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“There are whiles, said he, ye are altogether too canny and Whiggish to be company to a gentleman like me, but there come other whiles when ye show yoursel’ a mettle spark; and it is then, David, that I love ye like a brother (Stevenson, 174).”

In a time of great division between different racial groups, there are few examples of reconciliation. The long history of Cherokee and Scottish interaction has never been, and probably will never be, perfect—bearing scars suggesting eternal separation. Yet, miraculously and almost unexplainably, their shared history is marked by tattoos of forgiveness and unity.

How can one explain these strange relationships existing between the Cherokees and the Scottish Highlanders for over 300 years? Both groups of people were driven from their homelands. They share values about homeland and clan ancestry, but they differ in religious beliefs and approaches to learning. They clashed in military conflicts, spilling their blood over every path in Alabama, the Carolinas, and Georgia. Yet, their blood is also mingled in thousands of people in the
Southern states and Oklahoma. Their interconnections can be seen in Cherokee rolls in the form of Scottish surnames, offering evidence of centuries of inter-marriages, and somehow, despite the atrocities that both groups visited upon each other, some level of forgiveness and connection was forged between them. Still, though the two groups are to a large extent reconciled, it has been the Cherokees who have made the greater sacrifices for this relationship to exist. It has been assumed from the beginning that their traditional culture was inferior and that assimilation into high Western civilization was preferable. As will be demonstrated in this paper, any resistance to assimilation would be met with coercive governmental action.

The chief of the Cherokees during removal to Oklahoma beginning in 1831, John Ross, was in fact seven-eighths Scottish. While he was raised by his grandfather as a Scotsman and schooled as a European by clergymen, he was also influenced by a Cherokee mother who valued Cherokee ways. John Ross married a Cherokee woman, Quatie, who later died on the Trail of Tears, unlawfully planned and executed by a famous Scottish-American President of the United States, Andrew Jackson. This removal act initiated by Jackson resulted in an incalculable number of Cherokee deaths and in the herding of the majority of the Cherokee population from their historical lands in the Southeast to what is known now as Oklahoma (Woodward, 1988). Then, despite incurring this abomination, in 1849, Ross rallied his fellow Cherokees, who were themselves living in poverty, to raise $190 for the famine victims in the Scottish Highlands (Torotora, 2015). This act of Cherokee generosity and the on-going relationships between people of Cherokee and Scottish ancestry exists despite the efforts of Scottish people, and other White groups, to erase Cherokee cultural capital.

In an effort to understand the relationship between Cherokee and Scottish people, we will compare Robert Louis Stevenson’s book, *Kidnapped* (1926) and the traditional Cherokee story, *The Gambler* (Mooney, 1982), first in print in the late 19th century. Drawing from Object Relations Theory, we utilize the concept of resonance to compare the relationships and individual development of the main characters of the stories. The analysis makes recurrent allusions to relevant Cherokee and Scottish cultural and historical content. While many of the experiences described in the Scottish and Cherokee stories are shared and may be universal, others demonstrate differences among people living in distinct cultures. Ultimately, insights garnished from the analysis about appropriate teacher/student relational resonance are shared with readers. Additionally, potential discussion questions, as well as questions for research projects are shared for anyone who may want to teach these stories (see Appendix).
THE STRANGE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CHEROKEES
AND SOTTISH HIGHLANDERS

SIMILARITIES

There are abundant similarities between the Cherokee and Scottish Highlanders. They both have profound connections to their homelands, and for centuries they carefully monitored their lives according to the rhythms of nature and the seasons. Land was considered communal and not to be divided and sold (Bain, 1948, 224). Both groups labored extensively in agriculture. Scottish people primarily raised oats, barley, and wheat (Bain, 1948), while Cherokees focused mainly on maize (Woodward, 1988). It is this agricultural similarity that may have contributed to the early integration of Cherokees and Scottish people. Both Cherokee and Scottish peoples were known for their pottery making and their use of honey (Mooney, 1982, 37; Muir, 2007, p.172). They fought long and somewhat losing battles with the colonizing English. The Scottish Highlanders experienced clearances (evictions of Highlander tenants by the English government from 1750 to1860) (Bain, 1948), while the Western Cherokees experienced a forced 2200-mile march from their ancestral lands in the east to Oklahoma in 1838, known as the “Trail of Tears.” Both had strong oral traditions that allowed for the passing down of traditional stories as well as major events, preserving them for future generations (Bain, 1948, 276; Mooney, 1982, 12).

