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Preface

This is a study of the role of the Protestant missionary in the formulation and execution of the government's Indian policy. The first impulse for this subject came from reading some letters written by missionaries laboring among the Indians. There were constant references to the Indian policy of the government and recommendations of changes that they thought should be made. With some knowledge as to the involvement of the missionary in the real life situation of the Indian, the thought occurred that a study of the role of the missionary might supply helpful information relating to the forces that molded the policy of the government.

It has been a problem to know how to draw the line between supplying too much historical information and assuming a knowledge of the facts of government policy and the history of missions in order to comprehend the progress of the argument of this study. It was thought necessary, in the introduction, to present a survey of the relations between the colonial governments and Indian missions in order to prepare the reader for the developments after 1789.

The writer is under obligation to those individuals who have assisted in the gathering of research materials. To the libraries at Loyola University, University of Chicago, Northwestern University; to Newberry Library and the Chicago Historical Society, the writer declares himself grateful for the favors received.

Particular acknowledgement is made to Loyola University, where a genuine
 respect for scholarship has always been a great inspiration; to Dr. Paul Kiniery, Assistant Dean of the Graduate School, and to Dr. Paul Lietz, Chairman of the Department of History, and members of the faculty. Special thanks is due to Dr. Robert McCluggage, who has directed my graduate studies, for his aid, counsel and encouragement. His keen critical sense and his stimulating suggestions have been directed toward a more effective development of the writer's own ideas.

Finally, to my wife, Gladys, I owe a debt which can never be described or repaid. She has inspired my work at every stage and without her encouragement and assistance, it would not have been possible.

Harold C. Howard
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Indian Missions and the Colonial Governments

The earliest American Christian philanthropies were missions to the Indians. The native was to be converted to the Christian religion and his own culture was to be modified by an infusion of the European civilization. Together with mercantile profits and political aggrandizement, these were all part of the plan whereby the new world was to be given the intelligible order of the old.

The program of conversion and education began in Virginia. The charter issued to the Virginia Company by James I, April 10, 1606, called for the Christianizing and civilizing of those who "live in Darkness and miserable Ignorance of the true Knowledge" and looked forward to the time when the "Infidels and Savages living in those Parts" might be brought to "human Civility and to a settled and quiet Government." The second charter, dated May 23, 1609, looked forward to the "Conversion and Reduction of the People in those Parts unto the true Worship of God and Christian Religion." The third charter, given March 12, 1612, made a similar provision for the "reclaiming of People barbarous to Civility and Humanity." In 1609, Sir Thomas Gates, Governor of the colony, was instructed by the Virginia Company that his missionaries should work with Indian children. Should it be necessary, children were to be taken from their parents for they were "so wrapped up in the fogge and miserie of their iniquity and so tarrassified with their continuall
tirrany, chayned under the bond of Deathe unto the Divell" that they might have to be forced, when young, into the Christian religion. By 1619, at least fifty missionaries had been sent to Virginia to take charge of the Indian children who were being prepared for Christianity and civilization.

The first elected assembly, which convened in the choir of the church at James City, July 30, 1619, made provision for Indian education. Each town was urged to assume the responsibility for the schooling of a "certain number of the natives' children." Plans were also laid for an Indian College at Henrico and for the East India School for Indians at Charles City. The Virginia Company laid off a tract of land on the north side of the James River for the college and arranged a grant of land for the School which was partially supported by a contribution from the East India Company. The East India School was set up to prepare the Indians to enter the college. Both projects were suddenly ended by an Indian uprising in 1622 which destroyed the town of Henrico and Charles City. Mr. Thorpe, newly appointed superintendent of Indian education at Henrico, together with a number of the college tenants were put to death at the time. No further attempt was made to establish a school for Indians in Virginia until 1693. The massacre had made the hope of Indian Christianization and civilization seem unreal and impractical.

From 1622 to 1693 education was provided only for children held as hostages or taken into homes as slaves. In 1693 a new effort was made to provide higher education for Indian children. The charter of the College of William and Mary declared one of the objects of the institution to be, "that the Christian faith may be propagated amongst the western Indians." The yearly rents and profits from the Boyle Brasserton estate were to provide for
Indian education at William and Mary. The Indians were maintained by private charity and were instructed apart from the English students. The enrollment gradually fell off and had practically ceased at the time of the Revolution when the withdrawal of the English charity fund ended the college for Indians.11

In 1714 a school was built at Christ Anna for Indian children. This was the only school in Virginia located among the Indian tribes. The trading company controlling the settlement built the schoolhouse and assisted with other expenditures. In 1718 the privileges of the trading company were rescinded and the House of Burgesses ordered the school closed.12 Governor Spotswood had taken a keen interest in the school and protested against its abandonment. This represented the last attempt to provide schooling for the Indians in Virginia and soon the dwindling population removed the need. Spotswood accused the white community of not taking seriously the responsibility of civilizing the Indians. He wrote:

The little care that hath hither been taken for converting the Indians of this country to the Christian faith, or so much as endeavouring in any manner to Civilize them, seems to be no small reproach both to our Religion and politicks after above one whole Century that the English Government hath been established here.13

The New England Puritan of the 1630's knew that he too must be a civilizer and Christianizer of the Indians and was confident that God would reveal to him the best way to deal with the 'savage.' In the Puritan mind, the Indians were evidence of a Satanic opposition to the very principle of divinity. They were a symbol of what man might become if he lived far from God's Word. Yet the Indian was a man who had to be brought out of paganism into the civilized responsibilities of Christian manhood. He was the farthest
of all God's human creatures from God himself. Descended from wanderers, he had lost his sense of civilization and order. As a result of this loss, he was in the power of Satan. It is curious, however, that with their zeal for the spread of the Gospel, the Puritans made so little serious effort to convert the Indian.

The record of missionary efforts in New England is scattered, involving many organizations and men. Money was sent to New England for missionary work among the natives in 1630 when Roger Williams and John Eliot were going to the Indians. In 1636 Plymouth Colony enacted laws to provide for the preaching of the Gospel among the Indians and in 1643 Thomas Mayhew began his mission on Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket. Little or nothing, however, was achieved, until November, 1644 when the Massachusetts General Court asked the ministers to recommend measures for converting the Indians. Two years later the General Court directed the ministers to elect two of their number every year to engage in work among the Indians. In 1646, John Eliot, having learned a local Indian dialect, began systematically to preach to them. Then in 1649, Edward Winslow, acting as London agent for the United Colonies, persuaded Parliament to authorize the incorporation of the "President and Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England" and this organization financed the work until the Restoration. With the Restoration, the charter of "The President and Society" was declared invalid and a royal Charter was granted in 1662 to the "Company for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England and parts adjacent, in America." This society was reorganized under the presidency of Sir Robert Boyle, a noted physicist and chemist who directed it for three decades. Until 1776, when the Revolutionary War caused remittances to America
to be cut off, this company carried on most of the financing of New England missions.16

Out of all the missionary efforts among the Indians in seventeenth century New England, that of John Eliot was the most commendable. Eliot, a brilliant graduate of Cambridge University, looked upon Christianity, civilization and learning as inseparable. He established nine-self-sustaining Indian communities which were known as villages of praying Indians. He organized the villages and governed them in accordance with the Mosaic code. Both children and adults were regularly catechized in the faith. Husbandry and mechanical arts were taught in the hope that the Indians would abandon their old ways of living. King Philip's War brought to an end over twenty-five years of progress and shortly after Eliot's death, all of the villages had disappeared. Many of the Indians had fled to Canada and New York while others were taken captive and distributed among the colonists as slaves.17

In addition to Eliot's Indian towns, an Indian College had been established in connection with Harvard College in 1654. This effort proved to be a failure with many of the students returning to their homes and with some dying at the school. The only graduate died soon after receiving the Bachelor of Arts degree.18 New England had fared no better than the colony of Virginia in its attempt to civilize and convert the Indians. The want of success was blamed on a variety of causes; whiskey and non-puritan traders were mentioned. Some New England theologians thought that there could be no large-scale conversion of the heathen until the Jews themselves had been converted.19 The concern expressed by the Puritan for the conversion of the Indian is almost impossible to reconcile with failure to support projects such as Eliot's. The
money for the support of this mission work did not come from the New England colonists, but from friendly sympathizers in England. Many of the people ridiculed Eliot's schemes and sought to thwart all measures for the protection of the Indians while the magistrates hesitated to carry out beneficial legislation.

A rather brief project was developed among the Delaware Indians in New Jersey by Reverend David Brainerd and his brother, John. An Indian mission was established near Cranberry in 1745 in the hope of making the Indians self-maintaining. David Brainerd died in 1747 and his brother continued the work. The boys were taught to farm and apprenticed to learn a trade while the girls were instructed in spinning and knitting. The project ended in 1753 when the pressure of white settlements forced removal of the Brainerd Mission to Pennsylvania. Quaker attempts to civilize the Indians of Pennsylvania proved to be as ineffective as Quaker politics. Their plans and hopes were crushed by the power politics of Anglo-French dealings with the Pennsylvania Indians during the first half of the eighteenth century.

During the middle of the eighteenth century, a program of Indian education was developed by Reverend Eleazar Wheelock in Lebanon, Connecticut. Eliot had organized Indian settlements but Wheelock provided missionary training to Indian students in a boarding school far removed from the Indian country. The student body included boys from the distant Iroquois and Delaware tribes and a few from New England. They were taught reading, writing, arithmetic, English, Greek and Latin. While there was no particular emphasis placed on industrial training, the boys did assist with the work around the school. Indian girls were placed in English homes to learn housekeeping and
sewing and went to school one day a week to learn to read and write. William Johnson, Indian agent in New York, an ardent Anglican, patronized the school mainly because there was no other. Wheelock's influence among the New York Indians was later seriously curtailed by Johnson's growing dissatisfaction with the graduates of the school. Losing the Iroquois boys and girls for his school, Wheelock moved his school to New Hampshire where he hoped to seek students from the Canadian tribes. 22

The value of trade with the Indians and the strength and strategic location of the Iroquois along the French frontier proved to be a great impetus to the cause of Indian missions in New York state in the eighteenth century. Appeals were sent to England to send out missionaries. It was hoped that Anglican missionaries could assist in the plan to forestall any alliance between New France and the Five Nations. The first Anglican missionary, Reverend Thoroughgood Moor, arrived in 1701 but the Mohawks refused to receive him and on his way back to England, he was lost at sea. Three years later, Reverend Thomas Barclay arrived and made a number of successful visits to the Mohawks. In response to their request, a chapel and school were built and by 1712, a number of children had learned to read. The school was suspended in 1719 due to lack of interest but was reopened in 1735. It was an Anglican stronghold until the end of the Revolution. 23

With the arrival of William Johnson in New York in 1735, a new chapter begins in the use of the Indian mission as an agent of empire. Johnson came to New York to manage his uncle's estate in the Mohawk Valley. He soon became interested in the Indians and was appointed Agent for the Iroquois and other northern groups in 1756. Johnson saw Christianization of the Indians not
merely as an end in itself but as a weapon against French penetration from Canada and later against revolutionary dissent in the colonies. He contended that one of the most effective ways to hold the Indians to the English side was to station missionaries among them. From 1766 - 1768, Johnson urged the dissenting groups to send missionaries as well. After 1768, however, he regarded them with suspicion and depended wholly on Anglicans. He had just drawn up a comprehensive review of trade and Indian affairs in the northern district, dealing with all aspects of the Indian problem. This he had sent to Lord Shelburne. In this report Johnson explained the necessity of placing missionaries and assistants with the Indians, especially with the Six Nations, in order to hold them to the British interest. He insisted that these missionaries should be of the Church of England in order to keep the Indians away from both the French Catholic priests and the dissenting teachers. The death of Johnson in 1774 on the eve of the Revolution was a blow to the British cause.

With the revolt of the colonies in 1776, the paramount issue was the concentration of military strength against Great Britain. For this purpose, it was necessary to win the support of as many tribes as possible. Missionaries salaried by the Continental Congress were stationed among the Indians to serve as diplomatic agents. Funds were also appropriated for the maintenance of Indian students at Dartmouth College and the College of New Jersey, which is now Princeton University. The Oneidas and the Tuscaroras, owing mainly to the influence and exertions of the Reverend Samuel Kirkland, remained neutral during the first years of the war and insisted finally on taking an active part in the cause of the colonies. The role of the missionary in the
As early as March 16, 1775, Reverend Eleazar Wheelock, wrote to Governor Trumbull concerning the possible consequences of an alliance between the Indians and the "European forces." He advised the governor that he had sent Mr. James Dean to the tribes in Canada as a missionary "to keep the fire burning and brighten the chain" of friendship between the tribes and Wheelock's school. There were ten Indian boys in school at the time and more were expected soon. "This connection," the Congregational preacher contended, is "under God our strongest bulwark, if such invasion from the northward should be made." He thought that Mr. Dean, should the occasion arise and he be given the proper authority, could influence all of the Six Nations to join the colonies against any possible invasion. Governor Trumbull replied to the Wheelock letter on April 17, 1775, stating that "The ability and influence of Mr. Dean to attach all the Six Nations to the interest of these Colonies, is justly to be considered as an instance of divine favour for us, and proper authority and encouragement to him will undoubtedly be easily obtained for that purpose." In the interest of peace, the Continental Congress appropriated funds for the support of the Indian youths at the school.

Well informed concerning the confidence and trust which the missionary enjoyed among the Indians, the Continental Congress gave every possible encouragement to the work of stationing missionaries within the Indian country. In 1775, the Mohegans declared to the commissioners, appointed to treat with the Indians at Albany, "their desire to have teachers and instructors among them which the commissioners promised to report to Congress." In December of the same year, Captain White Eyes, a Delaware chief, being introduced to
Congress, the President said: "We will send you, according to your desire, a minister and a schoolmaster." This promise was renewed on April 10, 1776. At that time it was voted that a minister of the gospel, a schoolmaster, and a blacksmith should be employed "at reasonable salaries, to reside among the Delaware Indians." The Commissioners were also instructed to ask Jacob Fowler, a missionary among the Montauk Indians, and Joseph Johnson of the Mohegans upon what terms they would reside among the Six Nations and instruct them in the Christian religion.

The Committee on Indian Affairs in its report to the Continental Congress on February 5, 1776, outlined the prominent role which missionaries would occupy in the government's relations with the various Indian tribes. The committee suggested that "a friendly commerce between the people of the United Colonies and the Indians, and the propagation of the Gospel, and the cultivation of the civil arts among the latter" could produce "many and estimable advantages to both." The report recommended that the commissioners of Indian affairs give consideration to "proper places, in their respective departments for the residence of ministers and school-masters, and report the same to Congress."

The missionary to occupy the most important role in negotiations with the Indians during the War was Samuel Kirkland, missionary to the Oneidas. His mission, though not completely abandoned, was virtually discontinued during the war. Kirkland was absent for a long time serving as chaplain in the Continental army or acting as an agent for the Continental Congress in negotiations with the Indians. In an effort to preserve the neutrality of the Indians, he put forth his personal influence, took long journeys among the
Indian tribes, and attended several councils that were held at German Flats, Albany, Oneida and Onondaga. Kirkland's official services under the Continental Congress dated back to the year 1774. At that time Colonel Guy Johnson, acting for the British, had been ordered to remove the dissenting missionaries from among the Iroquois. Kirkland addressed a letter of complaint to the New York Provincial Congress stating that Johnson had ordered him not to speak a word to the Indians. Kirkland had interpreted to them the "doings of the Continental Congress" which he claimed had "undeceived and too much opened the eyes of the Indians for Colonel Johnson's purposes." The missionary thought that his activity in this respect had done more "real good to the cause of the country" than "five hundred pounds of presents would have effected." On July 10, 1775, John Adams in a letter to James Warren stated that a conference had been held with a "Mr. Kirkland, a worthy missionary among the Oneida Indians." Adams said the missionary had been "very useful last winter among all the Six Nations, by interpreting and explaining the proceedings of the Continental Congress and by representing the Union and power of the Colonies as well as the nature of the dispute." On July 18, 1775, the Continental Congress voted to pay the expenses of Kirkland and urged the Commissioners of the Northern Department to employ Mr. Kirkland "among the Indians of the Six Nations, in order to secure their friendship, and to continue them in a state of neutrality with respect to the present controversy between Great Britain and these colonies."

General George Washington, in a letter to the Continental Congress dated September 30, 1775, urged Congress to continue its financial support of missionary Samuel Kirkland. He stated that "all accounts agree that much of
the favorable disposition shown by the Indian chief of the Oneidas to this camp" was to be credited to the influence of Kirkland. 40 Governor Trumbull of Connecticut, in a letter to the President of Congress, spoke of Kirkland as a "virtuous, religious and very useful gentlemen" who deserved the assistance of Congress to enable him "to secure the friendship of the Indians and prevent their taking up the hatchet against us." 41 On November 11, 1775, Congress passed a resolution which provided for payment of Kirkland's expenses in connection with treaty negotiated with Indians at Albany in August, 1775. Taking note of the fact that Kirkland had "undergone much fatigue and hardship in procuring the Indians to meet the Commissioners at Albany," the resolution also stated that "he hath been very active and successful in endeavouring to conciliate the good will of these people towards the inhabitants of the united colonies...." The resolution further stated that Kirkland had "in some measure defeated the machinations of the emissaries and agents of the British Ministry to increase the number of our enemies." Congress also voted to place Kirkland on salary for the next year and advanced him funds "to be disposed of by him in such manner as may best promote the happiness of the Indians, and attach them to these colonies." 42

During the war, only the Oneidas and Tuscaroras remained loyal to the Colonies. Kirkland directed Oneida scouts, who secured valuable information of the movements of the enemy. He served as chaplain at Fort Schuyler and with Sullivan's expedition and performed other services. On March 12, 1776, Kirkland reported to Schuyler that there had been a change in attitude among the Indians since the Albany Treaty: "It is very evident their minds are poisoned by some enemy to the liberties of the colonies." Kirkland was
referring to the attempt on the part of the enemy to convince the Indians that should the Americans win the war, they would then kill the Indians. On June 8, 1776, Kirkland urged the American forces to occupy a post at the place "where Fort Stanwix formerly stood." The missionary hoped that this move might keep the Mohawks, Senecas and part of the Onondagas neutral and perhaps induce them to join in with the Colonies. On September 3, 1776, Kirkland set out for Fort Stanwix. He had been ordered to this post by the Commissioners to officiate as chaplain to Colonel Dayton's Regiment and to secure intelligence reports from the Indians. On October 6, 1776, the missionary visited the Oneidas and found that the Indians were much divided in "their sentiments to cause of liberty and the enemies to the United States were increasing." The Cherokees had sent a message to the northern Indians asking for assistance against the Virginians. Kirkland concluded his report, stating that he had several hints "from particular friends among them (the Indians), that the Indians are upon a plan of union - offensive and defensive among all their different Tribes.

On January 25, 1777, Kirkland informed General Schuyler that Colonel Butler had invited a number of the chiefs and head warriors of each tribe of the Confederacy to Niagara for a meeting in the second week of February. He had received a report that a general attack on Ticonderoga "is designed toward the close of February by Regulars, Canadians and Indians." On January 31, 1777, General Philip Schuyler wrote to Jonathan Trumbull that Kirkland had arrived from the west with several Indian sachems. He stated that "from the information he and they bring, as well as from many corroborating accounts, it is past a doubt that General Carlton intends to attack
Ticonderoga as soon as the lake is passable over the ice. He then urged that Trumbull send all the "new levies raised in your state instantly to Ticonderoga by the shortest route and with the greatest dispatch possible."

On February 6, 1777, Schuyler informed Trumbull that Kirkland was on his way to visit General Washington with six Oneida Indians. Washington in a letter of March 29, 1777, to Congress, stated that "the Oneida missionary [Kirkland] arrived here this week with a chief warrior and five other Indians of that nation. They had been to Boston and came from thence to this place, to enquire into the true state of matters, that they might report them to a grand council to be shortly held." The General invited them to go on to Philadelphia but Kirkland and the chiefs were satisfied with what they saw and were convinced that reports of the enemy were false. Washington informed them that France was helping us and was about to join in the war as an ally. Kirkland said he was persuaded that an announcement to this effect would have a great effect on the various nations of Indians.

In a letter addressed to Patrick Henry, General Sullivan stated that the Reverend Kirkland had served under him as an Indian guide and interpreter. He spoke of the missionary's knowledge of the Indian language, "his acquaintance with their country in general, and particularly his intimacy with an influence over the Oneidas" and urged Congress to appoint Kirkland to the position of Chaplain at the military posts in the area of Fort Schuyler. Kirkland's services during the war were formally recognized by Congress and by the legislatures of Connecticut, Massachusetts and New York. His knowledge of the Indians and influence over them enabled him to render most signal service in preventing Indian hostilities. More importantly, he became a trusted adviser
of the government regarding Indian affairs. He was thrown into intimate
relations of friendship and confidence with Washington, Hamilton, Schuyler,
Sullivan, Pickering, Knox and others. In the treaty negotiations that followed
the war, Kirkland was to occupy an important role.52

In the treaty of peace of 1783, which ended the Revolutionary War, England
made no provision for her Indian allies, most of whom had served her faithfully
during the conflict. The Mohawks moved to Canada and through the intervention
of Chief Joseph Brant, a grant of land was obtained from the Crown. The
affairs of the other nations of the confederacy were in an unsettled position.
Their lands, especially the territory of the Six Nations, were within the
boundaries granted to the United States. By treaty the sovereignty of these
lands became invested in the United States. Washington in a letter to James
Duane, recommended that Congress follow a just and humane policy with the
Indians.53 The legislature of New York wanted to take possession of the
Indian lands and expel the Six Nations from the boundaries of the state.
There was a similar attitude in some of the other states. Previous to the
cession by all the states of land within their boundaries to the general
government, the respective rights of general and state governments were but
illy defined. In 1784 the New York legislature passed an act making the
governor, George Clinton, and a Board of Commissioners, the Superintendents of
Indian Affairs. Clinton opened negotiations with the Indians and solicited
the services of Kirkland to assist in persuading the Indians to accept the
terms of a treaty.54

Congress also contemplated a general treaty with the Indians, especially
those bordering on the settlements in New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio.
Correspondence was carried on between the New York Board and the Commissioners of the United States, in an attempt to settle the question of jurisdiction over the Indians. The Indians were averse to treating with a state but generally disposed to meet the "Thirteen Fires." Most of the spring and summer of 1784 was consumed by attempts on the part of New York to get a council of the Six Nations convened. The United States Commissioners, Arthur Lee and Richard Butler, informed the Oneidas and Tuscaroras through Kirkland, that they wanted to meet them at Fort Schuyler on September 20, 1784. The Commissioners then instructed Kirkland to proceed to Fort Stanwix and receive the Indians as they came, provide them with all necessary provisions and inform them that the Commissioners were soon to arrive. Kirkland took part in the proceedings and signed the treaty as a witness and as one of the interpreters. He also used his influence in behalf of an amicable settlement. The sachems and warriors from all the Six Nations were present together with Cornplanter, famous chief and head of the clan or portion of the Senecas residing on the Allegany. The treaty was unsatisfactory to a large portion of the Indians and especially distasteful to the Mohawk chief, Brant. He was disturbed that a separate treaty had been made with the Six Nations rather than a general one with all the Indian tribes. He wanted any settlement to include the Hurons, Ottowas, Shawnees, Chippewas, Delawares, Potawatomies, Wabash Confederates and the Cherokees as well as the Six Nations. The policy of the United States, however, was to divide and conquer, and Fort Stanwix was the opening wedge in the plan to break up the united Indian nations by separating the tribes and obtaining from them sufficient territory out of which to create a public domain. On July 7, 1788, Brant informed
Kirkland that the only hope for the Indians was to be found in a confederacy of all the Indian nations. The Six Nations had sent an embassy to all the western and southern tribes. They had travelled for seventeen months conferring with some twenty-two tribes or nations from the Great Lakes down to the Mississippi in an attempt to unite all the tribes. What Congress had successfully done with the thirteen colonies, the Indians proposed to do with all the tribes. 59

In the summer of 1788 Kirkland made a tour through the Seneca country, holding some conferences with Brant and counselling the Six Nations in the business of the Phelps and Gorham Purchase. 60 The state of Massachusetts employed Reverend Samuel Kirkland to superintend the treaty to be held at Buffalo Creek in June, 1788, in order that justice might be done to the Indians. In assisting in the extinguishing of the title of some 6,144,000 acres of the Genesee country, the missionary was given two thousand acres of land for his services. 61 After a long discussion over the price to be paid to the Indians for their land, it was left up to Butler, Brant and Kirkland to make the final offer. 62 Kirkland was also commissioned by the state of New York to assist in treaty negotiations between that state and the Indians in February, 1789. Clinton in writing to Kirkland, stated that "The Commissioners reply upon your attachment to the interest of the state, and trust much to your prudence in the execution of this business...." 63 For his services, the missionary was given two square miles of land and a square mile of land for each of his two sons. 64 The federal authorities negotiated a second treaty with the Six Nations in 1789 but this development and the role of the missionary must be discussed within the framework of the Washington
administration's Indian policy.

