. "Nation of Israelites: Prophecy and Cultural Autonomy in the Writings of William Apess." *Religion and Literature* 26 (1994): 31-54. Print.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. "I Have a Dream." *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. Ed. Baym, Nina, and Robert S. Levine. Shorter Eighth Edition. New York: W.W. Norton, 2013. 1395-98. Print.
- Konkle, Maureen. *Writing Indian Nations*. Chapel Hill and London: U of North Carolina P, 2004. Print.
- Krupat, Arnold. *All That Remains: Varieties of Indigenous Expression*. Lincoln, NE: U of Nebraska P, 2009. Print.
- Leith, Sam. *You Talkin' To Me? Rhetoric from Aristotle to Obama*. London: Profile, 2011. Print.
- Miller, Keith D. "Second Isaiah Lands in Washington, DC: Martin Luther King, Jr.'s 'I Have a Dream' as Biblical Narrative and Biblical Hermeneutic." *Rhetoric Review* 26 (2007): 405-24. Print.
- Miller, Keith D. and Elizabeth Vander Lei, "Martin Luther King Jr.'s 'I Have a Dream' in Context: Ceremonial Protest and African American Jeremiad." *College English* 62 (1999): 83-99. Print.
- Moon, Randall. "William Apess and Writing White." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 5 (1993): 45-54. Print.
- Murray, David. *Forked Tongues: Speech, Writing and Representation in North American Indian Texts*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1991. Print.
- O'Connell, Barry. "Introduction." *On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess, a Pequot*. By William Apess. Ed. with an intro. by Barry O'Connell. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1992. xiii-lxxvii. Print.
- O'Connell, Barry, ed. *On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess, a Pequot*. By William Apess. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1992. Print.
- Sundquist, Eric J. *King's Dream*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2009. Print.
- Toye, Richard. *Rhetoric: A Very Short Introduction*. Hampshire: OUP, 2013. Print.
- Walker, Cheryl. *Indian Nation: Native American Literature and Nineteenth-Century Nationalisms*. Durham and London: Duke UP, 1997. Print.