Women in both groups participated in counsels that settled disputes, though women in Scotland had lost this privilege before 1700 (Bain, 1948, 203), while Cherokee women continued to hold high positions well into colonization (Perdue, 1999, 12). Children in both groups were reared by the larger communities with less of a sole reliance on nuclear families than most of the European and Euro-American societies at the time. For instance, child rearing was more of the responsibility of the maternal clan consisting of mother, grandmother, relatives and especially aunts and uncles among the Cherokee (Woodward, 1988, 144), and Scottish people often had their infants reared by a family in another part of their clan, hoping to create deeper kinship bonds (Bain, 1948, 211). Both Cherokee and Scottish peoples also were renowned for their customs of feuds that resulted in ongoing bitter quarrels and bloody conflicts (Bain, 1948, 122; Woodward, 1988, 23). They had clan systems that allowed for both leadership from bloodlines and capability. Naming practices were similar. They were often given colorful names related to events, individual accomplishments,
significant objects, natural settings, or animals. For example, the Scottish Red Cloak, Dragging Canoe or Black Fox (George MacDonald Fraser) is comparable to Going Snake or Man Killer (Bain 1948, 234; Woodward, 1988, 56).

DIFFERENCES

By 1760, North Carolina was called Mac-ocracy due to the large numbers of Scottish people who lived there (Herman 2001, 231-232). Ironically, the Highlanders fought on the side of England against the continental soldiers during the Revolutionary War (Herman, 249). Today, there are probably more descendants of the Highland clans living in America than in Scotland. By 1777, every Cherokee town had been devastated (Tortora, 2015, 145). From that point on, just as the Scots had long engaged in husbandry in Scotland and then in Cherokee country, Cherokees raised hogs and poultry in the rural areas of Northeastern Oklahoma. Today, Cherokees in Oklahoma have community hog roasts every year, assimilating this new lifestyle into their own.

There were also increasing changes with Cherokee life due to economic interactions with Scottish traders. In the early 18th century, in what are now the Carolinas, Georgia, Kentucky, and Tennessee, most traders and British government agents interacting with the Cherokee people were Scottish, many specifically from the Highlands. Many Cherokee women married Scottish men and had children. The first recorded marriage between Cherokee and Scotsmen was Twister Clan member Elizabeth Tassel to trader Ludovic Grant, around 1726 (Yates, 2013, 211). Some companies encouraged these marriages due to the monetary benefit to the company (Van Kirk, 1999, 111), as Cherokee wives were interpreters during trade deliberations. Kinship ties were forged between Scotsmen and Cherokees. Nonetheless, the interactions were also fraught with injustices. Some of these Scottish men remained with their Cherokee wives through life and some abandoned their wives and children and went back to Scotland (Van Kirk, 1999). One scholar has estimated that in late eighteenth to early nineteenth-century Georgia, Cherokee women raised about four hundred mixed-blood offspring by themselves (King, 2013, 143). The Scottish traders who remained married to their Cherokee wives were known to show little attention to their children. The inattentiveness and irresponsibility of many Scottish men was offset by the fact that, traditionally, it was the uncles on the mother’s side that did most of the childrearing. Thus, their lack of attention insured that Cherokee mothers and uncles raised the half-Cherokee children with knowledges of cultural and tribal ways.
These bi-cultural “White-Indians” (as they were referred to) demonstrated a greater appreciation for White culture, economic interests, and Christianity. But they continued to view themselves as Cherokees, rather than as White, demonstrating a devotion to their traditional Cherokee lands and many traditional Cherokee ways. Many male children from these marriages became leaders in the tribe. While they became Christians, preaching and singing was conducted in the Cherokee language, and other ways of worship were also conducted according to Cherokee traditions (King, 2013, 132-145). Many of these Cherokee ways continue in Cherokee churches. And many Cherokees with Scottish heritage speak the Cherokee language and participate in traditional ceremonies. On the other hand, many of the Cherokee people donned the names of their Scottish fathers, such as Ross, Vann, and MacIntosh. To this day these names are common among Cherokees.

**CONFLICTS**

Cherokee and Scottish relations have been complicated from earliest contact, which have caused massive disruptions to traditional Cherokee life. Mooney (1982, 14-34) writes that by 1721, Cherokees seceded much land and were bounded in relegated areas by colonial government. A torrent of Scottish Highlanders came as refugees to Cherokee country in North Carolina in 1745 and created farms from the land of the pine forests. In 1784, most of the Cherokee land had been taken from the Cherokees and given to White settlers, primarily persons of Scottish and Irish decent, without Cherokee consent (McGrath, 2015, 143). While it has been said that the Scottish people were more courteous when encroaching on Cherokee land, the fact is that they too ultimately took possession of Cherokee lands, even if they tried to be polite about it. According to Mooney, every ford, path, trail, in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee were studded over with horrendous deaths because of Cherokee resistance. Every aspect of Cherokee life was impacted (Tortora, 2015).

The Scottish brought the Presbyterian Church, pragmatism, and a strong notion of individualism to America (Herman, 2001, 188-214). Scottish Presbyterian missionary pressures, combined with the perceived failures of Cherokee medicine people to curtail the devastating effects of the smallpox epidemic of 1739, was the beginning of the near annihilation of traditional ways (Strickland, 40). The Presbyterian Society in Scotland for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge (SSPCK), which had first focused its efforts on converting the “heathen” in the Scottish Highlands,
now funded efforts toward Indians in North America to bring reformed Christianity through establishing churches and European-based schools. Highlanders, in the British service, invaded Indian Country at places like Fort Duquesne in 1758 and the Cherokee Mountains in 1760 (Szaz, 2008). The first Cherokee convert to Christianity occurred in 1773 (Mooney, 46-58). In 1799, a mission was established by a Presbyterian minister at the residence of a mixed-Cherokee-Scottish chief named David Vann (Mooney, 46-58). Some Cherokee children began to attend European-based schools, including the mission school established by David Vann (Mooney, 65).