By the year, 1786, the value of the missionary in the political diplomacy of the government with the Indian nations had been well demonstrated. Certain factors relative to the government Indian policy and the role of the missionary had become abundantly clear. So far as the policy itself was concerned, three treaties during the years 1783 to 1786 had acquired the land northeast of the Ohio. All of these were dictated treaties. The Articles of Confederation stated that Congress had the sole and exclusive power of "regulating the trade and managing all affairs with the Indians, not members of any of the states, provided that the legislative right of any state within its own limits be not infringed or violated." New York state, however, had disregarded the treaty of 1783 and the authority of Congress by continuing to deal with the Indians as subject to its authority. James Monroe appealed to the Governor of the state but in vain. This dispute between the states and the federal government, relating to jurisdictional authority over the various Indian nations, was to be a source of great frustration. A further development in policy was the establishment of an Indian department under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War in August, 1786. The geographical divisions for the administration of Indian affairs were set up, namely, a northern and southern department with a superintendent and two deputies in each one. The northern half included all the tribes north of the Ohio River and the South, those South of the Ohio. A final step of significance came with the Northwest Ordinance of July 13, 1787, which declared that "the utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians; their land and property shall never be taken from them without their consent...."
No matter what the stated policy of the government was, other intruding developments often became more important. England's primary aim in its dealings with the Indians was colonial settlement; modifying the Indian culture through civilization and conversion was to a great extent of secondary importance. For the years, 1783-89, the Indian policy of the Confederation was geared to the necessity of acquiring the land from the Ohio to the Mississippi. In a report of June, 1783, Washington suggested the establishment of settlements of ex-soldiers in the West. These were to be placed in the vicinity of Indian towns and in this way would "be the most likely means to enable us to purchase upon equitable terms of the Aborigines their right of preoccupancy; and to induce them to relinquish our territories; and to remove unto the illimitable regions of the West." The colonial experience had revealed that there was often a wide gulf between the thinking of government policy makers and the frontiersmen whose support was essential to the enforcement of any Indian policy. To the latter, the only good Indian was usually a dead one.

The colonial governments attached great value to the support of missionaries among the Indians. For the colony of Virginia in the seventeenth century, mission schools and civilization measures were an integral part of plan to subdue the red man. For Sir William Johnson in New York, the missionary was a necessary instrument to counteract the French Jesuit influence and to aid the building of an empire. During the Revolutionary War, missionary Samuel Kirkland served as a most effective agent in attaching Indians to our side at a time when the concentration of force was the paramount issue. Following the War, missionaries were called upon to give an
atmosphere of honesty and integrity to the treaty negotiations of the federal and state governments. Rarely, however, from the viewpoint of the government, was the welfare of the Indian of chief consideration. To frustrate the efforts of other influences working among the various tribes; to attach them to our side in a war; to make them more willing to part with their land were only some of the motives impelling the government to give its support to missionary activity among the Indians.

By 1788, the missionary perspective, in his relations with the Indians, was more apparent, although confusing to the average layman. It would appear that most missionaries were motivated by high ideals in their desire to work among the natives. There was no question but that the Indian culture was far inferior to that of the Europeans, so far as the missionary was concerned. It was assumed that the Indians would in time recognise the beneficence of European civilization. But after two-and-a-half centuries of colonial endeavor to modify the Indian culture, the basic economy of the red man was unchanged. Nor has political and religious concepts been fundamentally altered. Communal land ownership and tribal organization continued and their native gods still seemed to meet their spiritual needs.

While fervently believing in the necessity of civilizing and converting the Indian, missionaries were not at all agreed as to how this was to be done. While Eliot segregated his Indians from the whites in special villages, Wheelock contended that the Indian should be educated in the white community. Some saw conversion to Christianity as the only necessity for uplifting the Indian while others called for both conversion and civilization. There was also a question as to which of these two should come first or should they be
done simultaneously. The purpose of all was to make converts, train missionaries and if possible produce laborers skilled in European work techniques. Youths were instructed in homes of settlers, in missions, day and boarding schools, and some sent to Europe to study.

Missions among the Indians were often interrupted and sometimes terminated by Indian uprisings brought on by English encroachment on Indian lands. One such example was the forced removal of the Delawares from New Jersey by the pressure of white population, bringing to an end the Brainerd mission. The power politics of the Anglo-French in Pennsylvania dashed the hopes and plans of the Quakers in regard to the Indians. The French and Indian War along with the American Revolution destroyed the self-maintaining Indian communities of the Moravians who had refused to defend themselves because of their pacifist convictions. Interdenominational strife and government interference often impeded the work of self-sacrificing missionaries. Always, however, overshadowing all missionary activity was the major policy of the government, that of negotiating with the tribes for more land. Thus it may be said that the colonial experience of the role of the missionary in Indian policy serves as a fitting background to a parallel development in the period, 1789-1840.

The Protestant missionary exerted considerable influence in both the formation and execution of the United States' Indian policy during the first fifty years of this nation's existence. The channels through which this pressure was applied were many and varied. Denominational boards memorialized Congress on virtually every aspect of Indian affairs. There was a steady flow of correspondence in both directions between the War Department and the mission stations in the Indian country. Missionaries made recommendations on such
matters as the handling of federal education funds, the form of government best suited for the Indians, military posts in the Indian country, conduct of Indian agents, and how to deal with a small-pox epidemic.

The federal government encouraged the missionaries to participate actively in Indian affairs. Missionaries were commissioned to make surveys and report their findings to the War Department. These in turn quite often resulted in important changes in policy. Considerable dependence was placed on the reports from the mission stations. These included the required statistics of the progress of the schools but more importantly, that which might be considered intelligence information, which only one who had the implicit trust and confidence of the Indian people could have known. Occasionally, missionaries were appointed to posts of agent and sub-agent of Indian affairs. In such instances, the missionary was often permitted to continue in the role of a religious teacher while performing the functions of a federal official. The War Department channeled many of its messages to Indian leaders through the missionary. Not only was the religious teacher asked to convey the letter, but, of more value to the government, he was to urge upon the Indians its acceptance.

The federal government's civilizing measures relating to the Indians during the years 1789 to 1815 were half-hearted and far from impressive. They were frustrated by the threat of the British on the Northwest and Spanish intrigues in the South. Frontier struggles and the friction between the federal government and the states only served to further aggravate any serious attempt to civilize the red man. While the War Department occasionally gave gifts of money or farming implements to missionaries, there was relatively
little active government participation in the civilization efforts of mission societies. In the year 1819, however, Congress voted an appropriation of $10,000 annually for Indian education. This was to be greatly supplemented in the ensuing years by the allotment of funds by the Indians from the sale of their lands. Quite often, missionaries were made the custodians of these monies. In fact, it was usually the missionary who attend the treaty negotiations and persuaded the natives to provide for the education of their children. The federal government not only urged missionaries to be present at the treaty sessions but paid their expenses and assisted them in their efforts. In the expenditure of these funds, some missionaries were salaried outright by the government with others receiving their support from the denominational board that was subsidized by the government. Sectarian mission boards not only appointed all teachers for the mission schools, but had the responsibility of selecting and directing the government salaried blacksmith and farmer.

After the year 1819, the government channeled its funds through the denominational mission boards mainly because it had no machinery of its own for Indian schools. Then, too, it was the church that urged upon the federal officials this new attempt to civilize the Indians. Federal funds were then apportioned among missionaries to enable them to establish schools. Such an arrangement, however, amounted to the government subsidization of not only the civilizing of Indians but their conversion to the Christian religion as well. No limitations were placed on sectarian preaching and teaching so long as the denominational school conformed to the educational system adopted by the War Department and periodic reports were faithfully made. It was an ideal arrangement for the missionary for it provided not only needed financial support but
the status of a representative of the federal government.

The role of the missionary in government policy must be seen in yet another perspective. In the mission schools, the sectarian religious teacher was indoctrinating the Indian youth with his own beliefs. These were concerned not only with religious precepts but they related to all the areas of life. Missionaries were invited to preach in the Council House and their advice was sought on problems quite often unrelated to religious matters. It was possible even to apply pressure on the federal government through the Indians themselves. Letters and documents calling for a change of policy and signed by the officials representing the various tribes, were sometimes drafted by the missionary and represented some of his own opinions. While this kind of influence is elusive and virtually impossible to document, it cannot be ignored. Through his converts, the missionary was creating a channel through which his will not only would be known but perhaps more effectively executed. Quietly behind the scenes, the solitary religious teacher was making his influence felt. This was most evident in an hour of crisis, such as that of the removal issue, when converts of a given denominational mission board tended to have the same views on the controversy as that board's missionary. While it is true that the missionary did not publicly declare his position, years of intimate relations left no doubt as to where he stood.

The role of the missionary in executing government Indian policy cannot be discounted. From a purely logical standpoint, it would seem that the very nature of his mission, primarily humanitarian, would bring him into a closer relation with the natives. Consequently, working through the missionary, was for the government, if nothing more, just good practical politics. From the
view of the missionary, it was an excellent arrangement through which his God-
given mission could be accomplished, that of indoctrinating the Indians in his
sectarian religious beliefs and instructing them in the white man's farming
techniques.

In assessing the value of missionary counsel, it must be noted that it was
divided and conflicting. The various Protestant mission groups were not agreed
on the procedures and methods to be employed in civilizing the Indians. They
were, however, unanimous in insisting that ultimately the Indian must be con-
verted to the Christian religion. Whether conversion should precede or proceed
civilizing was to be debated. Some sectarians contended that the natives were
unable to comprehend the Christian religion until they had been raised to a
certain level of civilization. Most insisted, however, that in some manner
the "Bible and plough must go together." As to the best environment for
instruction, one group wanted to integrate the Indian into white society while
others saw segregation as the only solution. One plan called for the establish-
ing of white "education families" or colonies among the Indians to teach them
by precept and example the white man's way. The segregation plan, unfortunat-
ely, called for constant removal of the Indians as the pressure of the white
population increased. It was always cited as evidence of the necessity of
Indian removal in the 1820's.

Another point of difference was concerned with where the mission schools
could best be located, in the white community or in the Indian country.
Missionaries could be found on either side of this debate with some taking a
compromise position which called for the first years of schooling in the
Indian habitat with the better students completing their studies in the white
community. How to create a taste for the white man's civilization was another problem. In some way, it was thought, the Indian must learn to appreciate private ownership of property. Missionaries were divided on the question of whether the natives should be permitted to have their own laws and constitution or be brought under the authority of the states and federal government. Which language to use in the education process, English or native, was also debated. In most mission schools, however, the native children were required to lay aside their customs and language.

Consequently, on plans, procedures, and particular issues, Protestant missionaries were not at all agreed as to what the government policy should be. Nowhere was this division of opinion more disastrous than in the Indian removal issue of the 1820's. One party of missionaries, believing that segregation of the Indians from the whites was essential to the preservation of the former, gave undivided support to the removal policy of the Jackson administration. The American Board of Missions, convinced that the Indians had made considerable progress in civilization led the forces that opposed any further removal of the natives.

This division within the missionary forces tended to diminish their strength and obviously lessened their effectiveness in influencing changes in government policy. Unfortunately the Indian, who was the supposed beneficiary of the missionary's benevolence, suffered the most.

As has already been indicated, this study is concerned with the role of the Protestant missionary in formulating and executing the government's Indian policy. It is not meant to be a detailed account of the government policy as such nor it is a history of protestant missions to the Indians. The purpose is
to show how the practices of the missionary reacted on public policy. As to
the choice of dates, 1789 has been chosen as the starting point because in some
respects it marks the beginning of the formative period of the nation's Indian
policy. This does not mean to imply that there was a definite break at this
point since the Indian policy of the Washington administration was in many
respects an adaptation of the British and Confederation experiences. There
were also at this time some renewed attempts by certain religious groups to
send missionaries to the Indians. These efforts had been disrupted during the
Revolutionary War. The great impetus to Indian missions, however, did not
come until the second decade of the nineteenth century. The closing date,
1840, was selected because it marks the end of the removal of the Indians to
the west of the Mississippi. A geographical restriction seemed necessary and
for this reason, the study is limited to the developments east of the
Mississippi.

The paper is divided into two sections. The first is primarily concerned
with the role of the missionary in the attempts made to civilize the Indians
during the years 1789 to 1830, while the second deals with the removal issue.
Although the discussion of the latter overlaps that of the former chronologi-
cally, it was thought that the removal issue warranted consideration as a
separate topic. The removal issue covers most of the period since it was first
proposed by Thomas Jefferson in 1803 but it did not become the object of
serious debate until some twenty years later.

Finally, this project is a study of the role of the church in American
history. Anson Phelps Stokes in the preface to his volumes on Church and
State in the United States points up the need for more serious study of the
role of the church in the development of public policy. There are histories of American art, business, invention, expansion, transportation, immigration, sectionalism, and education. Histories of religion in America, of Christianity and of the major denominations have been written. There is one area of American religion that needs further study; it is the contact between church and state. The part played by Protestant missionaries in the formulation and execution of Indian policy during the first half century of life under the Constitution exhibits one facet of the interdependence of church and state in American history.
Chapter I

Early Attempts, 1789-1815

When Washington took office as first President of the United States under the Constitution, he faced a crisis in Indian affairs. Individual states insisted on dealing independently with the Indian tribes making a unified approach to the problem almost impossible. During the Confederation period, the colonists had resisted the efforts of the Confederation Congress to impose a unified Indian land policy. Some of the states impaired the war effort by fighting and negotiating with the tribes without consulting Congress. The new Constitution simply stated that Congress had the power to "regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes." This provision was not designed to clarify the jurisdictional dispute but to encourage the states to ratify the Constitution.¹

The changed status of the Indian as a result of the Revolutionary War remained a source of contention. The Indian tribes had placed themselves under the sovereignty of the United States. This, they contended, had been done voluntarily in consideration of the protection promised and the perpetual right of occupancy within the territory of the United States. The Confederation Congress had negotiated separate treaties with the tribes; the confederation of Indian nations wanted all cessions of land to be approved by all the nations. In addition to this, the Indians had determined never to abandon their lands northwest of the Ohio River. In fact they had warned the United States that
unless surveyors and other people were kept from their side of the Ohio River, that they would be "obliged to defend those rights and privileges which have been transmitted to us by our ancestors." 

The Washington administration was confronted with the Spanish intrigues in the South. In 1789, approximately one half of the territory of the United States South of the Ohio was in possession of the Indians. The four powerful tribes, Creeks, Cherokees, Chickasaws and Choctaws, occupied land largely within the territory of the United States but also within the region disputed with Spain. Of the 50,000 Indians in these four tribes, most were hostile to the United States. They were also a threat to the southern frontier and a barrier to southern expansion. 

Perhaps a more urgent problem for the new government was how to restrain the frontiersman. The rapidly expanding population refused to ignore the rich lands in the west and the Indians were determined not to yield them without a struggle. The American government was caught in the middle of the conflict and could only make the process for the Indian a little less painful. While the administration planned a policy of peace, it was forced to wage a five-year war. 

In January, 1789, Governor St. Clair signed two treaties at Fort Harmar; one with the Six Nations, and the other with the Wyandots, Delawares, Ottawas, and Chippewas. He informed the Indians that while the United States did not fully concede the Indian right to the land of the Northwest, it was ready to pay for it. No treaty, however, could solve the basic dissatisfaction of the Indians, that of losing their lands.

The management of Indian affairs was intrusted in 1789, by Congress, to the War Department. At the same time, $20,000 annual appropriation was
provided to defray the expenses of negotiating treaties. The two geographical divisions created in 1786, providing for a northern and southern department, were retained. The territorial governors were considered as ex-officio superintendents of Indian affairs, a practice initiated in September, 1789. Special agents were appointed in 1792 to deal with special problems in the Indian country. In 1793 the President was given the authority to appoint temporary agents to reside among the Indians. The agents were under the general superintendents and reported to the War Department through them. The sub-agent was at first an assistant to the agent but later was assigned to a separate location.

The enforcement procedure of legislation designed to protect the Indian was most inadequate. The distinction between the Indian country and ceded territory proved to be an enforcement problem. It became the accepted opinion that federal regulation and the supervision of the superintendents and agents applied only to the lands still owned and occupied by the Indians. In those areas where the Indian title had been extinguished, federal laws did not apply. Not only did the very expanse of the frontier and the great number of settlers make difficult any systematic enforcement of Indian legislation, but the agents themselves lacked power to enforce decisions. They were obliged to call on the military commanders and both had to apply to the courts for action. Frontier courts usually represented the frontier thinking and manifested opposition to the Indians and to the federal officials sent to protect them.

It was within this framework that the Indian policy of the Washington administration was formulated. In a report dated June 15, 1789, Henry Knox, Secretary of War, outlined the basic principles to be followed in dealing with
the Indians. Financial and humanitarian reasons necessitated the purchase of the western lands. All treaties were to be carried out. The emigration of the whites was to be restrained, hoping that the gradual taking over of Indian lands might be peaceful and as economical as possible. He urged negotiation rather than war, insisting that justice and economic considerations rendered this the best policy. He figured that it would cost $15,000 annually to attach the Indians North and South of the Ohio to the United States but the use of force would cost considerably more. In order to enforce the treaties and preserve peace on the frontier, Knox advocated the establishment of a line of garrisons in the Indian country. His program called for the civilisation of the Indians and for this purpose, missionaries were to be employed by the government. He admitted that it might not be possible to fully civilise the Indians, but the missionaries would serve to attach them to the American interests. President Washington was in basic agreement with Knox, and saw the problem of friendship with the Indians and the development of the West intertwined. The policy, however, revolved around the problem of acquisition of land. It assumed that the pressure of the white population would cause the Indians to sell their land cheaply. The plan was to give the native as much justice as was compatible with the wholesale acquisition of land. Thus, while hoping for peace, Indian resistance resulted in a five-year war, for the United States.

The role of the missionary in government Indian policy during the first decade of this nation's existence was determined by the immediate crisis that confronted the Washington administration north of the Ohio and, secondly, by the long-range policy of peaceful penetration into the Indian country.
Missionaries were called upon to use their positions of trust and confidence among the Indians to implement this policy and to offer recommendations for its improvement. The projected policy of peaceful relations with the Indians called for civilisation or the acquiring of the white man's farming techniques. Henry Knox, Secretary of War, and principal architect of the Indian policy in 1789, urged the use of missionaries as the "instruments to work on the Indians." All gifts from the government to the Indians would "pass through their hands, or by their recommendations." For the next several years, some encouragement was given by the federal government to religious organisations engaged in missionary work to the Indians. Sometimes this was in the form of an official endorsement while in other instances, money or implements and other supplies were provided out of federal funds.

It must be kept in mind that the civilisation scheme of the government was postulated on the theory that a civilised Indian would need less land and would be willing to sell the surplus created. It was assumed that the Indian would be removed or absorbed. As the whites invaded the Indian hunting grounds and killed off the game, the Indians would be induced to sell their lands and move west. To reconcile this with civilising the Indian and settling him on a farm seemed an impossibility. Perhaps, the second reason for the plan was more important, that is, in civilising the Indian, he would become more peaceful and docile while the painful process of losing most of his lands was completed. President Washington and the officials of his administration by and large appeared to be sincere in their desire to help the Indian but they were also realists. They knew what surely had to happen as the whites continued to approach the Indian country. The administration wanted to prevent
any major war with the united Indian nations.

The first major crisis in Indian relations for the Washington administration came in 1790. For many years the Indians northwest of the Ohio had proved themselves to be formidable enemies of white emigrants who settled near them and of the armies of the United States. Serving under French commanders in former wars, they were quite well trained in the use of European firearms. With the encouragement of the British, the western Indians resisted all peaceful efforts of the United States. They insisted upon the Ohio as the boundary and demanded that settlers advance no further. How to pacify these Indians who were greatly agitated by the advance of white settlers across the Ohio was the first and gravest problem.16

The crisis was precipitated by the refusal on the part of the United States' government to deal with the United Nations of Indians and the efforts of St. Clair to force the Indians into separate treaties. On September 19, 1790, the Shawnees, Ottawas, Potawatomies, Delawares, Syandots, Miamis, Mingos, and Chippewas took to the warpath. General Josiah Harmar, commander of the American forces north of the Ohio, decided to settle the problem by a raid into the Indian country. As one author declares, the only thing accomplished by Harmar was to raise Indian morale.17 President Washington decided to deal with the Senecas of the Six Nations in New York whose connections with the western tribes were most intimate. He urged them to exert their influence to persuade the confederacy to abandon the warpath. He invited Cornplanter, the Seneca chief, to visit Philadelphia with a delegation from his tribe. On December 1, 1790, Cornplanter spoke in behalf of his people and was assured by the President that "no state, nor person, can purchase
your lands, unless at some public treaty, held under the authority of the United States. The General Government will never consent to your being defrauded, but it will protect you in all your just rights." The Seneca chief asked the President to provide instruction for them in farming techniques, in the building of saw mills and to supply them with "broad axes, saws, augers, and other tools..." They also asked for teachers and schools for their children. Cornplanter held conferences with the Quakers while in Philadelphia. Under the direction of Quaker representatives, schools were later established in the Seneca country.

In the spring of 1791, the hostile demonstrations of the western Indians was causing great concern; Washington's attempt to use the Senecas as mediators had not brought any constructive results. Little Turtle's alliance of the western nations against the United States, thanks to the Harmar episode, was stronger than ever. It seemed that all expeditious for reconciliation with them had been exhausted. More importantly Harmar's defeat had tended to confirm the wavering purposes of the Six Nations and encourage them to join in with the hostile forces that threatened to break up the border settlements west of the Ohio. Had they been successful there, all of the new settlements in the Genesee country would be involved in the conflict. At this point Colonel Pickering was commissioned to hold a treaty with the Six Nations in New York at Newtown in June, 1791. Some five hundred Senecas attended, accompanied by Red Jacket and Cornplanter. Complications arose with the state of New York at a time when it was absolutely necessary for the United States to conciliate the Six Nations in the crisis. New York was adverse to all measures that might give the Indians a permanent title to the lands they
held within her limits. There was considerable opposition to the ratification of the treaty on the part of those New Yorkers who had hoped to get possession of the Indian lands. Cornplanter again stated the desire of his people to become civilized. 22

At the treaty sessions in 1791, the United States commissioners invited the Six Nations to send a delegation of chiefs to visit the government officials in Philadelphia during the next session of Congress (1791-92). The purpose of the visit was threefold. The United States wanted to prevent the Six Nations from joining the hostile western Indians. It was also necessary to impress upon them the physical and moral strength of the country so that they might "see with their own eyes how futile must be every warlike effort of the Indians against the United States." Finally, there was further need for consultation as to the best method for introducing among the Six Nations the "advantages and blessings of civilization." 23

At this time, 1791, Samuel Kirkland had been carrying on a correspondence with Captain Brant, the Mohawk chief. In March, Brant had written to Kirkland stating that he wanted to bring peace between the United States and the hostile Indians but insisted that the system of treaty making would have to be changed. The federal government, Brant declared, must call a general treaty with the United Nations and stop dealing with them as separate tribes or nations. 24 Kirkland wrote to Knox, Secretary of War, enclosed Brant's letter, and suggested that Knox send Captain Hendricks, a chief of the Stockbridge tribe, to talk with the western nations. The Stockbridge tribe, Kirkland declared, formerly had more influence with the Miamis, Shawnees, Delawares, and Chippewas than all the Six Nations. Hendricks was well acquainted with their customs
and manners, the missionary informed Knox, and he had received invitations to visit them. Knox approved of Kirkland's idea and wrote to Hendricks accordingly. The Hendricks mission, unfortunately, was not successful. The western Indians continued their hostile spirit and demonstrations.

With the breakdown of negotiations, General St. Clair led a force north in October, 1791. Attacked while encamped on the Maumee River, his army retreated in panic and suffered one of the worst defeats ever inflicted by the Indians on the white man. Writing to his wife on December 8, 1791, Pickering lamented that the "Indians will be less than ever inclined to peace." He stated that he had been reading a pamphlet sent to him by two Quakers, Pemberton and Parrish, and that he was inclined to agree with them that the "deplorable Indian war" might have been averted. Furthermore, the victory of the Miamis over St. Clair had so excited the Senecas that there was prospect of further uprising under their leadership.