The first Cherokee Women’s Seminary, whose ruins are still in Tahlequah, Oklahoma, was established in 1875. Its expressed mission was to help Cherokee women students to adopt white society’s value system. Florence Wilson, of Scottish descent, was the first principal teacher at the Cherokee Female Seminary from 1875 to 1901. She created a curriculum based on the Western Classics and strictly enforced rigid rules to guide student behavior. She explicitly attempted to become a role model for acculturation of the Cherokee girls by emphasizing upper-class, non-Indian cultural values. With the adoption of court systems, there was a gradual abandonment of traditional blood revenge between clans (Perdue, 1999, 233-245).

OBJECT RELATIONS THEORY AND THE CONCEPT OF RESONANCE

Though the incidents in the stories The Gambler and Kidnapped are packed with far more potential than any one interpretative approach can yield, the fictive experiences and relationships of the main characters, Chooch and David Balfour, respectively, provide examples of contemporary psychological concepts of affective experiences best analyzed through the theoretical lens of Object Relations Theory. As do all psychological theories, Object Relations Theory has underlying assumptions derived from European and Euro-American epistemologies and ontologies; nonetheless, we feel it has no peer as far as complexity among psychological theories regarding relationships. (For more in-depth discussion in using Object Relations theory with Native American clients and in research with Native Americans, readers are referred to Comas-Diaz, 2011 and Tummala-Narra, 2015).

According to Object Relations theorists such as Winnicott (1957) and Kohut (1977), the foundation of Object Relational theory is that human beings are relational creatures, and healing and growth occurs only when a person first recognizes others as subjects. This stands in contrast with
colonizers’ disrespect for the distinct cultural identities of Native Americans. People move through a variety of stages in their relationships:

Trust and harmony
Recognition that others are separate and different
Staying in conflicts long enough to own responsibility in creating the conflicts
Achieving developmental transformation

Kernberg (1975) argues that in the early stages of our lives, we develop our egos through the organization of our perceptions, memories, and autonomous functioning. Differentiation and reorganization of our egos begins early in our lives as we meet strangers. The experiences we have with new people result in either defensive reactions that may block development or integration and possibly positive transformation into a new ego synthesis. For ego transformation to occur, the most common obstacles to overcome are guilt and mourning for abandoning one’s earlier ideals often associated with early caregivers and projecting of one’s own unresolved issues and flaws onto others.

In this paper, we refer to the growth-producing relationships of Chooch and David as resonances. Kernberg (1975) writes about what he calls the “valences” of different self/ideal tensions that arise as one engages in the process of early and later development. Cozolino (2006) uses the term resonance in human relationships, elaborating, “Resonance provides a visceral-emotional experience of what the other is experiencing, allowing us to know others from the “inside out” (17). Clawson and Newburg (1997) describe the potential outcome of working through the stages of resonance as “the experience of being in harmony with the situation and the events in which one is performing to such an extent that one is able to influence those events masterfully, with great psychological reward (65).” Growth-producing relationships can be developed through three different types of resonance:

Affinity—harmonious alignment
Contrast—acceptance of differences
Conflict—misalignments, which can either be worked through to harmony or resisted at the price of pre-mature closure.

It is through the lens of affinity, contrast, and conflict, that we examine The Gambler and Kidnapped.
THE TEXTS: ANALYZING THE MAIN CHARACTERS
THROUGH THE LENS OF RESONANCE

*The Gambler* and *Kidnapped* are not only representative of the Cherokee and Scottish peoples, but also share a similarity in genre, helping to steer clear of unreconcilable differences that arise from comparing “apples and oranges,” so to speak. Both texts might be characterized as folk tales or stories that originate in the culture of the common people and are passed down orally (Webster, 1991). Stevenson himself describes his story as a folk tale (Commins, 1947). Until well into the late 18th and early 19th centuries, both the Cherokee and Scottish cultures were primarily oral, and story tellers or orators held positions of great significance. Cherokees still regale folk tales at feasts and dance gatherings. Western and Highland Scotland are replete with folk legends. Several Scottish folk tales crossed to America with Scottish settlers and even today, the southern Appalachian frontier and the Ozarks abound with their folk tales. “The ballads, songs, folklore, and stories passed on to the children contain the distilled wisdom of their people” (Calloway, 2008, pp. 522-524).

*The Gambler*, a story typically told to Cherokee children, was obtained by James Mooney during an interview with a Cherokee elder and later published in *Myths of the Cherokees and Sacred Formulas of the Cherokees* in 1891 (Mooney, 1982). *Kidnapped*, first published in 1893, by the Scottish writer, Robert Louis Stevenson, is set in the summer of 1751. The following condensed versions of *Kidnapped* and *The Gambler* are provided for reader convenience:

**The Gambler: A Traditional Cherokee Story**

Long ago when the world was new, there lived a Cherokee boy, Chooch. When Chooch becomes a teenager, he goes in search of his father, Thunder, who lives in the Darkening West. After several days of travel, Chooch meets the Gambler, a shapeshifter, who presses him to relax from his journey to gamble with him. But Chooch, undeterred, continues toward his destination. The Gambler resorts to taunting but eventually offers directions to follow the river to find his father. Arriving at his father’s house, Chooch first meets his stepmother who tests the validity of Chooch’s claim to be Thunder’s son. Chooch passes arduous tests. Having gained trust in his claim, she warns that his father will match him in a fight for his life with his other three brothers. Chooch survives the battle and earns the new name, “Lightening.”

After the fight, Thunder directs Lightening to gamble with the Gambler, the stakes being his life. Lightening wins but the Gambler escapes. Chooch and his stepbrothers catch him, tie him
with vines onto a raft, and submerge him under water. To this day, the Gambler lies on his back looking up through the clear water, never dying until the end of the world. (Mooney, 1982, 311-314).

**Initial chapters of Kidnapped**

*Kidnapped* begins with David leaving his secure village to seek his own destiny. A kindly parson gives him a letter guiding him to an uncle who might provide him with means for a start in life. The environment becomes more and more unfriendly the farther he travels from home. An unpleasant old woman offers him the final directions to his Uncle Ebenezer. When he knocks on Uncle Ebenezer’s door, he intuitively feels that he is relating to someone he cannot wholly trust and that his uncle’s values may be divergent from his own. He considers that his uncle may want to take his possessions. He wonders if his uncle’s sense of loyalty may contrast from his own. Initially, David assumes that his uncle would feel an affinity with him because he is blood kin. In fact, he appears to have adopted an approach to life that is totally self-interested. Nonetheless, against David’s own intuitive awareness of his uncle’s corruptness, desperately desiring to trust him and to be about his life’s journey, he ignores clear signs of treachery and takes risks that put his life in peril. The reader cannot help but wonder why David continues so long in such an unrewarding relationship.

**THE RESONANCES OF CHOOCH AND DAVID**

Unlike David, Chooch is given a supportive “send off,” not by a male parson, but by his mother, who had, up to this point in his life, provided for his every need. Cherokee culture is matrilineal. It was described by early colonizers as “petticoat” because women had considerable input in all aspects of life, from business transactions to the actual declaring of war and fighting in battles (Strickland, 1982, 65). The two persons Chooch resonates with most profoundly in the story are female (his mother and his stepmother). Both women provide him with nurturance but also with concrete teachings and advice. On the other hand, the world described in *Kidnapped* is almost totally male dominated.

In their early youth, both Chooch and David may have been fortunate enough to have had a secure environment to develop some degree of ego strength to begin their life’s journeys with some confidence. Each is represented to be confident enough to know the positive benefits of having some doubts about people he will encounter. His distasteful early encounters with the old woman and
robbbers may have helped him suspect his uncle enough to avoid his death on the stairway. Chooch also intuitively distrusts the Gambler. But they have much to learn. David is not mature enough in his awareness to fully recognize his false resonance with Uncle Ebenezer. Superficially, he had to learn that blood relations cannot be equated with positive resonances of affinity. Chooch is dependent on his stepmother to guide him through his initial challenges.

Like our main characters, many of our students have difficulty discerning true and false resonances due to intense desires to connect with others. Readers may recognize other false affinities that David may have unconsciously entertained about Ebenezer. For instance, Ebenezer’s ownership of riches may reflect David’s own desire to attain material achievement. Insecure students are at great risk of attaching themselves to revered students who may influence them to engage in destructive activities. From a more symbolic perspective our main characters and our students may house a hoard of unresolved unconscious conflicts. Chooch and David would not become aware of these unresolved unconscious conflicts until much later in the stories.

After David is knocked out and dragged onto the ship, The Covenant, he meets Ransom, a boy his age who works with the cook. Ransom warns him to be leery because the crew are pirates and murderers. David’s resonance of affinity with Ransom is based on age similarity and mutual vulnerability. Stevenson takes great pains to help us identify Ransom with David. The reader cannot help but consider the symbolic meaning of Ransom’s name in its significance to David, considering Ransom’s sacrifice when the drunken cook tortures and kills him. One of the most poignant moments in the book is the understated glance David gives to Ransom’s corpse. He knows how easily it might have been him. Then David is given Ransom’s job working with the murderous cook.