An expensive and disastrous war, Pickering declared, now made it of extreme importance to preserve peace with the tribes in New York. He wrote to his wife on December 20, 1791, "It appeared to me highly expedient that a few of the chiefs of the Six Nations should come to Philadelphia as early as possible." Knox wrote to Kirkland giving him the responsibility of bringing the chiefs of the Six Nations to Philadelphia and, if possible, Captain Brant. Since Brant exercised a great influence, not only upon the Six Nations but over all the Indian nations, it was deemed an important point to persuade him to attend the anticipated meetings at Philadelphia. According to the plan, Kirkland was to go to Genesee to meet the chiefs of the Six Nations who were going to Philadelphia and accompany them on their journey to the capital city.
Arriving at Genesee, Kirkland was instructed to write to Captain Brant in his own name and then send messengers to Brant assuring him of the friendliness of the government and pledging himself for his personal safety. The Secretary of War told the missionary that "your knowledge of the language and customs of the Inidans, a confidence in your character and integrity, induce me to place an entire reliance on your reliability to this business."  

Kirkland discovered that the victory over St. Clair had produced a great sensation among the Six Nations and now they were thirsting for war. The western Indians were urging the Six Nations to join them and had threatened to attack them too if they rejected the offer. The idea of a visit to Philadelphia was not so acceptable as it had been in June of 1791. Several of the chiefs had gone to attend a secret council at Buffalo Creek. Kirkland heard that the British had supplied eighteen boat loads of supplies from Detroit for the recent attack on St. Clair's army and that they were also building large ships on Lake Erie. Kirkland tried in every possible way to persuade the Indians that a policy of war would destroy them. He succeeded in bringing together a council of the Six Nations in spite of the threats of the western nations and the intrigues of the hostile whites. He persuaded the council to send a large delegation of chiefs to Philadelphia to negotiate with the federal government.  

Pickering had written Kirkland that he should stop at his house and Mrs. Pickering would entertain them with a breakfast or dinner. He wrote to his wife, "I have requested Mr. Kirkland to take them to see you and the children."  

The delegation arrived in Philadelphia in March, 1792, for a six-week visit. There were some forty chiefs and warriors in the group. While the
delegation was much larger than had been anticipated, Kirkland had written stating that it would be better to bring 500, rather than offend someone when the situation was so serious. This was the largest and most important Indian representation ever to visit the government. The success of persuading the delegation to come to Washington was chiefly due to the efforts and influence of Kirkland. There had been a growing desire on the part of the Six Nations to join the western Indians and take the position of hostility to the United States. Had they done so, the frontier of New York and Pennsylvania would have been the scene of savage warfare. 32

One problem remained unsolved, namely, how to get Brant to Philadelphia. He had scorned the proposal of Kirkland, that is, to accompany the delegation. It was possible that the British influence at Niagara had been strong enough to induce him to reject immediate acceptance of the invitation. In a letter to Kirkland, Brant intimated that if he went to Philadelphia, it would have to be in a manner more consistent with his character and position. Knox then sent a special letter of invitation to Brant urging him to use his great influence toward reconciling the existing Indian difficulties. Brant replied to the effect that he would leave for Philadelphia within thirty days. He arrived in the city in June, 1792. Every effort was made to engage the active participation of Brant in bringing about peace with the western nations and conciliating his friendship to the United States.33 To the degree that the plan called for using the Six Nations as mediators between the federal government and the western Indians, it was a success. It also secured to the Six Nations a larger measure of the patronage and efforts of the government in their behalf for the promotion of education and the introduction of
agriculture and the arts of civilization among them. It did not, however, bring peace between the United States and the western Indians. The Six Nations, however, continued on friendly relations with the United States.

The humiliating defeat of General St. Clair at the great battle of the Miami had revealed the bankruptcy of American Indian policy. The inability of the Six Nations to mediate a peaceful settlement with the hostile western tribes, necessitated further attempts at conciliation. The government sent General Rufus Putnam with the missionary, John Heckewelder to negotiate a treaty with the Wabash Indians. The plan was to detach these tribes from those farther west and thus prevent a completion of the Indian federation. In the instructions to Putnam, Secretary of War Henry Knox stated that "The United States are highly desirous of imparting to all the Indian tribes the blessings of civilisation, as the only means of perpetuating them on the earth." The government had asked Heckewelder to accompany Putnam because it was thought that his presence would be a guarantee to the Indians of the government's good intentions. A treaty was negotiated in September, 1792, but the Senate refused to ratify it on the grounds that it did not contain a clause guaranteeing America the right of pre-emption. They also disapproved of the Indian insistence that the Ohio be forever the boundary between them and the United States.

In the fall of 1792, a council was held by Indians of various tribes at which time it was decided to extend an invitation to the Americans to attend a peace conference the following spring at Anglaise, on the Miami of Lake Erie. States government accepted but with little hope of any successful outcome. General Anthony Wayne had just advanced into the Indian country with
a large army. The Indians had insisted that the conference be held at Anglaise, not far from Detroit. Pickering, one of the commissioners for the United States, was a bit hesitant to comply since it necessitated passing through British-held territory. The United States Commissioners were under constant surveillance by the British. British officers were detailed to accompany them and they were not permitted to go to Detroit but were required to stay at Niagara. Everything transacted between the Indians and the United States had to be done in the presence of the British. The commissioners were not permitted to meet the great Indian council at the place where it was to be held. They were held at a distance and the Indians appeared to them through deputies so that all negotiations for a treaty were prevented. It was a most crucial hour for the Indians for it resulted in the choice of war rather than peace with the United States. Within a year the power of the tribes North of the Ohio would be forever broken by their utter defeat at the hand of Wayne's army.  

Sensing the importance of this conference and hoping for some peaceful conclusion, the War Department called on the assistance of the Quakers. Writing to Jefferson on March 22, 1793, President Washington mentioned that the Quakers were desirous of sending a deputation to the council and suggested that "if done with pure motives \[it\] may be a means of facilitating the good work of peace." He then suggested that consideration should be given to their participation in the deliberations.  

Pickering wrote in his journal that the Quakers were present at the treaty sessions to contribute "their influence to induce the hostile Indians to a peace." Not only was the government desirous of the services of the Quakers in this crisis, but the
Indians themselves had requested that some of them be present and appointed on the commission to treat with them. Secretary of War Knox recommended that the missionary John Heckewelder accompany the American Commissioners to the treaty. His presence, it was thought, would have a conciliating effect and would serve to offset the suspicions aroused among the Indians by Wayne’s activity in the neighborhood. In the instructions to the commissioners, Messrs. Lincoln, Randolph and Pickering, Knox wrote: "The Rev. John Heckewelder, a Moravian teacher, who resided many years among the Moravian Indians of Delawares, will accompany you, in order, also, to use his influence towards a peace." The Secretary of War stated that the missionary was most essential to the deliberations since he "well understands the Delaware tongue, and, although he is unwilling to act as a common interpreter, yet you may rely upon his ability to correct others and prevent imposition. His knowledge of Indian customs and manners may be of great use in your negotiations." The veteran missionary to the Oneidas, Samuel Kirkland, visited with General Lincoln with several Indians and expressed his satisfaction in attempts being made for a peaceful settlement between the western Indians and the United States.

During the deliberations, the missionaries were most active in trying to bring together the opposing parties. The points of contention were the presence of Wayne’s army and what appeared to the Indians to be hostile activity. They also wanted to know if the United States was willing to make the Ohio the boundary line. If this could be agreed to, then it was expected that all of the whites would be immediately removed to the other side of the river. Heckewelder, the Moravian missionary, held a conference with the war
chief, Blue Jacket, and inquired of him the prospects of peace. He recorded in his journal that Blue Jacket would not commit himself and that according to the accounts that he was receiving, there was little hope for peace. It appeared that the western nations were assembling for war. One indication was the fact that the customary practice of bringing women and children to treaty sessions was not observed this time, thus creating the impression that war was imminent. Heckewelder recorded in his diary that a deputation from the Cherokee and Creek nations had arrived on the Miami with "a British leader at their head and that their business was to encourage these Nations to continue the war, and to make known the great successes they had had to the Southward against the people of the United States of late . . . ." The Moravian missionary later had a conference with the Delawares. He observed that they were determined that the Ohio should be the boundary and the white settlements be removed. They also expressed their resentment at the idea of the United States sending an army into their country.  

The Quakers were engaged during the deliberations in attempting to find some point of agreement between the United States and the western Indians. Prior to their arrival they had notified the Indians of the Northwest of their interest and concern and especially the desire on their part to send some of their men to teach the Indian children how to read and write and instruct them in the tilling of the ground. Upon arrival the Indians expressed pleasure at seeing the Quakers present and indicated that they knew of their fine character in dealings with the Indians. Once the commissioners for the government had informed the Indians that it was impossible to make the Ohio the boundary, the negotiations broke down. The Quakers then debated sending
one of their number with some Indians to their Council but this was thought to be too dangerous since any American citizen was forbidden to come on the ground where the grand council was being held. In fact they had received news that should the Americans refuse to come to terms, "the Indians will sacrifice all the Americans on the spot." This information was conveyed to the Americans by two Shawnees who had been to the Indian Council. They also stated that the western Indians "want neither presents nor purchase money, but their hunting grounds, without which they cannot subsist; and for their recovery they will risk their lives." After the breakdown of the negotiations Pickering briefed the missionaries on everything that had happened, showing them the "commissioners' books and papers." They had received a message from the Indian council in which the right of pre-emption to Indian lands as vested in the United States was rejected. They also insisted that all of the lands west of the Ohio were theirs. The commissioners refused to accept the terms, packed up and left. On the way home, the commissioners stopped and conferred with missionary Samuel Kirkland filling him in on all that had happened. Kirkland after hearing the terms proposed by the United States thought that they were such that "their very enemies would think them generous and fair and that the Indians were unwise in not accepting them." The so-called policy of peaceful penetration accompanied with promises of schools and missionaries had come up against the stone wall of Indian resistance. Missionary influence had gone a long way in bringing the Six Nations under control but it was helpless in persuading the western Indians of the "benefits" of the United States' civilization plan.

The year 1794 opened with gloomy prospects. Negotiations with the
western Indians had failed; one army had been routed and another defeated. Indian murders of border settlers at the west continued; a war with England was not improbable. There was the imminent danger of a renewal of the border wars with the active participation of the western confederation of Indians. The disastrous defeat of the Indians by Wayne's army at the Battle of Fallen Timbers in August, 1794, proved however, to be a turning point in the three-way conflict between the western Indians, British influence and the United States. The power of the tribes north of the Ohio was broken. The Treaty of Greenville of June, 1795 gave a feeling of security to the region. At the same time, it extinguished the Indian title to a large portion of the Northwest Territory. The area relinquished was eastern and southern Ohio with a strip of southeastern Indiana. The United States was also given the right of pre-emption to the rest of the land of the Northwest. It was given sixteen reservations of land on the Indian side of the boundary line to serve as military posts and free communication between them was granted. A line was left between the whites and the Indians but only theoretically since it was never seriously regarded by the United States. Territorial organization preceded and in 1800 the Indiana Territory was organized disregarding any assumed line.

The other area in which missionaries exerted influence on the government Indian policy during the Federalist era was related to the proposed plan to educate the Indians. Missionary activity in this regard was thwarted by the fact that the government was so preoccupied with the Indians of the Northwest that it had little time or money to expend on Indian education. A most impressive plan for Indian education was submitted by the veteran missionary to the Oneidas, Samuel Kirkland. A copy of the plan was sent to Timothy
Pickering in 1791 who, after suggesting some alterations, gave his approval. The plan called for the establishment of small schools within the Indian territory and an academy in the vicinity of Oneida. Whites were to be admitted to the academy and a certain number of Indian youths. The former were to assist the Indian students in the acquisition of the English language. They were to be "instructed in the principles of human nature, in the history of civil society, so as to be able to discern the difference between a state of nature and a state of civilisation..." Kirkland also thought that there should be instruction in various languages, geography, music, logic, laws and government, and the principles of agriculture. The plan called for the erection of work houses in each village where females could learn to read, write, and become trained in spinning and weaving. Farmers were to be stationed in some of the villages to show the new how to till the soil. After the first year, the expenses of the whole program were to be defrayed by the Indians themselves. Secretary of War Henry Knox asked Kirkland to submit to his department an estimate of the total cost of implementing his program. In doing so, according to Knox's request, Kirkland suggested that the United States government could well afford to subsidize the proposed schools because they would serve to attach the Six Nations to the United States and induce the former to influence the western nations to become more peaceful.

In 1792 Kirkland visited New York and conferred with the governor on the education plan for the Six Nations. He then went on to Philadelphia and had conferences with President Washington, Pickering, Hamilton and others. Hamilton consented to be one of the trustees and along with Washington and Pickering, offered his support. The cornerstone for the first academy building
was laid in 1794 by the Baron Frederick William von Steuben, drill master of the Revolutionary War and Washington's inspector general. The times were not conducive to the implementation of Kirkland's plan or perhaps any other. A report in 1797 stated that Hamilton Academy had one building partly completed but the work on it had been suspended. There was a small school about half a mile from the academy where students were taught for a short time. There had not, however, been any school there since September, 1794. The report of the Board of Regents of New York in 1797 also indicated that the Academy was in a worse situation than in the preceding year. The white population gradually lost faith in the possibility of civilising the Indians and the school proved to be of more value to the white settlements.

The activity of the Quakers during the last years of the Federalist period did assist the government in maintaining friendly relations with the Six Nations and produced some commendable results in attempts to civilise them. In 1794, the Treaty with the Six Nations provided that $4,500 be spent annually "in purchasing clothing, domestic animals, implements of husbandry, and other utensils suited to their circumstances, and in compensating useful artificers, who shall reside with or near them, and be employed for their benefit." At this treaty, the Quakers had assisted in the negotiations as witnesses at the request of Red Jacket and the United States government. Red Jacket informed the Quakers that he wanted them to be present to see that the Indians "were not deceived or imposed upon." The Quakers, while approving of the civilisation provision, refused to sign the treaty because they thought the Indians were not receiving fair compensation of the tracts of land ceded to the United States. For the next five years, the Society of Friends sent a
number of their young men to live among the Indians of the Six Nations for the purpose of teaching them how to cultivate their lands. In the summer of 1796 three Quakers settled among the Oneidas, remaining there for some three years. They found that with few exceptions, the Indians were averse to work. Premiums were offered to excite competition among the Indian men in the raising of crops and among the women for the weaving of woolen cloth. Schools were maintained for part of the year. The station was closed in 1799 and the blacksmith tools and implements of husbandry given as presents to the Indians. A settlement of Friends among the Senecas was made in 1798 within the state of New York. This work continued for some six years. An effort was made to teach the Indians the ways of civilized life and at the same time to influence them religiously. The Quakers were also invited to visit the Wyandot Indians on the Upper Sandusky in 1799. A committee was sent but they were greatly depressed by the "terrible havoc which they saw was being wrought among the Indians by the use of spirituous liquors." It had been ten years ago that Cornplanter, chief of the Seneca tribe, had visited Philadelphia and asked the President of the new Republic to send them teachers and provide them with farming implements. The government and the missionaries had found their plans frustrated and thwarted by the hostility of the western Indians, the intrigues of the British, and the voracious appetite of the whites for Indian lands. Even in those isolated and sporadic attempts made to civilize some of the Indians of the Six Nations, mistrust and suspicion of the missionary's motives, the Indian averseness to work, and the "use of spirituous liquors" rendered any significant progress impossible.

The election of Thomas Jefferson in 1800 brought about no revolution in
Indian policy. Many of the problems that had plagued the Federalists still persisted. Emigration to the frontier of thousands of whites and the powerful influence of land speculators intensified the drive to acquire Indian lands. This was particularly true in connection with the Northwest Territory. William Henry Harrison, governor of the Northwest Territory from 1800 to 1812, was involved in fifteen treaties which ceded to the United States most of what is today Indiana and Illinois, a segment of Ohio and portions of Michigan and Wisconsin. The British were continuing their intrigues among the western Indians and the Spanish threat in the South was still present.

The civilization of the Indians received the support of President Jefferson. In his inaugural address he declared that the Indian was "endowed with the faculties and the rights of men, breathing an ardent love for liberty and independence, and occupying a country which left him no desire but to be undisturbed..." He then stated that the United States was obligated to furnish the Indians with "the implements of husbandry and household use." In his annual message, December 8, 1801, the President reported that the continued efforts to "introduce among them the implements and the practice of husbandry and of the household arts have not been without success." In August, 1802, while making plans to take over most of the Indian lands, Governor Harrison told the Wabash tribes that the President wanted them to form towns and villages and that he would provide them with "horses, cattle, hogs, and implements of husbandry, and will have persons to instruct" them in their use.

The stated policy as outlined in presidential addresses, directives of the War Department, and treaty negotiations must be understood within the
context of other statements, equally, if not more important. On August 12, 1802, Jefferson suggested, in a letter to the Secretary of War, that trading houses could be used for preserving the friendship of the Indians. Furthermore, the president said that "there is perhaps no method more irresistible of obtaining lands from them than by letting them get into debt, which when too heavy to be paid, they are always willing to lop off a cession of land." 68 

In a letter to William Henry Harrison, on February 27, 1802, Jefferson expressed the same views. 69 In that same year he noted the reluctance of the Indians to make further cessions of land to the whites. He then advocated the establishment of trading houses to get the Indians used to the white man's goods. To further assist in overcoming their reluctance to give up land, the Indians were to be encouraged to apply themselves to the raising of stock, to agriculture and to domestic manufacture. 70 It must be concluded then, that the primary consideration in the Jefferson Indian policy was the acquisition of land and that in some mysterious way there was an attempt to combine a concern for the welfare of the Indian with a voracious appetite for Indian land. 71 After the Treaty of San Ildefonso, fearing French influence might result in greater danger, Jefferson instructed Harrison that "whatever now can be obtained, must be obtained quickly." After 1803 and the Purchase of Louisiana, Jefferson became interested in a plan to remove all the Indians to the West of the Mississippi. 72

Any influence exerted by missionaries on the Jeffersonian Indian policy was limited to the civilization program and primarily in assisting the government in implementing the plan. The painful experiences of Indian wars on the frontier combined with the revival of missionary interest persuaded
many Christian leaders of the necessity of Indian missions. They thought that conversion of the Indians would be the peaceful way of solving a difficult problem. While the official government policy was designed to make acquisition of Indian lands as economical and peaceful process as possible; the missionary was concerned with the need for peace as against the strife of war and saw in civilization the hope of the Indian race. There was no official or formal plan to be followed for the implementation of civilization measures. The various church groups experimented with different plans. There was no agreement as to procedure. For example, the Quakers thought that the Indians had to reach a certain level of civilization before they could grasp the precepts of Christianity. To them the Christian example was far more important than indoctrination in the Christian religion. For this purpose, a single man or a Quaker family was commissioned to reside among the Indians for a limited period of time. While giving instruction in methods of farming and the use of farm implements, they would serve as an example of the superiority of the white man's religion. The Moravians established colonies of Christian Indians. The thinking behind this approach was the necessity of separating the aborigines from contact with white persons, except those who would present a proper example of morality, industry and piety. The labors of missionaries among the Indians was often sporadic and short-lived. The receptivity of the Indian to the missionary and his message was sometimes friendly, but more often one of disinterest or obstinate hostility. The greatest thorn in the flesh for the missionary was the fact that Indians tended to identify friendliness with whites with the loss of tribal lands. This assisted, together with denominational differences, in
destroying most of the idealistic missionary attempts to convert and civilize the red man.

The degree of missionary influence in the civilization efforts of the Jefferson administration may best be documented by official endorsements and, in some instances, financial support of those responsible for the conduct of Indian affairs. The President had at his disposal an annual appropriation of $15,000 which he could use for civilization purposes. The President was given considerable discretion in the disbursement of the funds. He might furnish the various tribes with domestic animals, implements of husbandry, or even money. He had the authority to appoint temporary agents to live among them in order to instruct some of the Indians in the use of implements of agriculture. The President directed, in certain instances, that some of this money should be applied to the support of mission schools. Rev. Steiner was given permission to establish a school among the Cherokees in 1800. Mainly due to the advocacy of Colones Return J. Meigs, the missionary received an annual grant of $100 for the school. Primers and Bibles were also supplied. In 1803 Gideon Blackburn, a Presbyterian clergyman, made request for federal aid in order to open a school among the Cherokees. The Cherokee agent was instructed to erect a school house at federal expense. In 1806, the Secretary of War instructed Colones Meigs to pay Blackburn $300 "for the encouragement of the civilization of the Cherokee Indians." In 1807 Blackburn was given permission to use certain public buildings at Tellico for the school and the government was to station a "corporal and four or five" men at the school. The Quakers had established a mission among the Indians near Fort Wayne in the Northwest Territory and in 1806, the
President gave them a grant of $6,000 to assist in the work. 85

Funds for practical training of the Indians were made available through treaty stipulations. Indian treaties varied, some stipulating that cash annuities be paid over a specific time period or perpetually. Some were to be paid in rations and clothing, farming implements and domestic animals and to assist in providing instruction in agriculture along with education. In some instances missionaries were maintained by these treaty funds. It was due to the fact that the mission school supplemented the federal program of practical training. In 1801 a Moravian mission had been established among the Delaware Indians on White River in the Indiana Territory. On July 15, 1801, Governor Harrison informed the Secretary of War that the Delawares were making another attempt to become "agriculturists" and that they were forming settlements on the White River under the leadership of the Moravians. The chiefs had requested that "one half of their next annuity may be laid out in implements of agriculture, and in the purchase of some domestic animals as cows and hogs" in order to assist the Moravians in this venture. 86 The Treaty with the Kasaskias in 1803 set aside funds for the support of a Roman Catholic priest, who besides the religious duties, was to "instruct as many of their children as possible in the rudiments of literature." 87 Other treaties carried civilization grants but these were not necessarily to be used for religious purposes or for the support of missionaries. They usually stated that "suitable persons" should be employed for the purpose of teaching the Indians how to make fences, cultivate the earth, and other skills connected with the white man's way of life.

The Jeffersonian civilization policy had been almost as unsuccessful
as that of the Federalists. Some encouraging results were reported by the Quakers in their work with the New York Indians and among the Cherokees and Chickasaws, significant progress had been made in civilization and agriculture. The most critical area of Indian relations, the Northwest Territory, had seen a worsening rather than an improvement of the Indians, from the white viewpoint. The half-hearted attempts made to civilize the Indians in the Indiana Territory had been stabbed in the back by the three-way conflict between the United States, Britain and the western Indians. Furthermore, the Indians themselves were not too enthusiastic over the white man's civilization plan. No one knew better than the missionary of the Indian's distaste for work. One Quaker, Philip Dennis, sent to teach the Wabash Indians to farm, wrote that the Indians would take a seat on the fence or in the trees and watch him with "apparent interest in his daily engagement of ploughing and hoeing, but without offering to lend a hand." Another missionary gave further insight as to what the Indians thought about the offer of free ploughs and other farming implements by writing that the Wabash Indians had been "offered more than once all sorts of farm implements like plows, oxen, . . . so that they might live like civilized people." At their Council, they are reported to have said, "This time we have to agree to the proposition, for they continue to bring up the matter and give us no rest. If we agree they will say no more about it." 

The major issue of contention from the Indian perspective was that of tribal lands, and nowhere was this more evident than in the hostility of the tribes in the Northwest. With the organization of the Indiana Territory in 1800, there came a demand from those moving into the region north of the Ohio
that additional lands be secured for settlement beyond the bounds set by the 
Greenville Treaty in 1795. The Indians had understood that these limits were 
set for all time. William Henry Harrison from all appearances had little 
interest in seeing the Indians rooted to the soil if it had to be in 
Indiana. 93 Tecumseh had his brother, the Shawnee Prophet, led the opposition 
to Harrison's tactics. He declared that individual tribes could not alienate 
land held in common by all Indians of a given area. While Tecumseh did not 
want war, to achieve his objectives within the situation as it was, in a 
peaceful manner, would have been impossible. 94 During the years 1807 to 
1812, the United States was faced with a possible war with Britain, whose 
agents, it was believed, were using every means to stir up the Indians 
against the Americans. With the end of the War of 1812 and the signing of 
the peace treaty in 1815, the Indians' hopes were dashed and shattered. 95 
Never again could they count on the support of the British government. From 
1815 on they would have to negotiate on American terms. Missionary efforts 
and hopes were crushed by Anglo-British politics, by the white man's greed 
for land and by the inability or unwillingness of the Indians to appreciate 
the white man's religion and civilization. The year 1815 seemed a long way 
from the advent of the Washington administration and the Indian policy of 
Knox which called for the use of missionaries as the government's instruments 
to work on the Indians. In the time of crisis, however, missionaries had 
performed invaluable service to the War Department in its negotiations with 
the Indians. The missionaries had brought to the treaty sessions an 
atmosphere of trust and confidence. In the half-hearted and perhaps hypo-
critical attempts of the government to civilize the Indians, 96 the
missionaries had pledged their support. Regardless of the motivation that
gave thrust to the official policy, the unofficial or informal policy of the
missionaries seemed to be a sincere attempt to incorporate the Indian into
American society. Even though their exertions did not seriously alter the
official government policy, they contributed considerably to the degree of
friendliness and trust that did exist between certain Indian nations and the
United States for the first quarter century of the new nation.
Chapter II

Revival of Interest in Indian Education and Civilization

The end of the War of 1812 marked the beginning of an era of unprecedented expansion in America. Within less than half a century, the nation pushed its borders to the Pacific and began to settle the Mississippi valley. This peopling of the West represented one of the greatest mass movements in the world's history. From 1820 to 1840, the United States nearly doubled its population. In 1789 only 250,000 of this nation's people lived west of the Appalachians; by 1830, nearly four million or one-third of the total population resided there. The Louisiana Purchase of 1803 and the Spanish Treaty of 1819 had opened up vast areas for settlement. The death of Tecumseh at the Battle of Thames in 1813 cleared the way for white settlement in the Northwest. Between 1820 and 1840, the population of the Northwest increased 36% reaching nearly three million by the latter date. Within the brief span of nine years (1812-1821), Indiana, Mississippi, Illinois, Alabama, and Missouri came into the Union.¹

The War of 1812 had stimulated nationalism and aroused patriotic sentiments. Henry Clay was preparing his "American System" and John C. Calhoun was proposing the construction of roads and canals. The building of the National Road, the Erie Canal and the introduction of the steamboat on the western rivers all facilitated the movement to the West. The people had tended to lose interest in the Old World and its affairs and had turned toward
the west. The nation was optimistic and proud. Fourth of July orators called up the memories of the glorious past and looked forward to a great future. The era witnessed the ferment of reform that touched every facet of American life by the 1830's and 1840's; science, education, politics and religion all felt its impact.

There was a renewed interest in religion in the opening years of the nineteenth century which helped produce the missionary movement. In fact, the church historian, LaTourette, contends that "measured by geographic extent and the effect upon mankind as a whole, the nineteenth century was the greatest thus far in the history of Christianity." In America the religious upsurge saw a rapid growth in the popular Protestant denominations such as the Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, and, also, the Roman Catholic Church. In 1800, there were 65,000 Methodists in the United States; by 1830, there were more than 300,000 and by 1850, some 1,250,000. The Baptists and the Presbyterians also enjoyed a rapid increase in the number of communicants.

The religious order was characterized by division of opinion about doctrine and practice in the various religious groups but there were many examples of inter-church cooperation. Between 1815-1826, many interdenominational societies were formed with the west being the main object of their concern. Sending out home missionaries and planting Protestant institutions in the west, they hoped to civilize and Christianize it. The American Education Society was organized in 1815 for the purpose of training candidates for the ministry. In 1816 the American Bible Society began sending colporteurs to the west distributing Bibles and influencing the lives of western statesmen such as Abraham Lincoln. More than 200 local groups were formed and by 1821,
some 140,000 Bibles had been distributed. In 1820 the Protestant Episcopal Board of Missions was established; in 1823 the American Tract Society; in 1824 the American Sunday School Union and in 1826 the American Home Missionary Society began to carry out the plan of union between the Presbyterians and Congregationalists for work on the frontier.

Westward expansion and the revival in religion led to further consideration of the role of the Indian in American society. There was no urgent need to conciliate the Indian since the threat of British intervention no longer existed. Some changes were made in the Indian service during the decade of the 1820's. The factory system was discontinued in 1822, leaving the trade to free enterprise. In 1824 the Bureau of Indian Affairs was created within the War Department. The three-member staff handled the paper work for the three territorial governors, acting as superintendents, and about 100 agents, sub-agents, interpreters, and blacksmiths. The growing emphasis during the decade was on removal. In 1825 the Indians in the Northwest were persuaded to sell their lands and remove to the Indian Territory west of the Mississippi. The only violent resistance in this instance was that of the Black Hawk and the Sauks and Foxes. In 1830, the Southwestern Indians began moving west at the request of the government and in ten years, they had made new homes in the territory. The Cherokees presented the most formidable resistance in 1838.

The renewed interest of the church in the conversion of the Indian to Christianity may be dated from the Schermerhorn and Mills report of 1814. These two ministers had traveled among the Indian tribes west of the Alleghenies and came back with encouraging news as to the possibilities for Indian missions. This report stimulated the old state societies to new
efforts and greatly helped the founding of the new national societies to meet the need of the west, a work through which the church rendered an important service to the state. Reverend Cornelius Elias, as an agent of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, made a trip in 1817 through the southwestern part of the United States. He conferred with some of the officials of the federal government as to the advisability of establishing mission schools within the Indian country. President Madison was interested and offered to provide a school building, a house for the teacher, and some farm implements. The American Board of Missions supplied the teacher. The report of May, 1818, showed some 47 Indian children in attendance.

The church's revived concern for the conversion of the Indian to the Christian religion seemed to coincide with the renewed attempts on the part of the federal government to civilize him. A Committee of the House of Representatives reported to that body in January, 1818 that it favored the establishing of schools among tribes that were friendly to the United States. Congress approved the report and on March 3, 1819 voted an annual appropriation of $10,000 to be paid to the several missionary organizations who were engaged in activity among the Indians. Congress authorized the President to direct the dispersal of the funds. Perhaps it was coincidental that both church and state should manifest an increased interest in the Indian at this time. It would appear, however, that Rev. William McKendree hit upon the reason when he declared in the Episcopal Address to the Methodist General Conference of 1820, that the "reform...of the continent" required the civilizing of the Indian and that this must be plain to everyone.
The acceleration of missionary and government activity in behalf of Indian civilization intensified the discussion of the role of the Indian in white society. Where did the savage fit into the American idea of progress or the American mission calling for expansion to the Pacific? Could the aborigines be civilized or must they perish at the onrush of the swelling tide of whites to the west. Perhaps, more importantly, what was the nature of the Indian and his culture? Time was running out; the westward movement was soon to force the Indians west of the Mississippi. So far as the nature of the Indian and his culture were concerned, it had been, since colonial times, a mystery to most of the whites. The Indians were a disturbing problem to the peace and consciences of the Europeans. Pious folks debated as to whether the redskins were children of God or the devil. If the Indians were of the devil they might be destroyed in good conscience and their land appropriated for what was considered to be Christian use. The Puritan agreed that the Indian was of the race of man but his religion was devil worship and his culture was not worth knowing.\textsuperscript{13} The Quaker in the seventeenth century never sought to analyze the nature of the savage and its meaning for civilized man. The Quaker apparently never thought in terms of differences between savage and civilized.\textsuperscript{14} In fact, it was not until the eighteenth century that much serious consideration was given to the role of the Indian in the past, his nature and his fate.

In the eighteenth century the debated question of the superiority or inferiority of the savage was one of considerable interest.\textsuperscript{15} Missionaries tended to consider the Indian as both noble and savage.\textsuperscript{16} It was they, along with the explorers, who had created the "noble savage" and their accounts
were used by such writers as Rousseau. While the "cult of the noble savage" may have been strong in Great Britain or in those areas far removed from the frontier in America, it did not dominate the mood of frontier society. While they were the exception, there were those who found the Indian possessed of noble virtues. Benjamin Franklin wrote in 1784:

Savages we call them, because their manners differ from ours, which we think the perfection of civility, they think the same of theirs . . . . Our laborious manner of life, compared with theirs, they esteem slavish and base; and the learning, on which we value ourselves, they regard frivolous and useless.

After some thirty years among the Indians, Missionary John Heckewelder, praised them for their goodness. "I owe them," the Moravian Missionary said, "a debt of gratitude which I cannot acquit better than by presenting to the world this plain unadorned picture, which I have drawn in the spirit of candour and truth." At the outbreak of the War of 1812, Colonel James Smith said it was a mistake to call the Indians "undisciplined savages." He contended that they had all the "essentials of discipline" and that they are "punctual in obeying orders." In 1823, John D. Hunter, who had resided among several tribes for many years, observed that the Indians compared quite well in their "physical conditions, with any other great division of the human family." He had discovered that they had great mental powers and their "judgment and perceptions" were "clear and quick, and their arguments ingenious and cogent." In 1827, Isaac McCoy, a Baptist missionary who had labored many years among the Indians, commented that he thought it strange that after two centuries of contact with the aborigines, we knew so little about their "character and condition." He observed that no other "branch of publick business is so little understood, as that which relates to Indians."
Even those benevolent societies formed for the express purpose of helping the Indians, knew so little about them. In fact the missionary declared, "missionaries who labor among the natives, usually find more trouble in managing the mistaken notions of their patrons, than they do in encountering those of the people of their charge." More important than this shameful lack of knowledge, was McCoy's contention that the Cherokees had reached their present level of civilization without any help from the whites except that afforded them in the past few decades. The missionary then called attention to the northern tribes where there had been civilization attempts since 1646 with the result that they are "perishing under our hands." 23 In other words, McCoy had concluded that the Indians had the ability to civilize themselves if given the opportunity and time, and left somewhat to themselves to work it out.

George Catlin traveled extensively among the natives of the central United States and Florida. He painted portraits of some of the leading persons for his gallery of the North American Indians. He wrote in the 1830's, "The reader . . . should forget many theories he has read in the books of Indian barbarities, of wanton butcheries and murders; and divest himself, as far as possible, of the deadly prejudices which he has carried from his childhood, against this most unfortunate and most abused part of the race of his fellow man." Catlin had found that the Indian in "his native state" was an "honest, hospitable, faithful, brave, warlike, cruel, relentless, - yet honourable, contemplative and religious being . . . ." This remarkable traveler thought, after many years of familiarity with the Indians, that their misfortune resulted "chiefly in our ignorance of their
true native character and disposition. . . ."24 The Rev. Stephen Olin told his fellow Methodists that little had been done for the Indians and predicted that another wave of civilization from the west would check what progress had been made and swallow them up. He said that many thought their situation hopeless and that they could not be civilized. Surveying the failure of past attempts, he declared that these were not due to Indian incapacity for he was confident that they could be "molded into all the noblest forms of intellectual and moral excellence." 25

The "myth of the treacherous savage" would more characteristically represent the mood of frontier society. 26 The Fourth of July toast drunk by the officers of Sullivan's expedition in 1779 put it bluntly, "Civilization or death to all American Savages."27 Jack D. Forbes, recognized as an authority on the American Indians, declared that in the mind of the masses (Anglo-American) "a stereotype of the 'Redskin' as a savage, cruel, and almost irredeemable enemy became very strong." Admitting that this image was somewhat modified by the "myth of the noble savage," he insists that the latter was effective only at the literary and intellectual level and was seldom applied to a living Indian. 28 Thomas Jefferson in 1785 spoke of the "proofs of genius given by the Indians of North America" affirming that this placed them on a level with the "whites in the same uncultivated state." The Virginian claimed that he had seen thousands of Indians and conversed with them and had found in them a "masculine, sound understanding." In his way of thinking, the Indian was equal in "body and mind" to the white man. 29 In his inaugural speech in 1805, President Jefferson declared the Indian to be "endowed with the faculties of the rights of men, breathing an ardent love of
At the same time, he had observed that there were "powerful obstacles to encounter" in any attempt made to bring them into white society because of those "who dread reformation." In 1812, the ex-President could see little hope in changing the American Indian. He contended that those Indians who were backward in civilization would be thrown further back. They will relapse into barbarism and misery . . . ." He then lamented that "we shall be obliged to drive them with the beasts of the forest into the stony Rocky mountains." Even though at one time Jefferson praised the noble virtues of the savage, he had come to a point in his thinking where he, like most Americans of the nineteenth century, wondered if time had not run out for the Indian culture.

The frontiersman was forced in many instances to consider the Indian from the viewpoint of kill or be killed. The immigrant farmer who made his way into the west has been characterized as a "man of small imagination, hard and thrifty, who marched with a rifle in one hand, the Old Testament in the other, and a jug of 'likker' in the wagon." Life was hard and there was always some grievance. In the determination to carve out a niche for himself in the growing west, the white settler had little knowledge of and cared less about the feelings and customs of the Indians. To make up for the boredom "of plodding along the endless trail" he sent home "highly-colored accounts of imaginary Indian raids." For the most part, the image of the Indian held by the frontiersman was that of a lying, thieving, skulking murderer who would delight to torture any unfortunate wretch who fell into his clutches."

In 1824, the Reverend Dr. Joseph Doddridge of Wellsburgh, Virginia, published his views on Indian warfare. He wrote, "The Indian kills indiscriminately.
His object is the total extermination of his enemies. Children are victims of his vengeance, because, if males, they may hereafter become warriors, or if females, they may become mothers." The clergyman then suggested that the "linient maxims of civilized warfare" must be exchanged for what he considered to be the savage warfare of the Indians. Since very few Indians ever become civilized, he questioned the advisability of sparing the life of a captive. He declared that "a war of utter extermination, must be met by a war of the same character;" . . . for he concluded that "in a war with savages, the choice lies between extermination and subjugation. Our government has wisely and humanely pursued the latter course." 34 Lewis Cass, for many years holding responsible government positions, took issue with the Moravian Missionary, John Heckewelder who he said "thought and reasoned like an Indian and like a Delaware." In any contest between the whites and Indians, Cass accused the missionary of adopting the "train of the thinking of the Indian." It was the contention of Cass that the Indian was in a state of constant bloody and exterminating wars when the European came to North America, thus giving the white man credit for bringing some order out of chaos.35

For more than five years, Reverend Robert Baird, Presbyterian minister, traveled all over the settled parts of the United States. He assisted in the founding of thousands of Sunday Schools and churches, many of these being on the frontier where there were no churches at all. In his history of religion in the United States, Baird presented his view of the Indian and his culture, a view that might well have been representative of most Americans in the nineteenth century. He thought it no easy task to:

Christianize and civilize savages who, from times unknown, have
been devoted to hunting and to war; and, when not thus occupied lounge like their dogs about their miserable hovels and tents, clad in skins and leaving to their women, or squaws, the drudgery of cultivating a little patch of maize, making the fires, and even dressing the animals that have been slain in the chase, as well as all other domestic cares.

He noted their aversion to work and bluntly declared that "not a single noble aspiration seems ever to enter their souls." The Presbyterian Divine saw little hope of their adopting the "habits of civilized life" so long as "the forests last and game can be found." He then rebuked those who indulged in "mawkish lamentations over the disappearance of the aboriginal tribes of North America" intimating that such people would rather see the continent given over to a "few thousand savages, roaming the forests, and continually at war with each other, than covered with a civilized and Christian population . . . ." As if he were warning the various Indian nations, Baird contended that those Indians who had refused to become Christians and be instructed in agriculture and the mechanical arts had almost wholly disappeared or they had been merged "in other uncivilized and heathen tribes." Baird had expressed well the thinking of American whites as to the inevitability of the triumph of Christian, civilized progress. At the same time he gave in capsule form the generally accepted version of Indian nature and culture.

With the church and the state committed to more schools for the Indians, it was necessary to reach some agreement on the best possible approach to civilizing the Indians. Economy had always been a prime consideration in past efforts as well as in the present attempt. Return J. Meigs in 1819, contended that whatever the cost of Indian education, experience had proved this approach to be the "most well devised economy." There was also the
question of time. Nineteenth century Americans were practical and to a great extent, materialists; they thought in terms of time and money. At best, however, to integrate the Indian into white society would take time, patience and understanding. All of these were lacking. While the various approaches to the problem were being discussed, new states were being carved out of the west. The state of Georgia was pressing the federal government to persuade the Cherokees to relinquish title to the lands they held within that state. White impatience and Indian resistance rendered any hope of success for any civilization plan almost impossible.

While encouraging removal to the west of the Mississippi, the government was committed to a program of civilization for those Indians who, during the 1820's insisted on remaining in the east. Unofficial and semi-official organizations and individuals advanced plans for civilization. They involved removal, separation of Indians from the whites, creation of a special Indian state and education into civilized farming. Thomas Forsyth told John Calhoun in 1818 that it was rather strange that although we exceeded the British in expenditures and had all the Indians residing within our territories, we had less influence over them than the British had enjoyed. Forsyth thought that one of the weaknesses of American Indian relations was to be found in the practice of appointing young men to Indian agencies who had never seen more than three or four Indians together and who could not speak the Indian language. All future plans, he insisted, should demand that agents know some of the Indian languages "from which it is supposed, that he must be acquainted with the Indian customs and manners." Bishop Hobart was thinking along the same lines when he blamed much of the failure of past efforts toward
converting and civilizing the Indians on the conveying of religious
instruction "through the imperfect medium of interpreters." He had found
that Indians tend to place more confidence in those who knew the language,
manners, and customs of the tribe. Few would have disagreed with Forsyth
and Hobart on this point; the problem was to find young men who were able to
meet the language requirements which they posed.

The form of civilized society in nineteenth century America was agrarian
and urban with a system of private ownership. Few would have questioned that
the Indian could be civilized without giving up his system of communal owner-
ship in exchange for private ownership. Only in this way would the necessary
incentive be provided for coming up to the level of white society. Private ownership was linked with cultivation of the soil which in turn was
seen to be the intention of the Creator. The inability or the unwillingness
of the Indian to cultivate the soil had been cited as reason enough to take
over Indian lands. Thus William H. Harrison, governor of the Indiana
Territory, with westward expansion breaking through the barriers into the
areas reserved for the Indians, posed the question:

Is one of the fairest portions of the globe to remain in a state
of nature, the haunt of a few wretched savages, when it seems
destined by the Creator to give support to a large population and
to be the seat of civilization, of science and of true religion?

President Monroe in 1817 gave expression to the same sentiments when he
declared, "The hunter state can exist only in the vast uncultivated desert.
It yields to the . . . greater force of civilized population . . . ." He
concluded that this was right for "the earth was given to mankind to support
the greater number of what it is capable and no tribe or people have a right
to withhold from the wants of others, more than is necessary for their support and comfort.\textsuperscript{49} The Presbyterian preacher, Robert Baird, could see no possibility of preventing civilized men from taking over the Indian lands. He inquired, "But how civilized men are to share the same continent with uncivilized, without the latter being supplanted and made to disappear, is a question by no means of easy solution." Unless the natives could be civilized, they would be displaced. Reverend Timothy Flint, Massachusetts missionary, commented on the role of the Indian in the destiny of the American nation: "Either this great continent, in the order of Providence, should have remained in the occupancy of half a million of savages, engaged in everlasting conflicts of their peculiar warfare with each other, or it must have become, as it has, the domain of civilized millions."\textsuperscript{51} Senator Benton wrapped the theory up in one sentence; the white man had the superior right to the land because he "used it according to the intentions of the Creator."\textsuperscript{52} The Indian must be brought to see that cultivation of the soil along with private ownership was the superior system.

The incentive to cultivate the soil, it was thought, came from private ownership of one's own land. Henry Knox, chief architect of the nation's first civilization plan, proposed for the first step, the introduction among the Indian tribes of a "love for exclusive property. He thought this might be done by making them presents of sheep and other domestic animals.\textsuperscript{53} A missionary report of 1806 cited the idea of "distinct property" becoming more prevalent among the Senecas as an evidence of civilization.\textsuperscript{54} Thomas L. McKenney, Superintendent of Indian Trade, thought that an important step in leading the Indian from "the pleasing of the chase" to the "practice of agriculture" was to "give them a just conception of the value of goods." This was with the
understanding that soon they would be willing to put forth the "proper exertions" necessary to possess those things thought necessary to civilized living.\textsuperscript{55} William Clark, Indian agent, recommended that Congress provide the Indians with private property. He commented that "it is property alone that can keep up the pride of an Indian and make him ashamed of drunkenness, begging, lying and stealing. It is property which has raised the character of the southern tribes."\textsuperscript{56} James Finley, missionary to the Wyandots who were situated on reservations in Ohio, stated that the Indians held the land in common. He recommended that the reservations be divided up into equal sections so that "each individual might have ownership in the soil . . . ." This he contended would bring stability to each family and "beget an ambition to improve their property." He concluded, "Thus a new stimulus to the development of civilized life would be secured." Approval was given by the War Department and the reservation was subdivided. Tracts were apportioned according to the size of the family with each receiving not more than 160 acres. Finley reported that the experiment resulted in an "impetus to improvement and increase of stock. Houses now went up in almost all directions . . . ."\textsuperscript{57} After many years of missionary labors among the Indians, the Baptist Isaac McCoy thought the system of communal property was a "sore evil" which he admitted was "difficult to cure." He had observed that "under its existence, the lazy and improvident impose on the more frugal and industrious . . . ." which he interpreted to be "hostile to a spirit of enterprise and improvement." He suggested that a grant of land be made to each Indian, "either for a farm, shop, mill, or town lot and a similar grant might be made to widows and to other females who might wish to occupy the same."\textsuperscript{58}
The consensus of opinion was that the Indian must not merely give up his system of communal property; he must ultimately cast aside his customs and language in order to be integrated into white society. Those who advocated segregation of the Indians, thought of it only as a temporary expedient necessary to give them a chance to catch up with the white man. The segregation school of thought generally held that the Indian was unable in his savage state to compete with the unscrupulous traders and the lawless whites who encroached on his lands. Experience had proved this contention to be well-founded. The weapon of whiskey had been used most effectively by certain elements of the white community. Ramsay D. Potts, government sub-agent in the Michigan Territory to the Indians, wrote to Governor Lewis Cass in July, 1826 that "the only impediment to their (the Indians') advancement toward civilization is that some regardless of all moral and legal restraints are in the habit of introducing ardent spirits among them, which by degrees is in-feebling their minds and constitutions. . . ." George Catlin, after traveling among the Indians for more than seven years observed: "Of the two millions remaining alive at this time, about 1,400,000 are already the miserable living victims and dupes of white man's cupidity, degraded, discouraged, and lost in the bewildering maze that is produced by the use of whiskey and its concomitant vices. . . ." Missionaries had always crusaded against the whiskey traffic carried on mostly by whites among the Indians. A missionary report from the Choctaw nation stated that "Intemperance abounds; and many of the whites, in the neighbouring settlements, unblushingly set at defiance the laws prohibiting the introduction of whiskey. Partial and feeble resolutions are formed by the natives to suppress the evil; but it is feared
that they will not soon become effectual.\textsuperscript{63} Jackson Kemper, Episcopalian missionary, made a trip to Green Bay and was there when the Oneidas arrived from New York.\textsuperscript{64} He wrote: "The whiskey agents were ready for them and although there was a law of the Territory which called for a fine of $200 for anyone caught selling whiskey to the Indians" it could not be enforced. Kemper explained that the "magistrates" themselves will sell whiskey to the Indians and "no jury would convict a man of this crime." Kemper's observations raises doubts concerning the possibility of being able to segregate the Indian at all.\textsuperscript{65}

The second great thorn in the flesh for Indian white relations was the fur trader.\textsuperscript{66} One government Indian agent referred to the traders as the "most immoral, dissipated and heartless people" that he knew. Once the Indians became civilized, the fur trader realized that his business was through. The agent, Joseph M. Streets, had heard traders say that once the Indian is civilized, "it spoils them as hunters."\textsuperscript{67}

The lawless whites represented the third major threat to any civilization scheme. As early as 1794, Henry Knox had written: "The desires of too many frontier white people to seize, by force or fraud, upon the neighboring Indian lands has been, and still continues to be, an increasing cause of jealousy and hatred on the part of the Indians."\textsuperscript{68} After making an extended tour of the various Indian nations under a commission from the War Department, Rev. Jedidia Morse reported that the failure to civilize the Indians was "obstructed by the influence of depraved white people who have insinuated themselves among the Indians and whose interest it is to keep them ignorant . . . ." and for this reason they were opposed to all plans to civilize the Indian.\textsuperscript{69} John D. Hunter,
who resided among the tribes many years, wrote that any hope of helping the Indians rested on a sandy foundation until "all their intercourse with" the lawless whites was broken off. Thomas Forsyth was confident that "in most of the misunderstandings which take place between the whites and Indians in the interior of the Indian country, the fault is with the white people. . . ." All in all, it was thought that the Indian did not have the qualities demanded by the way of life which was sweeping over him. Until he could catch up, it was assumed that segregation, so far as was possible, was necessary.

The segregation of the Indians from the whites was to be continued until the Indian reached a certain level of civilization. He would then be able, it was hoped, to take his place in the nineteenth century world of the "survival of the fittest" and survive. The United Brethren Church in advocating isolating the Indians, stated that "the whole idea of planting the Christian Indian community . . . was predicated upon a hope, that they would there be perfectly secluded from all connection with other white persons, except such, whose own state of morality, industry, and piety, would be an example . . . ."