Due to his receptivity to Ransom’s warnings and advice, David develops cognitively and intuitively. In many ways the resonance of affinity that David experiences with Ransom touches on the most elemental aspects of all relationships; that is, that they are all impermanent and sacrificial. At the deepest unconscious level, engaging in an authentic relationship is associated with the death of the self as one yields to trusting another. We die or sacrifice a little of our egos when we authentically relate to another human being. In addition, in the murder of Ransom, Stevenson gives us an incident from which we may infer that David’s life of innocence was over. He has moved into the adult life of experience where “the end” is always possible. It also reminds us of the perilous life and death costs of experiencing resonance with another human being. The anxiety that his life could end before he has actualized his potential will now propel him to act with urgency.
When Chooch embarks upon his quest to find his identity in the form of his father, he too comes face to face with death. He must step into the direction of the Darkening West. His initial step into experience are steps into an unknown future and into an awareness of the time limitation of his life. Like David, Chooch’s shift into awareness entails a separation from a relationship of similarity, namely his mother who has, up until then, cared for his every need. Then, after trials of trust described above, he can engage in a resonate relationship with his stepmother which propels his growth and wellbeing.

David had another encounter that is particularly vital to the growth of his awareness. The pirate Reich is kind to him when he is recovering from a head-wound. As Reich dresses the wound, David tells him his whole story and then has him promise to keep his disclosures a secret. For a while, David feels a relationship resonance with him and, in fact, the entire pirate crew. He reflects that while these pirates are “rough and brutish,” they also have good qualities. He is ashamed of his judgements and reflects that all people have both faults and virtues. Refusing to engage in entitled self-righteous judgement allows for liberty from his own projections; nevertheless, the reader is told that David is bothered by the fact that when he discloses his story to Reich, Reich does not return the favor. David is left with uneasy feelings. It is dawning upon him that more complex understandings about how there are good qualities in most everyone, does not mean that he should relinquish realistic discernments.

Likewise, Chooch experiences ambiguous feelings for the Gambler. His conversation with him results in correct directions about how to find his father’s house, but he also feels uncomfortable with the Gamblers’ supplication to stop his quest and gamble for a while, as well as the Gambler’s untoward comments about his pimples. Still, he does not judge him with rigid moralistic standards. Both Chooch and David’s refusal to judge others allows them to remain open to others and new experiences in general, but they are also growing more discerning in their appraisals of others. They move beyond black and white dichotomies that paralyze the growth of knowledge and understanding. Instead of objectifying human beings into easy categories, they remain open to subjective experiences in their interactions, and are open to learning instead of experiencing a premature closure that characterizes thinking in rigid categories. On the other hand, as Object Relation Theory proposes, they desire to have intersubjective experience with other human beings. Consequently, they intuitively know that their experiences are superficial and unfulfilling due to the
lack of reciprocal openness of Reich and the Gambler. For profound resonance to occur reciprocal interaction is required.

David has a complex relationship interaction with the swashbuckling Alan Breck. David observes Alan after he has been hauled in, having escaped his own sinking ship. David is impressed by Alan’s honesty and forthrightness. Without even knowing the political affiliations and beliefs of the pirates, Alan dares to introduce himself as a Protestant, a Redcoat hater, a Stewart, a friend of the French and a Jacobite, disregarding consequences that might have befallen him for his declarations. David’s initial impression is that he trusts him more than the pirates, but when he encounters Alan later, he is unprepared for Alan’s immediate “embrace” and declaration of friendship. Now it is David who is not forthcoming about his politics and opinions. Alan berates him for his lack of clear convictions, but still accepts him as a friend. We are told that David has yet to consider his views in a profound way. Though unable to articulate his views, he thinks he is, unlike Alan, politically a Whig and is bothered by Alan’s hatred of King George.

On the other hand, Chooch is forthrightly told not to express his opinions but to rather listen and learn by his father. The social environment in which Chooch lives has yet to have individualism encroach into its collectivism. He learns from his stepmother and father about his predicament and the role the Gambler plays in the destruction of the community. His father has him sit silently to reflect about what he has experienced and learned. Then, he is given specific instructions about how to deal with the trickery that the Gambler will use against him. Only after he has paused and integrated the knowledge does he set out on his adventure. He is taught that individualistic thinking and impetuous behavior are unacceptable.

Now, David has the ego strength to stand up to his uncle and the pirates who wish to wrong him. He exhibits a healthy suspicion and can engage in strategic necessities in case he needs to defend himself. But with Alan, he is hesitant about entertaining a relationship of contrast. It is partly because he has not developed a substantive cognitive schema for himself. He moves through life with a vague undeveloped moral and value system that influences him to be defensive and to react but not interact openly with those who have different opinions. Similarly, Chooch is unable to engage in an exchange of ideas with his stepmother and father during the first half of his journey. He simply listens and does what he is told. A listener to the Cherokee story may feel that it is important to listen extensively from elders before expressing one’s own viewpoints. David’s resistance stems from his
distrust, while Chooch’s stems, at least partly, from his acceptance of a collectivist hierarchy he chooses not to question.