This system was to continue for a "sufficient length of time to render the attachment of the Indians to an agricultural and perfectly civilized life altogether habitual . . . ." In his message to Congress in 1824, President Monroe stated that "experience has shown that unless the tribes be civilized they can never be incorporated into our system in any form whatever." Contending that civilizing them was necessary to preservation, the President suggested that it could only be accomplished by degrees and that removal of all the Indians to the West of the Mississippi would be the best way to begin. The territory could be divided into districts and civil governments established.
Fully in agreement with segregation, missionary Isaac McCoy looked forward to the day when the Indians "might become organized into a civil community and ultimately become citizens of the United States." While not all those supporting temporary segregation favored removal of all the Indians to the west of the Mississippi; the thinking that the natives were unable to defend themselves against the lawless whites proved to be a potent weapon in the hands of those who preached removal.75

The preparation for integration into American society during the time of presumed isolation from the white community, was to follow certain prescribed lines laid down by the federal government. As one writer expressed it, the Indians "never will become our cordial friends, until they are assimilated to us in language, manners and religion ... ."76 Thomas L. McKenney, in charge of the Office of Indian Affairs, informed Cyrus Kingsbury, missionary among the Choctaws, that the Indians should be given our language. McKenney contended that the failures of past attempts to civilize the Indians had gone astray at this point. He then concluded that the less of the Indian language that is "taught, or spoken, the better for the Indians. Their whole character, inside and out, language, and morals, must be changed."77 Students attending the mission schools were given English names and in many instances the Indian dress was laid aside in exchange for the white man's clothes.78

Secretary of War John Calhoun laid down the principle in 1820 that any permanent results of civilization measures necessitated the bringing of the Indians "under our authorities and laws." Facing the situation realistically, the Secretary of War declared: "It is impossible, with their customs, that they should exist as independent communities in the midst of civilized
society. They are not, in fact, an independent people, . . . nor ought they to be so considered. 79 He concluded that the Indians must be taken under the guardianship of the United States government and "our opinions, and not theirs, ought to prevail, in measures intended for their civilization and happiness." 80 Some two years later, in a report sent to the House of Representatives on civilization measures, Calhoun indicated that a number of schools had been established among some of the Indian tribes but again warned that all of this would go down the drain unless some system could be devised to bring them under our laws and authority. 81

Involved in the discussion of the civilization by segregation plan, was the location of schools for the Indian children. Thomas McKenney, largely responsible for the supervision of this aspect of Indian affairs, thought the schools could best be located in the Indian nation. Even though the adults did not participate in them, he reasoned that they would be benefited by the example. Since economy was of primary consideration, McKenney said the cost would be less and the money expended for schools would be kept in circulation among the Choctaws. 82 In an article appearing in the Missionary Herald, the writer objected to any plan which would take a select number of youths from a tribe and educate them in the schools for the whites. He argued that young people taken from "a savage life, are not prepared to endure the close confinement and rigid discipline of our mode of education." 83 There was also the danger of their being induced to associate with the "vicious and unprincipled" whites. Experience had proved, so the writer thought, that most of those who had been educated outside the Indian country, had found it "easy to return to their savage life with scarcely a struggle." 84 Solomon
Jones, Episcopal missionary at Green Bay, expressed similar sentiments in stating that from "actual experience" he had found that "in nine cases out of ten," those who were educated away from the Tribe, once they returned home, they "returned to that same indolence of mind and body which is characteristic of the Indian." Jones had found this method to be "an entire failure." 85

With the ultimate goal of some day integrating the Indian into white society, some missionaries advocated sending a select number of Indian youth to white schools for the completion of their formal education. Missionary Thomas C. Stuart, in his report to the War Department in 1826, suggested that "it is desirable that as many as possible should be sent into civilized and polished society to complete their education, after taking a course at the missionary stations." They should be permitted to associate with white children and in this way they would better learn the English language. 86 Missionary Bell informed the War Department that he had sent several of the young people to "different parts among the white people to finish their education." He too felt that this would facilitate the learning of the English language and they would "improve faster in civilization." 87 By 1830, Bell reported that in the future they hoped to educate most of their children in the white settlements. He had discovered that the Indians were "extremely anxious to have their children educated in that way." 88

Given the circumstances in which this new Indian civilization thrust was to be made, it was inconceivable that religion would be left out. Christian missions were actively engaged in establishing churches on the frontier and at the same time had established some missions among the Indians. The pioneer missionary was often among the first whites to move into areas vacated by the
natives. Since colonial times, government Indian policy and Indian missions had been related. Of more immediate importance to the government was a necessity that was both economic and moral in nature. The church was willing and ready to provide funds to supplement the small education fund voted by Congress. Of more value to the over-all program was the fact that the church could provide a staff of teachers who, due to their religious motivation were not only men and women of high moral character but teachers who were willing to give sacrificial service for mere living expenses. In many quarters among the Indians, the missionary could bring to the implementation of the civilization plan a legacy of trust and confidence.

Jedidiah Morse urged the Secretary of War to turn over the whole business of Indian Affairs to the direction of what he called "education families." These were to be missionary families but Morse thought the other designation might less "offend the opposers of missions." At the head of each family would be an ordained minister. Within each unit, there would be "school-masters and mistresses, farmers, blacksmiths, carpenters, cabinet-makers, mill-wrights, and other mechanics. . . ." No one would receive a salary but all would be provided for out of a common fund. These families would be, Morse declared, "the great instruments in the hands of the government, for educating and civilizing the Indians." The New England clergyman then recommended that as soon as feasible, all of the officers, "Indian superintendents, agents, sub-agents, and all other officers of the government, who have to do with Indians. . ." should be members of an education family. The advantages of the plan would be a saving of money and it would bring to the missionary the official influence of the government. Morse thought that all
candidates for the various offices should be selected by the missionary societies. The plan was submitted to the Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun. We do not know the Secretary's reaction but obviously the government was not ready to permit the mission boards to take over Indian affairs.92

While Morse's plan would have surely met stiff opposition, had there been any serious attempt to implement it, few would have questioned the necessity of some participation of the church in Indian affairs. There was, however, a wide variance of opinion as to the proper place and time for religion to enter the civilization experiment. Some advocated conversion to Christianity as not only coming first, but they implied that it was sufficient in itself to uplift the Indian from his savage state to civilized living.93 Rev. William McKendree of the Methodist Church insisted that the Indian was in need of having his understanding enlightened and that this was to be done by "the application of divine truth to the conscience and to the judgment." He assured his fellow Methodists that once this reformation was effected, "the rest follows as a consequence. Their minds become flexible, their hearts tender, and they may then be easily led on to perceive and to appreciate the blessings of civil and domestic economy and finally to attend to farming and mechanical pursuits."94 James Finley, missionary to the Wyandots in Ohio, stated that "A man must be Christianized, or he never can be civilized."95 Rev. Stephen Olin in 1824, speaking before a missionary conference, declared that in the present attempts to reform the Indian that "we are not resting upon principles, long since exploded; nor seeking to ingraft the refinements of civilization upon a savage nature, which uniformly recoils from their approach." He stated that a new process had been introduced which was "to change the nature and
implant new principles." Then with a note of triumph, the preacher proclaimed: "Our reliance is not upon a power which has often been defeated, but which has always been victorious."96

The Quakers were among those who thought that civilization should precede any attempt to convert the Indians to the Christian religion. A report of the Quaker mission in the Indiana Territory in 1807 stated that the missionary had been actively engaged in teaching the Indians how to cultivate the soil. While they were aware of the importance of schools and "religious improvement," it was supposed that this should come later.97 Writing to the Quakers in 1807, Thomas Jefferson commented: "It is evident that your society has begun at the right end of civilizing these people. Habits of industry, easy subsistence, attachment of property are necessary to prepare their minds for the first elements of science, and afterwards for moral and religious instruction."98 Morse reported that the Quakers had an agricultural establishment among the Shawnee Indians in Hoio and that they were about ready to establish a school. He added that "this truly benovelent denomination of Christians do not yet attempt to instruct these people in the principles of Christianity believing that they are not yet sufficiently acquainted with the arts of civilized life."99 Hunter, who had lived among the Indians for some time stated that "along the frontier settlements of the United States as also among many of the more distant tribes, the Quakers are, of all the white people the most acceptable to the Indians."100 Adam Hodgson of Liverpool, England, after touring the Indian country reported that the missionaries were aware that civilization must precede religious instruction.101

John Sergeant expressed the sentiments of a third school which insisted
that "Civilization and religion must go hand in hand..." The missionary had come to see that "The plough and Bible must go together." This was the general procedure to be followed by the government during the 1820's in civilizing the Indian. On January 22, 1818, the Committee on Indian Affairs reported to the House of Representatives that the Government should do all in its power to civilize "those savage tribes." For this purpose the House was urged to appropriate funds for schools to be established in the Indian country. The report stated bluntly that the "sons of the forest should be moralized" or they faced the ultimate possibility of extermination. As to the mixture of religion to be included in the plan, the committee was confident that once the "primer and the hoe" were put into the hands of the Indian that they would become enlightened and the Bible would be their book. The end result would be a forsaking of the "chase" and they would "become useful members of society." 

By the year 1820 the church and the state had embarked on a new attempt to make the Indian into a Christian tiller of the soil. At the same time there was an intensification of discussion as to the nature of the Indian and his culture as well as the best means of integrating him into nineteenth century white society. As this chapter has indicated, the controversy did not end once the government settled on a general plan for schools among the Indians but it continued with even greater intensity during the 1820's and 1830's. It was further complicated by the general policy of the government which called for removal of all Indians to the west of the Mississippi. In some instances, the schools had only begun to show some signs of success when serious efforts were undertaken to persuade the Indians to remove. While
promises were made assuring the Indians that the segregation-civilization scheme would be picked up again once they were settled on the west side of the Mississippi, the talk of removal had an unsettling effect on the whole experiment. To a large extent it defeated any hope of success. The story of the experiment in the 1820's in which the church and state joined hands is the theme of the next chapter.
Chapter III

Church and State Join Hands: Mission Schools

With the Congressional approval in 1819 of an annual appropriation of $10,000 specifically designated for Indian education, the federal government entered a new phase of the civilization program.¹ The President, to whom Congress delegated authority for the administration of the fund,² directed that the funds should be channeled through the religious societies who had schools among the Indian nations or were planning to establish them in the near future.³ The War Department mailed out a circular to the various church groups inviting them to make their needs known. Any religious body desirous of federal aid for their mission schools was required to submit such a request to the War Department stating where the school was to be located, "a plan of the buildings and an estimate of the cost." This was to be accompanied by a report of the state of their funds, the "number of youths of both sexes they intend to educate, the number and kind of teachers to be employed, the plan of education, and the extent of the aid required." If the funds were available and the plan of the society was approved, the federal government would pay two-thirds of the cost of erecting the necessary buildings.⁴ A sum would also be paid to any approved institution for operating expenses on the basis of the number of pupils, expenses of the establishment and degree of success of those attending it. Each missionary board was obliged to submit an annual report to the War Department showing the
number and names of teachers, number of students and the number of those who had completed the course. Any appropriations made through treaty stipulations for education were to be used according to instructions laid down by the War Department.\(^5\)

The President's civilization fund of $10,000 was to be expended on schools located within "the limits of the Indian nations who border on our settlements."\(^6\) In order to qualify for assistance, the curriculum in the mission schools, in addition to reading, writing and arithmetic, had to include instruction for the boys in the "practical knowledge of the mode of agriculture, and of such mechanic arts as are suited to the condition of the Indians," and the girls were to be taught "spinning, weaving, and sewing."\(^7\) The extent and nature of religious instruction was usually left up to the missionaries.

The treaty appropriations provided a further source of income for Indian education. These supposedly represented contributions from the Indians themselves to the cause of education. For this reason, some consideration was given to the desires of the various tribes as to their disbursement. The treaty funds were, however, placed at the disposal of the President and the War Department who directed their application through the same channel as the Congressional monies.\(^8\) The manner in which the Indians made provisions for education was not necessarily uniform. In the Delaware treaty of 1829, thirty-six sections of the best land, relinquished in the treaty, was to be sold for the purpose of raising funds for schools.\(^9\) In some instances, the treaty simply stated that a certain amount of the annuities to be paid to Indians for their lands were to be reserved in a special education fund\(^10\).
The Indians set aside a certain amount of land on which a school was built and the necessary acreage for the raising of food supplies. It was not uncommon for the missionaries to receive gifts of animals, such as cows and hogs, for the support of the school. In addition to the President's Fund and the Indian assistance, there was the support of churches and private contributions in money and property.

Consequently, the state, the Indians, and the church all were financially involved in the Indian civilization program. The American Board, the Presbyterian Assembly, and the Baptist Board of Missions all expressed approval of the government subsidization of mission schools designed to assist in the civilizing of the Indians. Accepting the proposed plan of the President, a number of Protestant mission boards applied to the War Department for financial assistance.

There was no interdenominational association through which all Indian mission work was coordinated. The government had no particular plan for placing the schools systematically in the various Indian nations. To a great degree, it was voluntary. Any denomination could apply to the War Department for some of the President's civilization fund. If the planned mission school met the requirement of location within the Indian country and the prescribed curriculum, federal assistance was granted. Since the number of schools and their location was determined mostly by this impromptu arrangement in which the church took the initiative, any consideration of missionary influence can best be studied from the denominational perspective.

The Baptist Board of Missions submitted its request for federal aid to the War Department on August 3, 1819. Dr. Staughton, Corresponding
Secretary, informed the government that the Baptists had a "valuable missionary and agent in Illinois, the Rev. Isaac McCoy who was making arrangements for the permanent establishment of a school among the Indians [Miamies and Ottawas] there." Staughton then requested "an appointment under the patronage of the government" for the purpose of financial assistance for the missionary and the school. Reference was made to a school near Great Crossings, Kentucky, and "the patronage of the government" was solicited for it.

Isaac McCoy, the Baptist missionary, moved to Fort Wayne in 1820 and opened a school for the Indians. The mission was permitted free use of the government buildings in that settlement. The school opened on May 29th with ten English pupils, six French, eight Indian and one Negro. The mission school received from the civilization fund a grant of $400.

At the Treaty of Chicago in the autumn of 1821, the Indians ceded to the United States four million acres of land in the Michigan Territory. The treaty, which was ratified on March 25, 1822, provided an annual sum of $1,000 for fifteen years toward the support of a teacher and blacksmith among the Potawatomies. At the same time, the Ottawas set aside $1,500 annually for ten years to provide for a farmer, teacher and blacksmith.

Upon hearing of these treaty appropriations for civilization, McCoy recorded in his journal: "This arrangement is the result of plans which I had formed long since, and for the accomplishment of which I had felt much solicitude." Whether the Baptist missionary is to be given much of the credit for this decision of the Indians to help finance their children's education is open to question, but the missionary, hoping for such support, did formulate his plans...
prior to the negotiations. On July 18, 1821, McCoy wrote in his journal: "I shall not ask a title to the land, I only want permission to live on their land as long as they remain satisfied with the school, and with the objects of the mission." He expressed the hope that the Indians might be willing to sell some land and place the proceeds in an education fund. This he reasoned would be no "material loss to the government, because they would get land which is the main object." The Indian would be benefited since the education of his children would be facilitated. The missionary was also concerned about the agents who would handle the money. He then wrote that he would propose at the treaty negotiations that the education funds, which he hoped the Indians would supply, would be placed in the custody of the missionaries to use as they deemed best. McCoy had found that most of the government Indian agents were "somewhat indifferent" to any plan to educate the natives.

After all his planning, Isaac McCoy was unable to attend the Chicago treaty sessions. He sent a friend, Robert Montgomery, to represent him and to carry out his instructions. Montgomery informed the Baptist missionary on August 22, 1821 that he, in the company of the government commissioners, had visited the Indian camps and questioned them concerning schools. The Indians finally agreed to set aside some of their annuities for the support of teachers, farmers, and blacksmiths. Recognizing a great opportunity in all of this for the Baptists, McCoy immediately informed his denominational mission board concerning the treaty stipulations that provided for a farmer, teacher, and blacksmith among the Ottawas. Since no denomination had a school among those Indians, he urged the board to expand its work among the Ottawas and suggested that if the board was unwilling to expend any of its own money on
the project that it would be better to have "three missionaries living there on the annual salary of $500 each, than to risk an establishment which might not favor our views." He was under the impression that the government would provide necessary "farming utensils, blacksmith tools, and even stock to work upon." The Indians themselves had set aside one mile square on the south side of St. Joseph's River and a similar area on the north side of Grand River for the two mission projects. McCoy stated that he planned to attend the next session of Congress in Washington in order to secure a "liberal share of patronage" from the government.

Receiving the mission board's approval, McCoy notified Governor Lewis Cass that he had been authorized to enlarge the sphere of the work at the Carey station. He then commented that it would "be truly gratifying for some of our missionaries to receive the appointment for the openings among the Ottawas for a teacher, farmer, and blacksmith. He recommended that the two civilization projects, the Ottawas and the Potawatomies, be placed under one supervisor.

On July 16, 1822, Lewis Cass notified the Baptist missionary, Isaac McCoy, that he had been appointed teacher for the Potawatomies at an annual salary of $400. Five cabins were to be provided for the use of the school, a certain number of tools, and a blacksmith. The governor instructed the missionary that his duties as a religious teacher would be separate from and independent of those which would be required under the treaty. As a teacher, he would be responsible to the "proper officers of the United States." He was obligated to give instruction to the old and young and it would be left up to his discretion as to how much of the "instructions shall be moral and religious." According to the instructions, the Baptist missionary was to be
regarded as an agent of the government. So far as possible, he was to prevent the introduction of whiskey into the Indian country. His other duties included checking on the conduct of traders, advising the Indians how to spend their annuities; visiting the Indian villages and becoming acquainted with the influential persons in the various tribes so as to "acquire their confidence in such a manner as to give the greatest effect to your advice and representations." The blacksmith and other workers were placed under McCoy's supervision. In his report to the War Department in 1824, two mission schools, one at Saint Joseph among the Potawatomies and the other at Grand River among the Ottawas, are listed. The combined staff for the two stations included three teachers, three farmers, and two blacksmiths.

Governor Rathbun of Georgia, "a strong Baptist and an active and zealous church-member," wrote the Baptist Convention in 1819 urging them to establish an Indian mission and school among the Creeks. That same year Francis Flournoy was sent to inquire as to the possibility of getting permission from the Creek Indians for the school. Unfortunately he was murdered by a runaway Negro. In 1820, Wilson Lumpkin was one of the five trustees appointed to act for the Georgia Baptist Association in the establishment of a school among the Creeks. This committee never held a meeting during the year for want of a quorum and their appointment was revoked. By 1822, the Georgia Baptists were ready to act and Lee Compere of South Carolina was appointed missionary to the Creek Indians. The school was discontinued in 1829 due to loss of interest and the removal of the Indians to the West.

On February 5, 1820, the Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun, informed the
Baptist Board of Missions that their request for federal aid for the support of a school among the Cherokees, was granted. In 1821, Evan Jones was appointed missionary to the Cherokees. Trying to document the extent of the influence exerted by a mission school on the affairs of the Indians is most difficult, if not impossible. One cannot deny that the convert and especially the native preacher, were to some extent, available channels through which the missionary could make known his will and perhaps more effectively execute it. The Baptists had ordained Kaneeda, a full-blood Indian, in 1829. It would be difficult to believe that Stephen Foreman, native missionary and speaker of the Cherokee National Council, never consulted with missionary Evans on important issues before the nation. Jesse Bushyhead, ordained a Baptist preacher in 1833, was to figure prominently in the Cherokee resistance to removal and the Seminole War.

The Choctaw Academy, a Baptist school for Indians, represented some diversions from the President's plan for schools. It was located outside the Indian country at Great Crossings, Kentucky. While it was managed by the Baptists, it was under the sponsorship of Richard M. Johnson. The Academy's principal source of income came from the Indian tribes who sent students to the school. For the first several years, the curriculum did not provide for instruction in manual labor; it might well have been called a classical academy. Most of the boys sent to the Academy were selected from among the better students of the mission schools located within the Indian country. The first pupils were received in the autumn of 1825 and for many years, the school flourished. By 1840, as a result of continuing dissatisfaction, on the part of the Indians, with the plan of education, the
school began to lose its student body and was forced to close. If, however, a school which indoctrinates youth in certain religious precepts and offers to them a certain philosophy of life, may be accepted as a channel for exerting influence on a race or a culture, then the Choctaw Academy merits further consideration.

The school had its origins in a circular of July 7, 1817, which had been published by the Kentucky Baptist Society and was subsequently mailed by Thomas L. McKenney, Superintendent of Indian Trade, to the government agents in the Indian country. The pamphlet merely stated that the Baptists were ready to do missionary work among the Indians. McKenney expressed his approval and accepted the appointment of "honorary member" to the Baptist Board. He thought the Baptist plan to establish schools among the Indians "manifestly practicable." The Choctaw Academy, however, did not become a reality until several years later. In 1825, a treaty was negotiated with the Choctaws at Dancing Rabbit Creek, at which time, the sum of $6,000 was to be set aside annually for the next twenty years for the education of Indian children. This Indian appropriation for education was to be used to pay the tuition for those boys who were selected by the Choctaw officials to attend the Academy in Kentucky. It was this Choctaw annual grant of $6,000 that made possible the opening of the school at Great Crossings and for this reason it was decided to call it the Choctaw Academy. Other Indian nations became interested in sending some of their young men to the school. On April 1, 1826, a Creek delegation informed the War Department that they had appropriated "twenty-four thousand dollars to be placed in the hands of the President to be applied for the education for Creek youth at the Blue
Springs in Kentucky." In that same year, twenty Creek boys were sent to the school. In 1827, John Tipton sent eleven Potawatomies to the Academy.

During the first years of the Choctaw Academy, white boys who were willing to pay their own tuition, were permitted to attend. The annual report of 1826 showed 53 Choctaws, 13 Creeks, 1 Potawatomi, and 20 whites enrolled. As to the attitude of the white community concerning this interracial arrangement, the report stated that "The prejudice of the whites has disappeared and the kindest feelings are manifested." It was known now that the Indians were able to keep pace with the whites in learning and the two races of boys were said to be working together in "perfect harmony." In 1827, the school enrollment was up to 91 and the association of the whites with the Indians was cordial and friendly. The 1830 annual report to the War Department made reference to the association of the Indian students with the "families of the most respectable part of the community." This, it was asserted, gave the Indian youth an advantage which he could not enjoy in his own nation: "In this way these youths have an ample opportunity of improving both by precept and example."

The principal of the Choctaw Academy was Rev. Richard Henderson, a Baptist clergyman. He had received the position mainly through the intercession of Richard Johnson, the sponsor of the school. In his recommendation to the War Department, Johnson referred to the Baptist minister as a "teacher of uncommon merit, a scientific character . . . a man of moral character. . . ." Henderson at the time was manager of Johnson's estate and had proved himself to be a "man of business, excellent disposition, dignified in his deportment and conciliatory in his manners."
The school's curriculum included reading, writing, arithmetic, English grammar, geography, practical surveying, astronomy, natural philosophy, history, moral philosophy and vocal music.\textsuperscript{53} There was a singing society, an Aeolian society to "instruct the young men in all the peculiarities of etiquette," and the Lycurgus Court to teach and practice self-government. The Court consisted of a grand jury, a judge, sheriff, two lawyers and a clerk.\textsuperscript{54} The Lancasterian plan was the teaching system used in the Academy.\textsuperscript{55} The kind of food and clothes were prescribed by the War Department. All the students were given English names. In the student body in 1831, there was a William Pinckney, two George Washingtons, James Barbour, General Jackson, Thomas L. McKenney, Thomas Jefferson, General Tipton, Lewis Cass, Thomas Henderson, and John Eaton.\textsuperscript{56} In 1832, William Clark, Benjamin Franklin and General Hughes were added to the list of notables.\textsuperscript{57}

Giving the Indian boys English names was thought to be a necessary part of the plan designed to integrate the natives into white society. It represented a determination to erase from the mind of the Indian children their very identification in their own culture. While it also served an utilitarian purpose of convenience for the teachers, it often created some rather unusual problems. On one occasion, when a Seminole chief requested that his boy be sent home, it was impossible for the school officials to determine which one of the boys belonged to the chief. One of the Seminole boys had died of cholera and it was not known if this was the son of the chief. Somewhat embarrassed, Henderson, principal of the Academy, requested the chief to send someone to identify the boy. It was explained that "not one of the Seminole boys could speak a word in English when they came to the
school neither had they English names, consequently they all had to be named after they came to the school, and now can speak good English. . . ." One of the boys finally remembered that his father was a chief but on closer examination, the name of the boy did not match that of the Seminole chief. An elderly Negro who had accompanied the boys to the school convinced the school that it was the boy who died that belonged to the Chief.  