When Covenant is blown off course and wrecked off the Western Scottish Isles, David and Alan are separated. David sets off on a lonesome journey, but he holds on to the silver button Alan had given him, which would help him gain the confidence from the Highlanders if ever needed. David reflects upon his loneliness, often even when he stays with other people. Nature is described in abject language. In contrast, from the beginning of *The Gambler*, Chooch feels at home in natural settings. Trees, insects, rivers, etc., are appreciated in all their beauty. Chooch is never depicted as being alone. He experiences a resonance with Nature, which is reflected in his communication with animals and insects.

During his lonesome journey, David gradually begins to understand and appreciate his connection to the natural beauty of the Scottish Highlands. He is bothered by his never having learned Gaelic. He is nourished by the seafood given up to him from the sea. After experiencing many difficult challenges, he begins to appreciate and understand the changing tides and their utility. David feels a deep resonance with Nature and place in the Scottish Highlands, and he realizes his cultural identity. David also finds that he must rely upon a woman to get across a river to get to his destination to recover his legal entitlement to his inheritance. Up to this time, he had no relations with females, unlike Chooch who constantly interacts with and relies upon women to help him escape dangerous situations and offer inspiration. Alan tries to get David to trick “the Lass,” a waitress, into helping them, but David chooses to approach her in an honest way. Such an approach resonates with her, and she secures them a boat and covert passage.

One might surmise that these contrasts with females and Nature are intricately related to the contrast between modern European cultures and Indigenous cultures. Could it be that industrialization, a more detached individualistic outlook, and the viewing of Nature in terms of its use rather than a living-breathing entity, is directly associated with the devaluation of women? After all, Nature has long been viewed as feminine in most societies. Such Western devaluation of women and Nature may be reflective of David’s delayed appreciation of females. Nonetheless, when David begins to internalize the less “modernized,” more resonate Highlander’s perspectives and values about Nature, he also begins working through resonances of affinity, contrast and conflict, which leads to considerable development in his growth as a human being.
When David reunites with Alan after the murder of the Red Fox, they are pursued as prime murder suspects and traitors. At this point, they join in common cause, to avoid the Red Coats and the Campbells, traveling across the east Highlands. Their alliance allows them to survive all subsequent hardships. The resonance of their relationship is characterized by the deepest elements of affinity and contrast. Just as students are often able to achieve deep connections when they are on school teams or projects, Alan and David were pulled together by their shared goal and vision. They agree upon who their enemy is, the Red Coats, and they both wish to return to their homes. Such shared visions allow them to avoid derailments that might come in the form of petty squabbles. Alan “rudely” taught David how to fight with a sword, which causes David irritation at times, but he perseveres and profits from the lessons and scolding. When they cross a rapid and dangerous stream, David at first balks but finally responds to Alan’s coaxing about “having to do some things alone.”

David finds courage he did not know he possessed and made the crossing. Alan declares his abhorrence to David’s “Whiggish spasms,” but then after drawing out the contrasts, he says, “I love you like a brother.” He also encourages David when he expresses fear by saying, “Small blame to you. To be feared of a thing and yet do it is what makes the prettiest kind of man (266).”

By giving themselves over to the resonances of affinity, contrast, and conflict, they create a relationship in which disagreement occurs, but emotional regulation is maintained. Such resonances occur because they had taken time to build the framework of trust in the early stages of their relationship. But the greatest challenge to their resonant relationship is yet to come.

Chooch has a similar experience with his brothers, though he moves through the statuses of resonance differently. Their first encounter triggers unconscious sibling rivalry as his four brothers try to kill him. Fleming (2014) was particularly interested in how persons deal with resonances of contrast and conflict. He argues that it is a basic psychological precept to have a natural tendency to try to reduce the anxiety resulting from the dissonance we experience when confronted with alternative values, beliefs, and ideas. He associates the fear of daring to temporarily align with different sets of ideas with a death to the self. We are sacrificing part of who we think we are as we open to something beyond ourselves. Openness to different perspectives takes courage, and it is an act of consciously choosing to live in balance and harmony with all things rather than remaining self-enclosed. Eventually, partly due to fatigue from long fighting, Chooch works through these competitive conflicts to open himself up to an alignment with his brothers to realize a unitary goal of defeating Gambler.
Probably the most psychologically powerful part of *Kidnapped* occurs just before and after Alan’s participation in a card game. David first refuses to drink with and play cards with Alan and a chieftain who is lodging them. David conceives of himself to be moral, but he had yet to develop his own set of values to provide him with a consequential viewpoint. Consequently, his thoughts about his values are neither profound nor complex. At this point, he has only swallowed his grandparents’ values about honesty and the immorality of gambling without critical consideration. The self-righteousness with which he refuses to play offends the chieftain. Later, Alan borrows and loses David’s money in the card game. David is rightfully angry. He feels Alan has selfishly abused their friendship and has put them in a dire situation, but Stevenson shows David’s disdain for Alan too be excessive.