There was considerable opposition to the Academy in the 1830's. A committee of the Cherokee nation reported to George Vashon, sub-agent of Indian affairs, that the boys had not coffee to drink; they were forced to live chiefly on mutton and that their clothes were washed once in two weeks. A petition of the Cherokees to the War Department in 1834 stated that "certain unauthorized individuals have taken the right of selecting the scholars and have chosen the Choctaw Academy in Kentucky in which they are to be educated. . . ." They also thought the "charges of Board and tuition" to be very expensive and that the distance and time involved in travel to and from the school was too great. They voted to withdraw the Cherokee students from the Academy. Bourrassa, a young Choctaw chief, while studying law at Georgetown College, protested against the strictly classical curriculum of the Academy. He wrote to General N. D. Grover in February, 1833, to the effect that some boys who could not "learn their books" were able to learn a trade. He contended that the school should have "shops with shoe maker's, blacksmiths and tailor's shops." In a letter addressed to Honorable E. Herring, he argued that an old Indian would be more pleased to get a knife or tomahawk from his son than ten "well-ordered philosophical lectures." Commented Bourrassa, "He will say these lectures do not feed me nor cloth my
body." In 1833 the first shop being wagon, shoe, and smith. In 1837, an agricultural division was opened in which some of the boys were instructed in the use of farm implements. In 1838, the War Department made work mandatory for the first time for the boys at the Academy. Despite these changes in the curriculum, opposition continued primarily because of the distance and expense involved. The Indians, late in the 1830's were on the other side of the Mississippi so that distance, which had always been a problem was even more so in 1840. The school was forced to close its doors in the early 1840's.

The American Board of Missions established its first mission school in 1817 on the Chickamauga river among the Cherokees. The future plans, as reported in 1816, called for schools not only among the Cherokees, but the Chickasaws and Choctaws as well. The American Board, mainly Congregationalist with an element of Presbyterianism, looked forward to the day when the Cherokee tribe would "become English in their language, Christian in their religion, and civilized in their general habits and manners." Cyrus Kingsbury, the first missionary of the American Board to the Indians, arrived in the Cherokee country January 13, 1817. He had already been informed that President Madison approved of the project and that he would be given federal aid to the extent that the "laws will permit." The government agent had been instructed to erect a school building, a house for the teacher, and to provide the missionary with some farming implements. As the work expanded, and "the hope of ultimate success" justify it, more federal assistance would be supplied. Kingsbury's responsibility was to report
annually to the War Department the "state of the school, its progress, and future prospects" and to follow the government's plan for civilizing the Indians. 71

The Rev. Elias Cornelius, as a representative of the American Board, made a trip in 1817 through the southwestern part of the United States, to determine where additional schools might best be located. Before returning to Boston, he conferred with some of the officials of the federal government as to the possibility of establishing schools among all of the southern tribes and the extent of federal assistance that could be had for such missionary projects. 72 The eighth annual report of the American Board outlined plans for schools among the Choctaws, Chickasaws and Creeks. According to the Board's report, the federal government had encouraged the expansion of mission schools and promised that "the same patronage will be extended to any establishment made within those nations for the objects stated. . . ."73 Cyrus Kingsbury, after completing the initial work for the Cherokee mission school, was sent to begin a similar project among the Choctaws. On March 27, 1820, John Pitchlynn notified Kingsbury that the "lower district chiefs in Council have given up one thousand dollars of their annuity for the use of a missionary school, to be established in the lower part of the nation, and one thousand for a black-smith's shop, and for steel and iron, to be also in the lower district. You are to have the whole direction of the business. . . ."74

The earliest Methodist missions among the Indians were in the state of Ohio. John Stewart, a mulatto with no formal education, began preaching to the Wyandot Indians on the Upper Sandusky in 1814. 75 His interpreter was
Jonathan Pointer, a Negro who had been taken prisoner by the Indians. In March, 1816, the Methodist conference licensed Stewart to preach, with some of the Wyandots vouching for his character. In August, 1821, James Finley was appointed by the Methodists to be resident missionary to the Wyandots. A personal appeal was made by the missionary to President Monroe for financial support for the school, giving as reference, John McLean, Postmaster General of the United States and former judge in Ohio. The President was reportedly pleased with the progress of the mission at Upper Sandusky and an appropriation was made to Finley which was used to build a church. Finley enjoyed the confidence of the Wyandots. Two of the chiefs, Between-the-Logs and Monocue were licensed preachers of the Methodist church. A letter from the Wyandot chiefs addressed to the Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun, indicated the trustful relations between Finley and the Wyandots. After expressing appreciation for Finley and the mission school, they informed Calhoun that five or six of them were coming to Washington to discuss some important matters and "we wish and expect that our friend and brother Finley will accompany us."

The Methodists began work among the Creek Indians in 1821. William Capers, South Carolina pastor, was appointed by Bishop McKendree to inaugurate schools among the Creeks. Since the Creek Indians were notably opposed to the introduction of Christianity, it was decided to limit the activity to schools. When the missionaries, a few years later, decided to begin religious instruction, Big Warrior, one of the chiefs, became angry. The missionaries charged the United States' agent, John Crowell with stirring up the chiefs against the continuation of preaching the Christian
religion. After a considerable amount of correspondence had passed between the missionaries, Crowell, and the War Department, the Secretary of War instructed Crowell that he was obligated to cooperate fully with the missionaries. "The President," Calhoun declared, "takes deep interest in the success of every effort, the object of which is to improve the condition of the Indians." He informed the agent that it was hoped his conduct in the future would be "such as to avoid the possibility of complaint, on the part of those who are engaged in this benevolent work." Crowell was directed to give his support and to exert every influence in favor of the "Methodist mission or to any other society that may choose to direct its efforts to improve the condition of the Creek Indians." He was urged to use his influence with the natives to "reconcile them" to the preaching of the missionaries. Commented Calhoun, "The Department feels confident that, by proper efforts on your part, you may secure to the mission the right of preaching among the Indians, which is deemed to be so essentially connected with the objects of the society."85

The Methodist mission school among the Creek Indians, like the Choctaw Academy during its first years, did not teach "agriculture and the mechanic arts." Reverend William Capers, chairman of the South Carolina Methodist Missionary Committee, reported that "the terms on which the other establishments have been set up, and which so especially provide for having the children employed in agriculture and mechanic arts, seem to the Creek Indians, a suspicious contrivance to prepare them for enslavement."86 They did not object to the teaching of reading and writing but the missionaries dared not "mention agriculture and the mechanic arts."87
mission among the Creeks was different from most of the other schools situated in the Indian country in that it was supported entirely by the Methodist Church for the first four years. The denomination had invested nearly $15,000 in the project during that time. In 1825, however, the superintendent of the school, K. Hodges, notified the War Department that due to "many difficulties in the nation, and the consequent state of feeling in the southern states, from which the support of the institution had been chiefly obtained, without the government aid we shall have to abandon the place for the want of means to support it." 88

After 1825, the Methodists opened a number of schools among the Cherokees along with a most energetic program of religious instruction. In this nation, like the Baptists, the Methodists licensed many natives to be preachers. The first Cherokee preacher was Turtle Fields, a veteran of the Creek War, having served under General Andrew Jackson. William McIntosh, for many years an interpreter, was also a licensed preacher. Boot, a full-blood Cherokee, was an itinerant preacher. Edward Gunter, half-blood, who fought in the battle of Horseshoe Bend on the Tallapoosa River, was a licensed exhorter for the Methodists. Other Methodist leaders among the Cherokees included W. S. Coody, Richard Riley, Joseph Blackbird, and John Ross, principal chief of the Cherokees. Ross had a house of worship at his home where services were regularly conducted. From 1819 to 1826 Ross had been president of the National Committee of the Cherokee Council; from 1828 to 1839, he was the principal chief of the nation. 89
Chapter IV

The Missionary: Other Roles

The role of the missionary was not limited to the mission classroom or church. They were assigned other responsibilities by the government with a few serving in the official capacity of Indian agent. As a result of his experience and knowledge of the Indians as well as the trust placed in him by the natives, the missionary was of practical value to government Indian policy. While the missionary affirmed a role of noninterference in political matters, there was a flow of correspondence in both directions between the mission school and the War Department in Washington. The missionary, in some instances, the best informed on the thinking, culture, and language of the Indians, was able to provide the government with important information.

Correspondence from the missionaries to the Secretary of War contained recommendations relating to many aspects of Indian affairs. William H. Barr, missionary to the Chickasaws, advised the Secretary of War that the money which was to be appropriated for education should not pass through the hands of the government agent. Barr explained: "I may be mistaken but my opinion is, if the money ever got into the hands of Maj. Smith, it will not easily be gotten out again." The Chickasaws were considering some appropriation for education and the missionary wrote that he had been informed that Smith might make some arrangement that would thwart the work of the mission. Barr then suggested to the Secretary of War that the money
should remain in the hands of the government "subject to the draft of Mr. Stuart, or (which would be the same thing) of our society, in behalf of Stuart and the Chickasaw Mission. . . ."¹

In 1822, Jeremiah Evarts of the American Board of Missions urged the War Department to appoint chaplains to reside at the military posts in the Indian country and on the frontiers. The chaplains, it was suggested, would not only be responsible for religious activities at the post but they could be very usefully employed among the surrounding Indians. Calhoun informed Evarts that the act of Congress of April 14, 1818, provided for the appointment of only one chaplain and he was to be stationed at the Military Academy at West Point. He also was professor of geography, history and ethics at the academy.²

In making recommendations to the government, the missionaries occasionally brought charges against the government agents who resided in the Indian country. Humphrey Posey, missionary to the Cherokees, informed the War Department that the agent had paid the government appropriation for the mission school in "depreciated paper" money. Calhoun wrote that the "transaction bears strong marks of an attempt at fraud" and ordered an investigation.³ In other instances, the conduct of a government agent might be defended by the resident missionary. Cyrus Kingsbury, missionary to the Choctaws, witnessed to the good character of Colonel William Ward, agent for the Choctaws, in a letter to the War Department in 1824. Certain charges had been brought against Ward in the Arkansas Gazette. The accusations were concerned with the use of improper influence on the part of Ward in treaty negotiations. Kingsbury assured Calhoun that he had never heard any
intimation that Ward had used his influence to counteract or retard in any way the proposed treaty. "On the contrary," Kingsbury wrote, "he has appeared desirous of facilitating the views of the government in this, as well as all other respects." The missionary concluded his letter by stating that he had read the "communications in the Arkansas Gazette against the agent and found them to be completely false." In 1834, missionary D. Lowry urged Elbert Herring, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to keep the agent among the Winnebago Indians. He observed that the Indians placed great confidence in the government agent, General Street, and that he was able to effect the wishes of the government of those Indians. Lowry recommended that "the services of the present agent should be continued here." He went on to explain that the agent "having originated the plan of the school, and in defiance of much personal feeling on the part of its enemies, thus far conducted and defended it, he, of course, must feel deep solicitude for its success. . . ." It was also noted by the missionary that General Street was free from that "strange, unreasonable and above all, unscriptural notion, that the Indians are beyond the reach of reclaiming influence." 5

One of the most common problems with which the missionary concerned himself was that of the selling of whiskey to the Indians. In 1824, missionary McCoy said the practice of selling whiskey to the Indians was so general that government officials held out little hope that the evil could be corrected. Lewis Cass, governor of the Michigan Territory, sent McCoy a magistrate's commission for enforcing the laws in such cases. 6 Thinking that it would interfere with his position as a missionary, McCoy declined the commission. He reported the situation to John Tipton, Indian agent, in 1825
and the latter assured the missionary that he would use "every legal means upon violaters without respect to wealth, rank, or influence. . . ."?

In addition to the private correspondence of missionaries directed to the War Department with recommendations relative to the government Indian policy, the various mission boards addressed memorials to Congress urging the consideration of certain proposals. On March 3, 1824, the American Board of Missions presented to Congress a memorial which covered the whole scope of Indian policy. The document set forth a plan for the future work of civilization, calling for the building of an Indian college. The memorial suggested the possibility of collecting all the remnants of Indian tribes, in the North and South, together, in two well-chosen locations. Education families would be placed among them and these two groups could form the "rudiments of future towns and cities and even states, and ultimately the entire civilization." While many such proposals were accepted only in part, if at all, they were imaginative and offered some way out of the distressing Indian situation.

The government encouraged the missionary to take an active role in Indian affairs. Some of those who were either missionaries or directly involved in the promotion of Indian missions, were commissioned by the government to make surveys of the Indian country and report their findings and recommendations to the War Department. One such person was Jedidiah Morse, Congregational clergyman and the "father of American geography." In 1811, he was elected to the American Board of Missions and served in that capacity until 1819. He took a most active interest in the efforts of missions to the Indians. In 1819, the government commissioned him to study
the condition of the various Indian nations. John Calhoun, Secretary of War, sent a letter of instructions to Morse on February 7, 1820, stating that the purpose of the survey was to "acquire a more accurate knowledge of their actual condition, and to devise the most suitable plan to advance their civilization and happiness." The clergyman was asked to carefully observe the religious, moral and political conditions of the various tribes. Other characteristics to be noted by Morse were: their mode of life, customs, laws, and political institutions. He was to report on the number of schools, the plan of education, the degree of success of each school. Finally, the Secretary of War instructed Morse to report his own opinions as to any improvements that should be made in the government policy toward the Indians. Morse's report, presented to the Secretary of War, gave the state of the Indian tribes and was regarded at the time as the most complete and exhaustive report of the conditions, numbers, names, territory, and general affairs of the Indians ever made. He emphasized the need for harmony between the civil, military, commercial and religious sectors of the community, as they related to the improvement of the condition of the Indian. His observations on the factory system may have exerted some influence on the abandoning of the system shortly thereafter. He discovered that the system in which trade was carried on partly by the government through the factory system and partly by licensed traders, appeared to have few advocates. He recommended that the government select and form a company which would act under a government charter and thus, while private, would be responsible for its practices or lose the charter. The company could appoint its own agents. For the charter, a generous
bonus would be paid into the treasury of the United States and this amount would be added to the fund appropriated by Congress for Indian civiliza-

The government solicited the assistance of the missionaries in gathering information concerning the Indian tribes. From the annual reports of the mission schools came much additional material. There were always the required statistics on the number of teachers, pupils, progress of the students and financial data. The missionary was requested to note "anything remarkable in the progress of any Indian child, accompanied by his or her age, and the tribe to which he or she belonged, the general health of the children, their advances in the work of civilization with such remarks as may be deemed useful as to the climate, soil, and productions of the surrounding country." In addition to all of this, any specimens of birds, minerals, Indian costumes or other curiosities were to be included. Seeds of indigenous plants with their names were to be sent along with the annual report. The missionaries were asked to prepare an alphabet and grammar and a chapter in the language of the tribes or tribes among whom they were residing. They were also asked to cooperate with those who were making a serious study of the origin of the American Indians.

While not the customary practice, a few missionaries were appointed to the position of agent or sub-agent of Indian affairs. James Montgomery, Methodist missionary, was appointed sub-agent to the Senecas. Thinking that this position might make it possible for the missionary to be of "great advantage" to the Senecas, the Methodist church released Montgomery for the position. In 1820, the Governor of Maine asked the Quakers to begin work
among the Penobscot and Passamaquoddy Indians. Samuel F. Hussey and Jackson Davis, two Quakers who were the Indian agents in that state, began the missionary work to the Indians. 15 Isaac McCoy, Baptist missionary to the Potawatomies, was a government salaried school teacher who performed the functions of an agent of the government. 16 James B. Finley, Methodist missionary to the Wyandots, was sub-agent of Indian affairs at Upper Sandusky, Ohio, for some time. 17 Isaac McCoy wrote John Tipton asking him to use his influence to get missionary Lykins "some suitable office in the Indian Territory." 18

The many-faceted role of the missionary to the Indians can only be properly appreciated in the light of the isolated incidents as well as those which seem to fit into some kind of a pattern. The government often sent letters to the chiefs of Indian tribes through the medium of the missionary. Quite often a change in policy would be explained to the Indian by the resident missionary. Compere, Baptist missionary, informed the Bureau of Indian Affairs that the Creeks were beginning to see that they must remove to the west of the Mississippi. McKenney then urged Compere to explain to the Creeks the government policy and the reasons why they must eventually remove. 19 Even those letters sent direct to Indian chiefs were often brought by them to the missionary to be read. Such was the case when Major General Pendleton Gaines, in 1823, addressed a letter to the Cherokee chiefs which had to do with the war between the Osages and the Cherokees. One of the chiefs took his letter to the missionary and asked him to read it. Some time later Gaines came to the mission and asked missionary Washburn to accompany him to visit the chief. The General told Washburn
that he was going to use threats to get the chief to obey orders. The missionary told the General that the old chief would laugh in his face. Gaines replied that he would call on the chief in the uniform of a Major General in the United States Army and tell the chief to cooperate fully with the government policy or he would be hanged. When Washburn responded that the chief would still laugh at him, Gaines decided not to call on the chief at all.20 In 1828, Joseph Duncan informed the War Department of the assistance given by the Methodist missionary, Walker, during the recent hostilities among the Indians on Fox River. He asserted that the firmness of the missionary "together with his intimate acquaintance with, and acknowledged influence over those Indians had a happy tendency to quiet the fears of the frontier settlers and prevent the sacrifice of an abandonment of their houses, which, but for his advice and example would certainly have taken place."21
Chapter V

The Church-State Arrangement

There are two important issues involved in the church-state Indian civilization plan. The first is concerned with the reasons behind the decision of the government to rely on the missionaries and churches rather than develop its own institutions for educating the Indians. Secondly, some attempt must be made to determine the actual role of the missionary in the civilization scheme. The church-state arrangement seems to have awakened little or no objection. Congressional appropriations for Indian education were apportioned among missionaries to enable them to maintain schools. As additional sums became available through treaties with the tribes, these, too, were entrusted to sectarian missionary agencies. While the federal government appropriated no money directly for the conversion of the Indians to Christianity, through its assistance to secular education, it was subsidizing the efforts of denominational mission boards to indoctrinate the Indians.¹

Perhaps the state entered into the unique mission school arrangement partly from economic considerations. The Committee on Indian Affairs intimated this in its recommendation of the civilization plan to the House of Representatives. After pointing out the advantages to be gained by working with religious groups in civilizing the Indians, the report concluded: "The experiment may be tried at a very small expense."² There must have been a question as to how far the public would go in supporting education for Indians
when many whites received little or no schooling themselves. The attitude of
the frontiersman toward learning in general may have been reflected in his
determination to thwart the government's civilization program. It must be
remembered that for the half century following the adoption of the
Constitution, slow progress was made toward public, tax-supported school
systems in the states. This was particularly true in the Carolinas, Kentucky,
and Tennessee. There was a general feeling that it was unjust to tax one
citizen to help educate another citizen's children. Obviously, those who were
strongly opposed to tax-supported schools for whites, would not look with favor
on large Congressional appropriations for the education of Indians. For the
whites on the frontier who had actual contact with the Indians, there may well
have been the fear that the native boys would surpass the whites in learning. 3

The small appropriation for Indian education, voted by Congress in 1819,
had considerable opposition both before and years after its passage. Thomas
L. McKenney in 1817, in a letter to the Chairman of the House Committee on
Indian Affairs, had urged the extension of the factory system with a strong
proposal for schools. His plan called for the profits from the government
factories to be used for Indian schools. 4 The Committee accepted the idea and
a bill was drafted calling for eight new factories to provide for schools. It
was voted down. 5 The bill providing an appropriation of $10,000 each year for
Indian education was passed March 3, 1819. 6 Opposition to this small amount
continued as indicated in a memorial of the American Board of Missions to
Congress in March, 1824. The document noted the various objections made "by
some of distinction and influence in our country . . . that it is impracticable;
that Indians, like some species of birds and beasts, their fellow inhabitants
of the forest, are untameable; and that no means, which we can employ, will prepare them to enjoy with us the blessings of civilization." 7

The small civilization fund provided by Congress had to be supplemented in some other way. There were two possible sources, the Indians and benevolent societies. In the past, there had been a reluctance on the part of the former to provide education funds. In some instances, missionaries had been most effective in persuading the aborigines to make some provision for education funds. By turning to the religious community, the government would find a source of revenue to implement its own program and at the same time have the services of missionaries to work on the Indians for a similar purpose. Whether the officials of government were thinking along these lines cannot be determined, but this is the general pattern that developed. In a memorial to Congress in 1832, the American Board of Missions stated that "since the commencement of the Choctaw mission the board has, on the average paid more than three times as much, annually towards its support, as has, been paid by the United States." Another distinct advantage to the government was called to the attention of Congress, that of missionary salaries. "The teachers, farmers, mechanics, and missionaries, who have engaged in no trade, have had no stipend, and have received nothing from the board, or from any other source, except a bare support." In fact, some of the missionaries had given "all that they possessed, which was considerable, to the board." 9

In some respects, the difficulty in procuring the right kind of personnel to reside in the Indian country, was, for the government, a greater problem than that of finance. The factory system, designed to contribute toward the
civilization of the Indians, had not proved successful. The factors had been instructed by Thomas McKenney, in 1816, to be "models of what can be done to tame the wilderness." McKenney confided, some years later, to one missionary, that "suitable agents are all essential" but the government found it increasingly difficult "to get suitable and only suitable agents. . . ."

Living within the Indian country was far from a life of ease and comfort. The American Board reported that one-third of their missionaries had either died or had been forced to retire on account of impaired health. The mission boards usually set their standards high for those who were to serve and offered only the bare necessities of life in return. The American Board in stating the qualifications for farmers and mechanics to be stationed at the Indian missions, insisted that candidates should be "among the first which our country produces, in point of health, zeal, energy, skill, diligence, economy, and courage, and of course moral and religious excellence generally." Where else but in the religious community could the government find personnel of high moral character and ready to serve for so little in return?

The nature of the missionary contact as well as his character made him an asset to the government's civilization plan. He was not buying land, trading in furs, or selling whiskey. While many of the missionaries did not learn the native language, some of them became skilled linguists. It must be kept in mind that there was nothing uncommon about the government using missionaries among the Indians for political ends. The French and the Jesuits, the English and the Anglicans are some notable examples. Congressional funds for Indian education during the Revolutionary War was not so much a voluntary contribution as they were a matter of expedience in the political and military
During the years 1789 to 1815, gifts of implements and sometimes money were given to missionaries who were cooperating with the government in its half-hearted attempt to civilize the Indians. Consequently the public would not be unduly alarmed by a practice that dated back to colonial times.

The government may well have turned to the denominational mission boards to implement its civilization program simply because the latter were already awakening to the need and were willing, if not eager, to accept the proposed plan of the President and the federal aid that was offered. Perhaps more important than even the presence of the missionary in the Indian country were the energetic labors of the Protestant missionaries among the frontiersmen. The popular denominations of churches were occupied in trying to tame the frontier and it could be that the government thought that the missionary might prove to be a link between the Indian and the lawless whites. The greatest problem for the government was that of enforcement of its policy along the expanse of frontier and among the great numbers of settlers. The frontier bordering the Indian country was thousands of miles in length. It has been pointed out that as the frontier was moving west, Congress reduced the total force of the army from 10,000 to 6,000.13 The Baptists and Methodists were especially concerned with the needs of western settlers. Many ministers accompanied their people on their migration west from the old states. Denominational home missionary organizations were actively engaged in sending out missionaries to all parts of the West.14 Unfortunately, there was little connection between missions to the Indians and those to the white settlers. The former was classified under foreign and the latter under home missions.

The thinking behind the church's acceptance of federal aid for the mission
schools is difficult to analyze. The important fact is that the very popular churches that were in the forefront of the struggle that led to the disestablishment of the church in America, did request and receive government funds for missionary work among the Indians. One of the results of the American Revolution was the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in the South and in that part of New York where it was strong. Baptists, Presbyterians, Quakers, and Methodists regarded Anglican establishments as undemocratic, requiring non-members of the church as well as members to pay taxes for its maintenance. The separation of church and state came to New Hampshire in 1817, to Connecticut in 1818, and to Massachusetts in 1833. 15

The church then turned to the state at a time when the evangelical denominations were the most sensitive to the separation of church and state. The typical Baptist preacher during the early nineteenth century was usually self-supporting and received no salary. This practice was largely due to the reaction against the conditions in the older states such as Virginia, and to some extent Connecticut, where the Baptists had seen the effects of a ministry supported by the church. Despite this practice, the Baptist missionary McCoy wrote that the government had been paying the salaries of the Baptist missionaries for the past four years and indicated that the Baptist Board of Missions was hoping that the "Indian stations would be amply supported by the government." 16

Certain observations may be made relative to the church's participation in the government subsidized project. According to the reports of 1824-1825, the Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, Moravians and Catholics all received federal subsidies for their mission schools. 17 Mission
Boards thought the federal assistance necessary to the continuation of the schools. Jesse Walker, Methodist missionary among the Indians on Fox River, informed the War Department that the mission was in dire financial straits. The Methodist Church had provided an annual sum of $1,000 on the assumption that the government would provide buildings and other needs. The American Board in commenting on the financial support which its missions had received from the government, stated that such help was not only highly valued but that "an opposite disposition or policy would be of dark and disastrous aspect." A Senate Committee reported that the "annual appropriation of ten thousand dollars has encouraged the benevolent and pious, in many parts of the country to form associations and collect donations with the view of aiding the humane purposes of the government."

A memorial to Congress submitted by the American Board gives some insight into the thinking of that missionary agency on the issue of church and state posed here. It was stated that the "grant of money by the government of the United States to Indian schools, ought not to be regarded in the light of a personal favor to the teachers, or the society under whose direction they labor. . . ." The document insisted that such government aid should be thought of as "an expression of benevolence, on the part of the government, towards the Indians; for the teacher and the society, so far from receiving any personal benefit from such grants, are only thereby, subjected to additional labor and responsibility." The enterprise was one in which two parties participated without either one receiving any personal benefits from it. The greater part of the funds were provided, not by the federal government, but by the Indians and interested church people. Furthermore, missions to the
Indians were classified under the foreign work of the society and in this respect was not thought of as directly related to mission work among the whites. It would not be unreasonable to assume that economic considerations played a role in the thinking of the churchmen, too. A considerable amount of money was needed for the missionary thrust into the West as well as the growing missionary projects in other countries of the world. Although the Congressional appropriation was not large, it is fairly safe to assert that the missionary agencies would not have been the recipients of the treaty funds provided by the Indians had they refused to cooperate in the government's civilization plan. There was no way either for the denominational mission boards to know how much support they could expect from the whites for the education of Indians. There was the advantage of knowing for certain that government funds were available.

In addition to all the other factors, the fact that the government did not attempt to curtail the preaching to the natives and made no rules regarding religious instruction, helped prevent any significant protests. The acceptance of close relations between the federal government and the missionary to the Indians was somewhat a product of circumstances and rarely questioned. The Indians were wards of the federal government and as such, it was necessary for any whiteman, including missionaries, to get permission from the government to reside among the Indians. Certain regulations were to be followed by those who worked among the Indians. The American Board contended that the church-state arrangement was beneficial "not only on account of the direct pecuniary aid offered; but more especially for the security which it gives to the aborigines themselves, to those who are engaged in this labor of
benevolence on their behalf and to the whole Christian community. . . ."22

One author notes that this arrangement between the government and religious societies "was perhaps the most significant feature of religious development during the period." The idea was not new but never had relations between the federal government and religious organizations assumed such a systematic and definite form. Martha Edwards in her study of religious forces in the United States after 1815, comments that the expansion of federal authority after 1815 came at a time when religious organizations were expanding their activities and the range of contact between the two broadened. "Under these circumstances, executive patronage became a matter of some concern to the agents of religious organizations who were in communication with the heads of federal executive departments."23 Religious organizations received indirect aid from the government in the form of land grants or direct appropriations for the support of schools and charitable institutions under sectarian control. In 1826, money was appropriated for a college established in Washington, D.C., to train Baptist missionaries. Franking privileges facilitated the circulation of religious literature and preachers were permitted to hold religious services in the halls of Congress on Sundays. Charters granted by Congress for the incorporation of churches as well as educational and charitable institutions in the District of Columbia were usually accompanied with a donation of land.24 It was not until the decade of the 1840's that states began to pass constitutional amendments prohibiting the granting of state funds of denominational schools. An amendment to this effect was adopted by New Jersey in 1844 and during the next twenty years several other states took similar action. The important consideration here, however, is that during the first two decades of
the nineteenth century, the granting of state funds to denominational schools was accepted by most religious groups as not being inconsistent with the theory of separation between church and state. 25

The second issue involved in the church-state arrangement for the civilization of the Indian is that of the actual role of the church. To a great extent the forces that shaped the government's Indian policy were not under the influence of either the church or the state. The availability of land in the West; the pressure of whites on the frontiers; the states that were determined to have all Indians removed from within their borders, the spirit of Manifest Destiny, were the influences that determined the shape of the federal government's dealings with the Indians. At best any missionary influence was only temporary and relatively insignificant to the basic policy pattern. In insisting on justice for the Indian at treaty negotiations, the missionary may have protected him in his rights, but did not, except in a few isolated instances, prevent Indian removal. Some legislation may have been passed to curb the practice of selling whiskey to the Indians or to provide free vaccination to protect the native from the ravages of smallpox. Although missionary influence was often responsible for this kind of legislation, it was not able to effect any serious change in the basic thrusts of the policy. Furthermore, the real need was not for more laws but it was to find some way to enforce the existing regulations.

Within certain areas of the Indian country, the missionary did enjoy the confidence and trust of the aborigines. The schools provided the sectarian missionaries with a mighty weapon in the Indian-white encounter. It was at this point that the pattern of Indian life and thought would have to be
effected, if done at all. While the government might prescribe a certain
curriculum, the all important attitudes, ideas and basic philosophy of life
of the Indian students would have to be shaped by the missionary. There was
also, for the missionary, the added advantage of being able to employ
religious motivation and the potent concept of "God wills it." The relations
between the convert and the missionary were intimate and out-going so that
the latter had access, in some instances, to the council meetings and the most
confidential information. Native preachers, used for most religious functions
by the Baptists and Methodists, often gave the resident missionary a channel
to the very inner councils of some of the Indian tribes. While the missionary
could exert his will on the Indians and thus make his position more of an
asset to the federal government, the Indian, too often, was not the benefactor.
The missionary was between two fires and given the circumstances, only the
wisest could have known how to use such powers to bring them to bear on
government policy so as to benefit the Indian. Klingberg in writing about
the Indian-white relations in the eighteenth century recalled that there were
four bidders for the Indian's loyalty: "The British government, which desired
him as a fighter and an outpost of empire; the trader who wanted him as a
consumer of alcohol and other goods, and as a supplier of furs and various
products; the colonist who craved his land; and the missionary who wished his
conversion to Christianity. . . ." The role of the latter, Klingberg asserts,
resulted in softening the "impact of the new order." For, the writer contends,
the Indian would have "suffered even more severely from barbaric effect of a
strange civilization upon a native culture" without the help of the mission-
ary.26 The circumstances had not changed considerably in the early nineteenth
It was in the implementation of the government's civilization scheme that the missionary played the key role. In this respect, the first civilization plan of the United States government, principally designed by Henry Knox, first Secretary of War, had come to life. In a report to President Washington, Knox had recommended that "missionaries of excellent moral character, should be appointed to reside in their \[Indians']\7 nations, who should be well supplied with all implements of husbandry and necessary stock for a farm. These men should be made the instruments to work on the Indians. . . ."27 The hostility of the western tribes, lack of funds and interest, as well as other eventualities had resulted in a half-hearted and partial fulfillment of Knox's plan until the 1820's. During the decade after 1820 there was considerable progress, at least so the reports indicated, in the civilizing of some of the Indian tribes.28 In 1824, the American Board of Missions stated that it had a staff of eighty-seven persons serving in its several mission schools with a total enrollment of 350 students in its twelve schools.29 Thomas L. McKenney, head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, informed the Secretary of War that there were thirty-two schools in operation with a total student body of 916.30 In 1826, McKenney urged Congress to consider increasing the annual appropriation of $10,000.31 In a report to the Secretary of War, which was submitted to Congress, McKenney quoted from a letter of David Brown, an Indian convert and mission school student. Brown stated that "the Christian religion is the religion of the nation. Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptist, and Moravians are the most numerous sects. Some of the most influential characters are members of the church and live consistently with their profession." Brown gave a most
optimistic report as to the progress of the schools. In the same report, McKenney indicated that several tribes had placed large annuites for education under the direction of the government. "The Choctaws have allotted twelve thousand dollars of their means, per annum, for nearly twenty years...; and the Chickasaws have given one year's annuity, amounting to upwards of thirty thousand dollars, as a fund for the same object." 32

The increasing tempo of state pressure on the federal government to remove all Indians within the boundaries of states east of the Mississippi was having its effect on the mission schools. Talk of removal not only destroyed initiative but it created distrust and suspicion of all whites, including the missionaries. There was little doubt by 1825 as to the true intentions of the federal government. The Baptist missionary Lee Compere, informed the Secretary of War in September, 1827, that "All those interesting symptoms which two years ago made their appearance and flattered our hopes, have for the most part been swallowed up in the confusion of the times." The missionary asserted that the pressure being applied by the federal government for the removal of the Indians to the West had destroyed "all confidence between the Indians and their chiefs... and what is still worse between them and their agent." He further stated that the efforts of the government and religious missionary agencies to promote civilization in that nation, the Choctaws, would fail for the Indians told Compere, that it was "useless to make houses or fields for the white people." 33 After a tour of the Indian country in 1827, the once hopeful and optimistic Thomas McKenney, informed Barbour that the Indians were abandoned "to vices, especially whiskey." He was now confirmed in the opinion that "removal was the only policy by which the Indians could be saved." 34
The irony here is that the talk of removal was considered by some of the missionaries to be the knife that stabbed in the back the promising plan for Indian civilization in the early 1820's. With the promise of payment for the missionary properties in the East and assurance of federal aid for schools in the West, the missionary removed to the West with the Indians and began all over again.
Chapter VI

Retrospect

This study has raised three most disturbing questions. First, was the government intending that the Indian should take his place in white society someday as a citizen of the United States or were these civilization schemes only stop-gap economy measures to be terminated when no longer expedient? Henry Adams, in recounting the events that led up to the Battle of Tippecanoe in 1811, noted that treaties with the Indians carried a provision stating that if an Indian killed a white man, the tribe would surrender the murderer for trial by American law. If a white man killed an Indian, the murderer was also to be tried by a white jury. "The Indians surrendered their murderers, and white juries at Vincennes hung them without scruple, but no jury in the territory ever convicted a white man of murdering an Indian." Adams also contended that Jefferson's greed for land equalled that of any settler on the border, "and his humanity to the Indian suffered the suspicion of having among its motives the purpose of gaining the Indian lands for the whites." Furthermore, the historian of the latter part of the nineteenth century, contended that Jefferson did not want the Indians to accept his advice and "become civilized, educated, or competent to protect themselves. . . ."¹ Jack D. Forbes, in his recent book of readings on the American Indian, intimates that Jefferson, being dependent upon the political support of frontier whites, was forced to accept the policy of acquiring land from the Indians as rapidly as possible.
Whereas at one time, the liberal and humanitarian Jefferson favored the amalgamation of the whites and Indians by intermarriage, after 1803, with the acquiring of Louisiana, he began to favor the removal of all tribes to the west of the Mississippi. Forbes concludes that it was in the administration of Jefferson that we have the beginning of a "harsh" Indian policy and that the War of 1812 was "in great part an outgrowth of this ruthless policy toward the aborigines."²

According to a report of missionary Gideon Blackburn, who had conducted a school among the Cherokees for several years, there was a large number within that nation of Indians who were seriously interested in incorporating within the United States and becoming subject to the regular government.³ The opposition suspected that this had been the motive behind the civilization efforts and opposed it accordingly.¹ In 1818, the American Board of Missions reported that the Cherokees considered the "offer of taking reserves and becoming citizens of the United States, as of no service to them." Receiving their information through their missionaries stationed among the Cherokees, the Board stated that the Cherokees "know that they are not to be admitted to the rights of freemen, or the privilege of their oath; and say, no Cherokee, or white man with a Cherokee family, can possibly live among such white people, as will first settle their country."⁵

The situation among the Indians in the state of Ohio in the 1820's was equally disturbing and casts doubt on the government's intentions. James B. Finley, a missionary who had labored many years among the Wyandots in Ohio, informed Lewis Cass on December 15, 1825, that the Wyandots had made such rapid progress in civilization that they would be soon ready to be admitted
"as citizens of the state of Ohio" and warned against any attempts to remove them. Despite the fact that the Wyandots were few in number; they were also related to some of the "best families" in the state and were almost ready to become citizens themselves, government agents continued to harass them, as Finley expressed it, by using "honeyed phrases" to "sugar over the bitter pill" which was being prepared for the unfortunate Indian. The Wyandots were told that they would be "free forever from the encroachments and injuries to which they are now liable, from their proximity to the whites." But these Indians were apparently desirous of living among the whites, if we can trust the missionary's words. 6

A similar situation existed among the Shawnees of Ohio as that one among the Wyandots. Thomas L. McKenney 7 of the Office of Indian Affairs had written to a clergyman in New York in 1829 stating that the state of Ohio did not urge the removal of the Shawnees. He admitted that the Shawnees would make good citizens. McKenney had been informed by the government's agent that both the Wyandots and Shawnees were seeking for ways and means to go West. It was thought by the agent that within five years there would not be an Indian in Ohio. Why under such favorable living conditions would any Indian want to remove to the wilderness of the West? McKenney surmised that it was due to that "unconquerable antipathy... of the red to the near neighborhood of the white men. And much of this arises from that conscious inferiority of which the former is never for a moment relieved...." The missionaries who were on the scene had a different version to report. They contended that, in the midst of good progress toward civilizing the Shawnees, the government sent its agent to induce the Indians, who were supposedly being prepared to citizenship,
to remove to the west of the Mississippi. The Shawnees were warned that the state of Ohio was almost ready to extend its laws over them at which time they would be required to pay taxes for the "benefit of white people but they would receive no advantages under those laws." The agent informed them that whites could collect debts against them but that they could not collect a debt against whites unless a white man swears to it. Should an Indian be beaten or even killed by a white man, the latter could not be brought to justice except by the witness of another white man. The missionaries reported that on June 29, 1831, the chiefs of the Shawnees met for the purpose of discussing the government's proposals. One of the chiefs supposedly said, that it was difficult to give his people up to come under state laws without being permitted to bote, or having their civil oaths regarded before a magistrate; it would be as bad as to give themselves up to have their throats cut; for he could easily conceive of their being driven to desperation, and immediately committing outrage that would bring them to the gallows. . .

The chiefs talked all night commenting to the effect that they had established schools, attended to agriculture and examined the "religion of the Bible" in the hope that the whites would be pleased and would want them to stay.

The situation was much the same in the South. Thomas C. Stuart, superintendent of Monroe mission to some Indians in Mississippi, stated that "every step toward improvement among the Indians is considered as strengthening the ties by which they are already bound to their territory; to prevent which all their energies are called into action." Stuart informed the Secretary of War that he had been "credibly informed" that the man who won election to the vacancy in the House of Representatives occasioned "by the death of Mr. Runkin, obtained election by wielding, as his electioneering engine, the popular clamor against the missionaries." He had promised to drive
the missionaries out of the country and the "Indians over the Mississippi." The missionary also stated that the Indians were well aware of their precarious position within the state. According to the constitution of the State of Mississippi, the Indians were "forever excluded from the right of suffrage and many other privileges of common citizen, however enlightened and civilized they may become." Stuart concluded that "a powerful incentive to action" had been taken away and the Indians are "discouraged from aiming at anything like a high state of improvement." While the Ohio and Mississippi incidents do not conclusively prove the government was not planning to make citizens of the Indians, they do give cause for doubt. A second disturbing question is concerned with the tendency on the part of the missionary to exaggerate reports of progress in the attempt to civilize and convert the Indian. The amount expended by the federal government on mission schools was not nearly enough to maintain the institutions. For this reason and in order to recruit new missionaries, the good will of the church people back home was essential. The periodic reports to the mission boards proved the value of the project. Since the movement to send missionaries to China and India was in full swing, Indian missions had keen competition. The Baptist missionary, Isaac McCoy, complained in 1831 that the Baptists were lagging behind in Indian missions primarily because the Christian community was beginning to think the Indian could not be helped. For this reason, McCoy stated that candidates for missionary service were inclined to seek fields that promised a more fruitful harvest. The church was caught up in the web of pragmatic thinking that judges the value of a project by results. Constituents back home wanted
immediate action in this business of converting the Indian or they would withdraw support. Missionaries found it necessary in such circumstances to give the impression that results were more far-reaching than they were. John Halkett in his remarks on the missionary, urged him to be on "his guard . . . against those seeds of incipient enthusiasm which often produce a similar superstition in those who repair to the wilderness for the purpose of converting the heathen. . . ."¹² McCoy, a missionary himself, bore witness to the fact that "missionaries are sometimes afraid to tell the worst of this part of the story, lest the benevolent societies and individuals at a distance, who patronize the missions, would become discouraged, and would decline the prosecution of the undertaking."¹³

In addition to the tendency of padding the reports, the missionary often mistook for hopeful conversion that which was no more than normal Indian custom of respect toward visitors. When John D. Hunter was living among the Osage Indians, a clergyman preached several times to the Indians through an interpreter. Hunter, relating the story later, said that this was the first Christian preacher he had seen or heard. "The Indians treated him with great respect, and listened to these discourses with profound attention, but could not, as I heard them observe, comprehend the doctrines he wished to inculcate." The writer then described the Indian custom of patiently listening while someone else is talking until their turn arrives. Hunter declared, "This respect is still more particularly observed towards strangers, and the slightest deviation from it would be regarded as rude, indecorous, and highly offensive." Concerning the missionary, the writer had found that it was this trait in the Indian character "which many of the missionaries mistake for a
serious impression made on their minds, and which has led to many exaggerated accounts of their conversion to Christianity.  

Some of the missionaries defeated their own purpose by showing disrespect for the Indian religion. George Catlin, who had traveled most extensively among the Indians, wrote that he had heard some missionaries say that the Indians "have no religion - that all their zeal in their worship of the Great Spirit was but foolish excess of ignorant superstition - that their humble devotions and supplications to the Sun and the Moon, where many of them suppose that the Great Spirit resides, were but the absurd rantings of idolatry." The natural tendency of the Indian to confound the Christian religion with the evils of white society did not help the missionary cause. Klingberg expressed it quite well when he wrote: "Curious about the White man's God, courteous in their welcome to the itinerant clergyman, they were, nevertheless, if drunken after contact with traders, sullen, dangerous, and unwilling to listen to missionaries and teachers." 

Unfortunately, there was too much truth in the repeated citing of lawless whites and whiskey as the chief causes of failure to civilize the Indians. Since these were rather easy to document, they resulted in blacking out issues that were more elusive but potent. The manner in which civilization was attempted, the failure to understand and appreciate Indian culture, the naive thinking that culture can be changed overnight and the absence of communication between the two races due to wide variance in cultural patterns, all united to create suspicion and mistrust. The Indian failed to appreciate the white man's religion because of what he knew about the white man's way. He failed to grasp the truth that while many a frontiersman professed the Christian
religion, he did not practice it. The missionary's method of sudden conversion was too simple for a situation that called for a change of one's whole cultural pattern. The demand for immediate results in order to keep the mission afloat only served to make more difficult what normally would have been an almost impossible assignment.

In all fairness to the missionary, the misconceptions concerning the Indian and how to deal with him were shared by most of the white community. Religious organizations and benevolent individuals had done a great deal for the Indian. Beginning with John Eliot, these agents of civilization had put forth much courageous effort to reclaim the red man from his life of hunting and at the same time to counteract the evil example of the frontiersman. They not only built churches and schools but they often worked side by side with the Indians and by actual experience with them learned something of their needs and hopes. In the introduction to this book of documents on the Indian, Wilcomb Washburn writes: "The missionary impulse was sincere, if it was not successful. The passages in his book illustrate the high hopes and acute disappointments of the missionaries. According to one's orientation, one can see the dedication or stupidity of those proffering the Christian God and the perversity or subtlety of those refusing it."17

A third question of consideration is that of the effect of the slave status of the Negro in white society on Indian resistance to being civilized. An Osage chief while visiting Washington, D.C., was asked to give his opinion on the subject of the civilizing of his people. He stated his admiration for the fine house, extensive fields of corn, gardens, cattle and machines which the white man owned. Then he commented: "But you are surrounded by slaves;
everything about you is in chains, and you are slaves yourselves. I fear if I should exchange my pursuits for yours, I too should become a slave."¹⁸ Many Indians among the southern tribes owned slaves themselves.¹⁹ The Indian considered work such as tilling the soil to be beneath him; work was for the Negroes. A missionary letter to the War Department revealed what appeared to be a paradox. He found that the Negroes in some respects were viewed by the Indians in a "degrading light, yet in others, they are considered as possessing an advantage over them; because they can talk and speak a little English, many of their owners suppose them to be much better acquainted with the world than they."²⁰ But the Indian could always reason that he would be more valuable to the white man were he to learn the technique of farming. One chief offered to provide a slave to work all day if the missionaries would excuse his son from agricultural labor between school hours.²¹

Another interesting phenomenon was that missionaries often had more success in converting the Negroes even when they were supposedly laboring in behalf of the Indians. In fact, in some instances, Negroes made up the greater part of the Sunday congregations. Negroes were also employed by the mission establishments and in at least one instance, a slave was owned by a mission.²² A few Negroes were appointed as missionaries to the Indians. The Cherokees were willing to have their Negro slaves attend the mission schools and the church services.²³ Some of the Choctaws permitted their slaves to attend the mission services.²⁴ Lee Compere, a missionary to the Creeks, found that the Negro slaves could not attend the church services at the mission without incurring the displeasure of their masters. In one instance, the owners came
to the church and whipped the slaves in the presence of the missionary's wife. As they emigrated to the West with their owners, the slaves carried with them letters of recommendation from their churches back in the East.

The effect of the slave status of the Negro on the Indian is difficult to determine. Obviously the Indian had little reason from past experience with the whites to expect much better treatment than that of a slave. Furthermore, the increasing grip of the slaveholders on the southern society during the 1830's at the same time that the Indians were being forced out of those states, must have created further suspicions as the real intent of the United States Indian policy.
Chapter VII

Removal: First Phase 1803 - 1828

Indian removal was first proposed by Thomas Jefferson after the purchase of the Louisiana Territory from France in 1803. In 1808 some overtures were made to the Cherokees to remove to the west of the Mississippi, especially those who chose to live by hunting. Although some Cherokees went West, there was no exchange of lands until the Treaty of 1817. The War of 1812, however, had disrupted any further serious consideration of removal.

In January, 1817, the removal issue was revived when the Senate Committee on Public Lands reported on the advisability of making an exchange of lands with the Indians and proposed that funds be appropriated so that the President could negotiate treaties with the Indians for that purpose. During the decade after 1817, the general policy of the government called for the gradual transfer of Indian tribes to their new western areas. Behind the policy was the desire of white settlers for Indian lands and the determination of eastern states to remove all the Indians from within their boundaries. The end of the War of 1812 marked an acceleration of the westward movement of white population. Incentives to mass migrations to the West were many and diverse. As a result of the new land laws after 1820, land could be purchased from the government for as low as $1.25 an acre. Steamboats on the western rivers after 1813 facilitated travel into the West. The opening of the Erie Canal in 1825 provided an ideal route for westward bound emigrants. In the South, the
plantation system had moved into the Gulf states and the newer states of Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi were drawing the population away from the older states of Maryland, Virginia and the Carolinas. During the decade of the 1820's, Mississippi increased its population 111%; Alabama 142%. This phenomenal development of the West resulted in a political influence that no official in the federal government could long ignore. It was the rapidly changing West that aroused the interest of the administration in removal of the Indians.

President Monroe, in a letter to Andrew Jackson, in 1817, stated that he thought "the hunter or savage state requires a greater extent of territory to sustain it, than is compatible with the progress and just claims of civilized life, and must yield to it." In his annual message to Congress that same year, the President declared that "no tribe or people have a right to withhold from the wants of others more than is necessary for their own support and comfort." Monroe was also convinced that the future preservation of the Indians depended on an end to their independent status within the white settlements. In his annual message of December 7, 1824, Monroe asserted that it was necessary to civilize the Indians in order to assure their survival and that this could not be effected where they were. Although he did not think forceful ejection would be justifiable, the President hoped that the Indians might be induced to move to the West. In a special message to Congress on January 24, 1825, Monroe set forth a definite plan for removal. He advocated the formation of a government in the West for the Indians that would insure order, prevent white intrusion and stimulate the civilization program. Lands were to be given outright to the natives and thus, it was hoped, settle the question of
the legality of Indian land tenure. No force was to be used in implementing the plan and, although not specifically mentioned, eventual statehood was implied. Monroe wanted a policy that would be liberal enough to satisfy both the Cherokees and the Georgians and one that would be attractive to Indians North and South. The report recommended that commissioners be sent to the various tribes to explain to them the objects of the government. Thomas Hart Benton notified the Secretary of War, Calhoun, that the Committee on Indian Affairs in the Senate unanimously adopted the system recommended by Monroe. Calhoun sent Benton a draft of a bill incorporating the plan suggested by the President. The bill passed in the Senate but was defeated in the House. The Monroe administration came to an end without any Congressional agreement on a removal plan.