Alan apologizes, but it is not enough to quell David’s indignation. David’s contemptuous feelings for Alan grow exponentially as he refuses to talk to Alan for days. Later, when Alan apologizes again, David verbally attacks him for being prideful. As he walks through the mountains, he ruminates on how he is a victim and how he is morally superior to Alan.

David explores his unresolved unconscious emotional conflicts. There comes a point in the extended narrative of his withdrawal into his inner self when most readers will realize that Stevenson is guiding the reader into David’s core being. That is, we are no longer considering a resonance of contrast but rather a resonance of conflict. David engages in self-deprecation, calling himself a “silly boy,” “never forgetting but nursing wounds,” and “unforgiving from birth.” Then, even as he wallows in his masochistic regressive self-assessments, he sadistically strikes out at Alan with vitriolic comments. He is compelled to punish Alan and cannot let his resentment go. David’s issue concerns unresolved conflicts within himself, which characterizes the working through of the resonance of conflict. He is externalizing his own self-contempt when he verbally attacks Alan. He is imprisoned in a whirlpool of self-righteous and aggressive ruminations. He feels uncontrollable rage and wants to inflict damage upon Alan. David avoids his own issues through transferring his arrogant self-condemnations onto Alan. David is at first utterly unconscious of his own duplicity. But the more he humiliates and frustrates Alan, the more he becomes self-loathing. He asks why he should have sympathy for someone who has spoiled his life. If David allows himself to feel the full force of his self-scorn, he will surely smash his own self-assurance.

Everything converges when Alan returns the abuse by calling David a “Whig.” David’s rage becomes so intense that he challenges Alan to a sword fight to the death. Instead of retaliating, Alan simply
drops his blade. David feels the full brunt of his contradictory feelings of guilt for what he knows he is doing to his friend. His vehemence has been so out of proportion, it literally has impacted his health as he experiences increasing fatigue and physical ailments. His impotent rage and irrepressible irritation suddenly deflate. He finally allows himself to recognize his sadism. David says he “feels like dying” and collapses. Now, David experiences the resonance of conflict that allows him to transcend his combative attitude to assume a kind and cooperative state of being.

In *The Gambler*, Chooch was for a time in competition with his half-brothers when he takes his stepmother’s advice to strike his father’s favorite locust tree to stop the deadly game. After being told by his father to pause and reflect, he is able to realize that he might move from interacting with his brothers in a competitive fashion to unite in a more cooperative venture, namely to annihilate the Gambler who is seen as an utterly destructive force. But the story clearly demonstrates that Chooch cannot annihilate the Gambler without destroying himself. The risk-taking, transforming Gambler is part of his personality. Consequently, the Gambler is tied to a wharf never to die until the end of the world. Chooch works through the resonance of conflict by taming his own compulsions rather than destroying the energy that drives them. Just as David’s change was associated with death, this incident in Chooch’s life depicts a maturation clearly linked with death. In fact, Chooch is given a new name, Lightening, from this point on.

For both David and Chooch, their compulsive needs are vanquished only after a profound struggle and cathartic experience. Both require a kind of death to connect in a way that transcends selfish desire. They see how their competitive attitudes are futile and interfere with their growth as human beings. They reject their impulse to withdraw. They realize they are not entitled to be moody and demanding, not allowing for cooperative ventures with people who are different than themselves. They understand their share in the difficulties they experience.

**IMPLICATIONS AND INSIGHTS**

These stories teach us that our development is bound up in relationship matrixes. For maximum growth, David and Chooch must become aware of other people’s subjective experience if they are to ever understand their own lives. Neither teacher nor student can simply use the other to attain what they want, whether it be knowledge, high evaluations, or ease with teaching.
Both Chooch and David experience resonances of affinity that provide a strong foundation of trust from which to grow. While learning they cannot always trust everyone, they also learn others who contrast from them can help them to expand their awareness. Brewer (2010) and Clawson and Newburg (1997) advocate the working through the resonance of contrast as an act of courage that leads to a larger shared understanding. Both argue that a teacher must first work for a connection of trust, then identify with the seeking self in the student to prepare them for different levels of contrast which may impact their core identity. Helping students to be open to questioning their assumptions is a key predictor of expanded learning and growth. For the most part, students are unable to fully articulate their undeveloped beliefs and values. They may experience cognitive dissonance when they are confronted with ideas and opinions contrary to their own. Teachers must strive to create spaces in which students can adopt an attitude of open-mindedness and curiosity that can allow them to listen to and consider challenging ideas. This does not mean that there will no longer be emotion involved in learning; it simply means that the student will be able to entertain new experiences without trying to pre-maturely disregard or attack them.

The greatest opportunity for growth that teachers, school counselors, and students have is when dealing with the inevitable challenges associated with resonances of conflict. David has a nervous breakdown when obsessing about how Alan has not lived up to the idealized image he has constructed. At one point, Chooch is almost swept away by a river current when he panicked about the challenge Father gave him. In both cases, a sense of “failure” is quickly blamed on others, arresting potential development that might have emerged if they could have worked through internal conflicts and competitive relationships. Displacement of guilt and responsibility is characteristic of entitled, immature persons. Most students, whose neuro-plastic mind is still developing, require an added level of support from teachers to work through resonances of conflict. Projections are automatic and lessen anxiety while more mature self-awareness requires the capacity to endure anxiety and eventually work through it to arrive at a higher level of development. Alan, on more than one occasion, was able to attain a profound level of empathy when David became emotionally unregulated. He responds to David’s violent comments with encouragement rather than reciprocal hatred. The same occurred in the relationship between Chooch and his stepmother. Eventually, Chooch views her harsh trials as vital events that provided a means to understanding and trust.

As teachers, we are sometimes confronted by students who appear to be angry at us or at other students. Like David, they may have a right to be angry, but their anger and stubbornness
strikes us as disproportionate to the event, and we wonder why. As we have argued, it may represent an unresolved unconscious conflict. Teachers, by maintaining emotional stability and supportiveness during these stressful interactions can help students maintain a moderate state of arousal which can serve as an external regulatory circuit to establish the optimal flow of energy and information. If teachers maintain an attachment with a student who is most adamant in their pride and anger, the connection can potentially result in psychological development.

The theoretical foundation of the Object Relations Theory is that healing comes only when people recognize each other as subjects. During the conflict resonance stage, a person has the choice of arresting their development or alternatively utilizing the conflict space to attain another potential way of being. Working through the conflicts in relationships allows for doubts which provide openings for new perspectives and creativity. When a person experiences this “negative capability,” they may feel that continuing the relationships will hurt or be damaging and consequently they retreat. Sometimes this is necessary. On the other hand, as we have seen in our stories, some conflicts may contain the seeds of resonance that, if worked through, may lead to a higher developmental level.

Our ideas concerning resonances may also be extended to relationships between Cherokees and Scottish people. Both the Highlander and the Cherokee histories are plagued by an accumulation of suffering and a lack of appreciation for their unique cultural capitals by the English people and Americans. There is a natural resonance of affinity between the groups due to similar histories and their mountainous home countries. In contrast, the above paragraphs emphasize the Western value of individuality and the tribal value of collectivity. Though both groups may be characterized as spiritual, one is primarily Presbyterian and the other more of a Nature-based spirituality, even when mixed with Christianity. Engaging in deep reflection about differing values and belief systems may have helped the two groups to think more complexly and to take on a potentially healthy and more expanded bi-cultural perspective.

Still, abhorrent colonialism imposed on Cherokees, to some extent committed by Scottish people, should never be forgotten. As described above, many children were born from false resonances. But along the way, the initial false resonances were transformed into love between many Cherokee people and people of Scottish descent. The Cherokee of today are largely a mixture of Cherokee, Scottish, and Irish descent. Much of what the Cherokee are today was born out of resonances of affinity, contrast, and conflict with Scottish people. Cherokees still find themselves in
need of resisting colonialism, but they also have found many benefits and opportunities for growth from being open to the mixture of the two cultures.

One cannot overlook the fact that Scottish people quickly became part of the dominant population of the United States, while dark complexioned and culturally unassimilated Cherokees were and are considered “others.” This results in poverty as well as feelings of alienation for Cherokees who wish to become a part of the larger American system. On the other hand, maintaining some level of separation is vital for the survival of Cherokee identity. Capitalist and Euro-American cultural hegemony conspicuously and inconspicuously creep into Cherokee souls. Cherokees who fail to engage in intellectual critique of tribal/cultural erasure soon forget their heritages and fail to preserve their Cherokee rituals, language, and epistemologies. For any relationship between groups to authentically exist, there must be separation as well as connection, else the dominant group absorbs the less powerful one’s unique cultural identity until all mutual interactional relations possible are forfeited.
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APPENDIX

Discussion Questions:

1. What are the differences between the resonances of similarity, difference, and conflict?

2. How are David and Alan and Chooch and his mother able to grow from being in relationships of similarity?

3. How is Davey similar but different from his uncle and the pirates? How does his recognition of their differences help him grow?

4. How is Chooch like his brothers and the Gambler but also different? Describe how he, at first, fights against them but eventually transforms his relationships with them to accomplish a shared interest.

5. What are the resonances of contrast that David and Chooch experience with the multitude of characters they encounter, and how do they mature from these encounters?

6. What are David and Chooch’s initial ways of dealing with resonances of conflict and how successful are they? How do they eventually work through these conflicts to mature as human beings?

Research Questions:

1. Describe the role the Ulster and Highlander Scots had in the colonization of the Southeastern part of the United States.

2. What are the similarities and differences that existed in clan systems between the Cherokees and Scottish people?

3. How similar and different were the conquests of their homelands?

4. Describe Highlander and Cherokee relationships to Nature and their relationship to their homelands.

5. Explore the experiences of Cherokee and Highlander blood feuds between families.

6. Explore the history of Scottish and Cherokee conflicts and their cultural exchanges.

7. How did marriage and children from Cherokee/Scottish marriages impact Cherokee culture?
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