On February 3, 1826, the Secretary of War, Barbour, submitted in his report to the House of Representatives, a plan for removal of the Indians. There was no significant change in the proposals offered by Calhoun in 1825. Barbour's suggested plan stated that a country west of the Mississippi should be set aside exclusively for the Indians and that they would be removed as individuals instead of as tribes. A territorial government was to be established and maintained by the United States. When possible, tribes would be broken up and property distributed among individuals. The condition of the Indians in the East was to remain unchanged. McKenney had informed Barbour that he was uncertain as to whether the Indians were willing to migrate but thought that if they were approached on the matter in the right way, they could be persuaded to go West. President Adams, in reference to the discussion of Barbour's plan by the Cabinet, stated that Barbour had given up
the idea of incorporating the Indians into states where they resided and now called for the forming of the Indians into a territorial government west of the Mississippi. The President questioned the practicability of the Barbour plan and so did the other members of the President's cabinet, according to Adams. Since no one else had anything more effective to propose, Adams gave his approval. Congress, however, refused to take any action on the Barbour plan and the Adams administration left office without finding any solution to the Indian problem.13

Although, during the Monroe and Adams Administration, Congress failed to enact legislation calling for removal, plans were proposed and a haphazard form of removal did take place. Protestant mission boards, cooperating with the federal government in civilizing the Indians, were inevitably involved in any discussions on Indian removal. They had committed both personnel and funds to the government civilization project and were personally concerned that certain objectives be realized. In fact, one of the early proposals for removal was submitted to the War Department by a member of the American Board of Missions, Jedidiah Morse. Morse, a Congregational minister and promoter of Indians missions, called for the removal of the Indians to the Northwest Territory. Morse had been commissioned by the War Department, in 1819, to make a visit to all the Indian tribes in both the North and South. He was instructed to gather certain data and report his findings to the government along with any personal recommendations. Morse informed Calhoun, Secretary of War, that there was a division of opinion among both the whites and Indians on the subject of Indian removal. The unresolved question was concerned with the most suitable environment for civilizing the Indians. Removing the Indians
into a wilderness among hostile strangers, Morse contended, was not conducive to their improvement. To permit some to remove and the remainder to stay would only serve to further weaken the "already enfeebled remnants of tribes."\textsuperscript{14} Morse then suggested that the Indians be moved to some "suitable prepared portion of our country, where, collected in one body, they may be made comfortable, and with advantage be educated together . . . ."\textsuperscript{15} He recommended that the Northwest Territory be considered as a future home for the Indians. He outlined a civilization scheme which was, in some respects, similar to the old Spanish mission system. The Indians were to be gathered into small communities and placed under the care of education families. Each village would have its own teachers, school, church and in time there would be a centrally located college. Morse was convinced that there was enough room for all the tribes who could be induced to emigrate to the area. He did not know, however, that within ten years a plan would be laid to erect every territory into a member of the federal union and eject these emigrant Indians. In the meantime, Morse looked forward to the day when the Indians would be "educated, become citizens, and in due time be admitted to all the privileges common to other territories and states in the Union."\textsuperscript{16}

Eleazar Williams, missionary to the Oneidas in New York, found himself in agreement with the Morse plan and began to promote the emigration of the New York Indians to Wisconsin. Williams was a half-breed and a lineal descendant of one of the victims of the Deerfield massacre.\textsuperscript{17} During the War of 1812, he was on the staff of the American army in the north.\textsuperscript{18} Following that War, he began his work as a missionary to the Oneidas at Oneida Castle, near Utica, New York. He was a born orator in the Mohawk language. He had been licensed
to preach by Bishop Hobart, of the New York diocese of the Episcopal Church. 19 Williams had reportedly been able to persuade nearly three-fifths of the Oneida tribe to forsake their own religion for the Christian faith. 20 According to Calvin Colton, William's "public character and private worth had not only given him a well-earned and merited ascendancy among the Indians; but a high and commanding influence with the Government." 20 Williams used his influence to induce a great number of the New York Indians to emigrate to the Northwest Territory.

Eleazar William's ideas on removal began to take form in 1818. He dreamed of establishing an Indian empire west of Lake Michigan and all of the Six Nations were to be included. 21 The country west of Lake Michigan all the way to the Mississippi was to be mapped out and each tribe allotted its own lands. 22 In 1819 Morse had visited Oneida at which time Williams convened a general council. Morse urged the Oneidas to remove to the lands formerly occupied by the Menominees and Winnebagos, in the vicinity of Green Bay. 23 Williams was then invited to come to Washington to discuss the matter of removal of the New York Indians. On his way he called on Bishop Hobart in New York City, who expressed his approval of the removal idea. Williams was well received in Washington and the War Department began to make plans for an expedition to the West under the direction of the missionary. The party was to consist of Eleazar Williams, Dr. Jedidiah Morse, and eight Indians, delegates from the Six Nations. 24

In the winter of 1820, the expedition set out for Green Bay and upon reaching Detroit, it was discovered that the Indian agent at Green Bay, Colonel Boyer, had negotiated a treaty of cession with the Menominees for the
land on the Fox River which the New York Indians had hoped to buy. Williams and
Morse presented their case against the ratification of the treaty. \(^{25}\) Governor
Lewis Cass in a letter of November 11, 1820, informed the Secretary of War that
Boyer had obtained a cession of land from the Indians. He doubted the
advisability of the transaction, since it was not required because no immediate
increase of the population in that country by emigration was anticipated.
Furthermore, Cass contended that extinguishing the Indian title to such a large
tract of land would only throw it open to "every adventurer, who may choose to
enter it." Cass thought that the New York Indians should be encouraged to
emigrate to Green Bay. He explained: "Their habits and the strong pecuniary
ties, which bind them to the United States would ensure their fidelity and they
would act as a check upon the Winnebagos, the worst affect of any Indians upon
our borders." \(^{26}\) President Monroe was convinced of the soundness of Cass's
reasoning and refused to present the treaty to the Senate. \(^{27}\)

In the spring of 1821, Williams visited New York and Philadelphia and while
in the former city, he met with Thomas L. Ogden, head of The New York Land
Company. General Ellis, who accompanied Williams on this trip, stated that
Ogden considered Williams to be a "powerful agent in effecting the removal of
the Senecas" and that the missionary was given a large sum of money. These
monetary gifts, according to Ellis, were repeated many times after this, for the
purpose of assisting Williams in the removal efforts. \(^{28}\)

The second delegation of New York Indians, led by Eleazar Williams\(^{29}\) made
their way to the Green Bay area of the Northwest Territory in the winter of
1821. Governor Cass wrote to John Biddle, the newly appointed agent at Green
Bay, on June 29, 1821, informing him that "another effort will be made by the
Six Nations to obtain a permanent site for their residence upon the Fox River. For this purpose their delegation will proceed to Green Bay. . ." Cass stated that he had informed his private secretary, Mr. Trowbridge, to accompany the delegation. He instructed the agent to do all that was necessary to enable the New York Indians to purchase land from the Menominees. 

Representatives of the Oneidas, St. Regis, Stockbridge, Onondaga, Seneca and Tuscarora Indians were included in the delegation. Upon arrival in Green Bay, negotiations were opened with Menominees. It was agreed that land should be purchased by treaty and on August 17, 1821, the deal was consummated.

Returning home, the missionary Williams was congratulated by Governor Clinton and others. The pagan party of the Oneidas, however, were most disturbed and requested that Bishop Hobart remove Williams from their nation. Williams resigned his station at Oneida and set out for Green Bay in July, 1822.

The plan to settle New York Indians in Green Bay met with considerable opposition from the French speaking community in the Green Bay area. They addressed a memorial to Congress in September, 1822, stating that Rev. Eleazar Williams had concluded a treaty between some of the New York Indians and the Winnegagos and Menominees. The memorialists contended that the treaty did not represent the feelings of the majority of the Menominees and that it had been signed by some of the "miserable outcasts" of that tribe and witnessed by the military, who, they claimed, were not even present.

Despite opposition from both New York and Green Bay, the Stockbridge Indians sold their lands and removed almost immediately; the Christian party of the Oneidas did the same. Opposition continued with a group of New York Indians informing the Secretary of War on April 5, 1824, that the missionary, Eleazar Williams, had not been
authorized to act as their agent and further stated that they did not want to sell their lands and remove to Green Bay. The Secretary of War was urged to look into the matter. The French community continued its attempt to prevent the New York Indians from settling in the Green Bay area. Woodbridge informed the Secretary of State that the French were fearful that the past treaty between the New York Indians and the Menominees would result in ejection from their lands.

The federal government encouraged the emigration of the New York Indians to Green Bay. On January 27, 1825, the Secretary of War presented to Congress a plan calling for the removal of most of the tribes to the west of the Mississippi. He stated, however, that the 13,150 Indians living in the states of Indiana, Illinois and the peninsula of Michigan and New York, including the Ottawas in Ohio, could be best removed to the west of Lake Michigan, north of the state of Illinois. It was thought that the climate and nature of the country would be more favorable to their habits and he observed that the New York Indians already had a settlement there. In line with Calhoun's proposal of the early part of 1825, McKenney wrote to Henry B. Brevoort, Indian agent at Green Bay, in March of that year, stating that the arrangements made between the Indians at Green Bay and those in New York had been sanctioned by the government. He was concerned about the reports that had reached the War Department to the effect that the French community of Green Bay had improperly interfered with the treaty negotiations and that they had attempted to incite the Indians in that vicinity to hostility against the New York Indians. He urged the agent to take necessary steps to bring the "settlers in line."
The Brothertown Indians in New York made plans to emigrate to Green Bay. They purchased a tract of land on the Fox River. The Secretary of War informed Governor Cass of the Michigan Territory on March 27, 1827, that the Brothertowns had purchased a tract of land on the Fox River eight miles wide and thirty miles long and that they were soon to emigrate from New York. He told the governor that some of the citizens of Green Bay "opposed the fact that Brothertowns would occupy that area" and that an investigation of the matter should be made. The second Christian party of the Oneidas, called the Orchard Party, removed to Green Bay.

Eleazar Williams, laid the idea of removal before the Senecas and they emphatically refused to leave New York. In fact, the Senecas never did emigrate.

The mass movement of white settlers into Wisconsin in the latter 1820's and early 1830's put an end to any plans for an Indian state in the Northwest. By the 1830's the federal government opened negotiations with these Indians still living in New York state and the tribes that had emigrated to Green Bay, with the intention of removing them all to the west of the Mississippi. That which a decade before had seemed to be a practical solution to the rapidly deteriorating condition of the Indians in the North new was considered to be an impossibility in the face of the moving frontier.

Isaac McCoy, Baptist missionary to the Potawatomies in the Michigan Territory, also had a vision of an Indian state, not in the Northwest, but as Jefferson had indicated, west of the Mississippi. Laboring among a tribe of Indians who showed little progress in civilization and were being exploited by the unscrupulous whites, the Baptist missionary thought removal to the West to be their only hope of preservation. McCoy wrote to Lewis Cass, Governor of
the Michigan Territory, on June 23, 1822, suggesting that as a first step in establishing an Indian state in the West, colonies of Indian students and their friends should be organized immediately in the West. In 1824, two members of the Baptist Board of Missions accompanied McCoy to an interview with the Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun, for the purpose of proposing some plan of Indian removal. In a letter to the Baptist Board of Missions on July 11, 1825, Isaac McCoy stated that the only "national salvation of the Indians" was in the anticipation of an Indian colony in the West. He suggested that Indian youths should be trained in leadership skills so that the colony would be supplied with men of their own nation, "capable of managing all their own business." In a letter to McCoy in 1826, Thomas L. McKenney, head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, declared himself in sympathy with the views expressed by McCoy on Indian colonization. The lack of funds, McKenney informed McCoy, ruled out the establishing of a suitable location and agency as a rallying point for emigrant Indians in the West. In May 1826, the Baptist General Convention, passed a resolution which expressed the "entire approbation" of that religious body of the "design of our Government to locate the aborigines of our country in the West, and of our readiness to cooperate in such a measure, and praying Congress to increase the appropriation for Indian reform."

In keeping with the general government policy of extinguishing the Indian title to lands in certain parts of the Northwest Territory, Governor Lewis Cass, planned to negotiate with the Potawatomi and Miami Indians in September, 1826. Knowing the sentiments of McCoy on removal of the Indians to the west of the Mississippi, John Tipton, government agent, urged McCoy to be
present at the treaty sessions. Some four weeks were required to complete the necessary negotiations. Preaching every Sabbath in the Council House, McCoy declared that he did not fail to plead "the cause of Indian reform" in his sermons. In the concluding remarks of his speech to the Indians, Lewis Cass, made practical use of the missionary's influence among the Indians by stating: "I am authorized to state to you, that if you will sell your lands and remove, your friend, Mr. McCoy will go and select a suitable situation, will remove and settle with you, and continue to teach your children. You know him to be a sincere man, that he is your friend, and would advise you nothing but good. He recommends it to you to remove." The most formidable opposition to the removal idea came from the southern tribes who had been making greater progress in civilization than had most of the Indians in the North. Progress toward removal in the North was easier because the tribes were smaller and tended toward a more wandering disposition. It was in the South that the real struggle over removal was to take place. The report of the Secretary of War in 1825 recommended that steps be taken to remove the nearly 80,000 Indians in the South to the west of the Mississippi. Within the states of Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, and Mississippi there were 53,625 Indians holding 33,571,176 acres of some of the best lands in those states. During the Monroe and Adams administrations, overtures were made to the tribes of the Creeks, Cherokees, Choctaws, and Chickasaws to exchange their lands in the East for others west of the Mississippi. The Cherokees made a treaty with the United States in 1817 in which they agreed to removal. Within two years, some 6,000 emigrated to the Arkansas Territory but most in the nation were opposed to removal. The treaty of 1817 was superseded by a new
one in February, 1819, which stated that the greater part of the Cherokees wanted to remain where they were. The American Board of Missions had sent their corresponding secretary, Jeremiah Evarts, to Washington in 1819 to instruct the Cherokee delegation and to urge the federal authorities to permit the Cherokees to remain in the East. Evarts thought that removal of the Indians who were progressing in civilization would cause them to revert to the "hunting and wanderung and savage life." This he reasoned would "doom them to extermination." A report of the intervention of the American Board of Missions in behalf of the Cherokees, stated that "the argument of Evarts appears to have had weight with the Government; and the delegation instead of finding themselves obliged, as their fears had led them to anticipate, to sign a virtual surrender of their country, had the high satisfaction to put their signatures to a treaty of a very different kind." For several years any formal action toward removing the Cherokees was abandoned. A treaty negotiated with the Choctaws in 1820 exchanging lands in the East for a tract in the Indian country, hopefully looked forward to voluntary emigration of that nation. By September 25, 1828, only fifty had gone west.

Attempts were made by the federal government to persuade the Creeks to remove to the West. Missionaries of both the Methodists and Baptists became involved in the negotiations that took place in 1825 and 1826. On February 12, 1825, the Creek treaty of Indian Springs was signed. All the lands lying within the boundary of Georgia and some of those in Alabama were ceded to the United States. The Treaty was signed by the United States Commissioners, Duncan Campbell and James Meriwether, and William McIntosh, head chief of the Cowetas and fifty-one other chiefs. It was ratified by the United States on
March 7, 1825. A number of the Creek chiefs and warriors opposed this large cession of land to Georgia and Alabama. They contended that the treaty was signed by Indians who did not have sufficient authority to form treaties and make cessions of land. The protesting party accused McIntosh of betraying the cause of the Indians and selling out to the Georgians. A storm of indignation arose and a party of warriors killed McIntosh. This led to the forming of parties in the nation and considerable strife resulted.

The murder of McIntosh brought about an investigation by the Georgia and federal officials. The Baptist missionary, Lee Compere, and the Methodist missionary, Isaac Smith, were both implicated in the complications growing out of the 1825 treaty. On the basis of conscience, the clergymen had refused to testify under oath for the Georgia commissioners, sent to investigate the death of McIntosh. It was known that both of the missionaries had considered the 1825 treaty an injustice to the Creek Indians and they had written to some of the newspapers expressing their sentiments. This missionary activity had enraged the Georgia state officials. Colonel Crowell, the federal government agent to the Creeks, had been accused of opposing the cession of land to Georgia by the Creeks. He had been implicated in the murder of McIntosh. The missionaries contended that McIntosh had been shot because he had signed away part of the Creek lands in violation of that nation's laws. As for Colonel Crowell's role in the whole affair, the Baptist and Methodist missionaries contended that he was innocent.

Knowing that the missionaries had clashed with Crowell in the past over the issue of preaching to the Indians, the Georgia commissioners were confident that the "missionary gentlemen were bound to give evidence against the agent on
any subject or charge, true or untrue, made against him." Upon discovering that this was not the feeling of the missionaries, the commissioners became angry. 60 With evident proof of fraud in the negotiation of the Treaty of 1825, the United States government ordered a new treaty drawn up with the Creek Indians and the old one was declared null and void. In the treaty of 1826, the Creeks agreed to sell all their land within the boundaries of Georgia, but reserved to themselves over five million acres lying within the state of Alabama and west of the Chattahooches River. 61

The Creek treaty controversy gave some indication of the reaction of the Georgia state officials toward anyone who opposed removal of the Indians. Compere and Smith, both missionaries who were supported by churches within the state of Georgia, had expressed their disapproval of the circumstances that surrounded the negotiations of the Creek treaty of 1825. They went before the public through the medium of the press and defended what they considered to be the rights of the Indians. They declared that fraud and deceit had been used to persuade the Indians to cede vast areas of their lands to the state of Georgia. For this stand, they suffered vilification at the hands of the Georgia state officials.

The action of the Baptist missionary, Lee Compere, angered the Baptist constituents who supported the mission to the Indians. The Georgia Baptist Mission Board reported that Compere's behavior in the treaty controversy had rendered him "odious in the eyes of this community" and had "dried up the stream of munificence which flowed for his support." The report stated that "a general expression of disapprobation against the part which the superintendent of Withington Station has acted, has come up from the churches and many
individuals, which calls for his removal." The Board had concluded that Compere's actions had a bearing on "the whole course of missions" and that little could be done for missions until the missionary was removed. Although the Board had no authority to depose Compere, it did "disclaim any connection with a man whose acts have brought said case into such disrepute." The Baptist Mission Board, obviously trying to keep the favor of its constituents and still maintain its mission among the Indians, stated that Compere was sincere and had done his duty as he saw fit and that his course had met with the approval of the Secretary of War.

During the 1820's, the Creeks, out of all the southern tribes, had been slow to respond to civilization measures. By 1827, Lee Compere agreed that removal to the West was, given the circumstances, the best solution. In September of that year, he sent a most discouraging report to the Secretary of War. He reported that the Creek Indians were declining rather than advancing in civilization. Two years before, the missionary asserted, there had been some "interesting symptoms" but these had been for the most part "swallowed up in the confusion of the times." On January 5, 1828, Lucius Bolles, Corresponding Secretary of the Baptist Board of Missions, informed McKenney of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, that the Creek Indians were in a deteriorating condition. He stated: "It would have been gratifying to us to propose in a memorial to Congress the colonizing of the Indians generally, but as other benevolent societies thought the time had not come, ... and were therefore unwilling to unite in it, necessity urged us on alone." In July of 1828, Bolles informed the Secretary of War, Peter B. Porter, that the hope of the Creek Indians "lies in their removal."
President John Quincy Adams, in his final message to Congress, presented a summary of the difficulties involved in any Indian removal plan. He stated that the United States had negotiated with the Indians by treaties and that all the land which the Indian had been willing to sell, had been purchased. In bringing to the natives the knowledge of "religion and of letters," the President declared that "the ultimate design was to incorporate in our own institutions that portion of them which could be converted to the state of civilization." As for the results, "we have been far more successful in the acquisition of their lands than in imparting to them the principles of inspiring them with the spirit of civilization." Some remedy, the President contended, must be found which "while it shall do justice to those unfortunate children of nature, may secure to the members of our confederation their rights of sovereignty and of soil."  

By the end of the Adams administration, the general lines of a removal policy had been drawn. It was thought that removal of most of the Indians to some area west of the Mississippi was the answer to the deteriorating condition of the Indians in the East. This removal was to be effected through persuasion, rather than the use of force. The removal offer was to be made so attractive that even the advanced Cherokees would remove by choice. The removal idea itself was postulated on the theory that the Indians had to be isolated from the whites while the civilization process was in progress. In his report in 1825, Calhoun observed that the incessant pressure of the white population keeps the Indians moving without "allowing time for that moral and intellectual improvement for which they appear to be naturally eminently susceptible." There was, however, considerable skepticism as to whether the
Indian could be persuaded to remove and more importantly, as to the possibility of uniting the many different tribes under one general government in the West. Adams had stated that he was doubtful whether there was any practicable plan by which Indians could be organized into one civilized or half-civilized government. 69

There was a fairly clear understanding in government circles that two general groups of Indians were to be considered in any removal discussions. The southern tribes, particularly the Cherokees, had made considerable progress in civilization; they had been at peace for some time and were engaged in agriculture. They were numerically stronger and had good leaders. Inter-marriage with the whites had no doubt strengthened them. The tribes in the North were smaller in number, were of a more wandering disposition and had not progressed so well in civilization. There were some notable exceptions, however, among the Oneidas, Brothertowns, Stockbridges, and Shawnees.

Missionaries and mission boards by 1828 considered the removal idea within the framework of the condition of the Indians among whom they were residing. Although the Baptists had two schools among the Cherokees, most of their work was among the Oneida, Creek, Seneca, Ottawa, Potawatomi Indians who were making slow progress in civilization. As indicated earlier, the Baptists were the first Protestant Mission Board to openly support the idea of Indian removal to the West. McCoy, Baptist missionary to the Potawatomies, favored the creation of a state in the West and contended that even the more advanced Cherokees would benefit by removing and becoming a part of an Indian state. The American Board of Missions, with its missionaries among the more progressive Indians, opposed Indian removal to the West, with some
qualifications. In 1824, that board presented a memorial to Congress, calling for the location of all the Indians into two communities, one in the North and the other in the South. All of those Indians willing to be civilized were to be brought into these two areas east of the Mississippi and there, under the care of education families, be civilized: "These will form the rudiments of future towns and cities and even states, and ultimately entire civilization."  

By 1827, as a result of the fast changing conditions in the states east of the Mississippi, the American Board of Missions was forced to consider again the removal idea. On March 3, 1827, the corresponding secretary of that board, Jeremiah Evarts, discussed the subject with Colonel McKee, a former agent to the Choctaws. McKee told Evarts that the Choctaws would ultimately be forced to remove to the West or they would waste away and become extinct. Evarts recorded in his journal that day: "These reasons would weigh powerfully in favor of a removal of the Indians, if it were possible to get them out of the reach of vicious white men." On March 9, 1827, Evarts discussed Indian removal with the President and on the following day with Barbour, the Secretary of War. Barbour favored removal mainly because the states of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi were determined to remove all of the Indians to the West. He did not feel that the federal government could resist the states in this effort. The Secretary of War had assured Evarts that the Indians would not be removed by force and that all proper measures would be taken to insure that justice was done to the Indians should they agree to removal. On March 12, 1828, Evarts wrote that he had made up his mind to work against removal unless Congress adopted a definite plan which would guarantee the rights of the Indians. He was opposed to any exploration of the West for removal purposes.
until Congress passed a removal bill outlining the policy to be followed in removing the Indians.\(^7^4\) On August 18, 1828, Evarts, secretary of the American Board of Missions, notified Thomas L. McKenney that the missionaries gave no advice as to the removal of the Indians, but that they had been instructed to do all in their power to prevent hasty measures, or violent proceedings of any kind.\(^7^5\)

The Secretary of War's report of November, 1828, indicated that the missionaries were taking an active role in opposing the removal of the Indians and that such opposition was endangering the "ultimate success" of the removal plans of the government. Porter stated that the $10,000 civilization fund had brought to the Indian reservations a number of missionaries and teachers who had acquired comfortable establishments and were "unwilling to be deprived of them by the removal of the Indians." He stated that while the government agents were using "money and presents" to persuade the Indians to emigrate, "another set of government agents [the missionaries] are operating, more secretly to be sure, but not with less zeal and effect, to prevent such emigration."\(^7^6\)

With the election of President Jackson in 1828, the subject of Indian removal had become a national issue. Although no formal action had been taken by Congress by 1829, Indian removal had, for all practical purposes, been established as a national policy. The Baptist Board of Missions had publicly endorsed the idea of Indian removal. The American Board of Missions had developed a wait-and-see policy, opposing any further removals until formal legislation had been passed by Congress and a specific plan had been submitted to the Indians for their acceptance or rejection. It was within this setting that the Indian Removal Bill was brought before Congress in 1820.
Chapter VIII

The Indian Removal Debate

The welfare of the Indians was thrust into the public view by a series of laws passed by the Georgia legislature on December 19, 1829, to go into effect on June 1, 1830. Confiscation of large sections of Cherokee lands and the prohibition of further meetings of the Cherokee legislative council were called for in the new laws. Contracts between Indians and whites were declared null and void unless witnessed by two whites. Indians were not permitted to testify against whites in the Georgia state courts. Several alluvial deposits of native gold were discovered in the Cherokee country in 1828, near Dahlonega, removing the last moral restraint from the whites who now entered the Cherokee lands. The Cherokees were prohibited by Georgia state law from digging for gold on their own land.\(^1\)

In his first annual message to Congress, December 8, 1829, President Andrew Jackson, called for the removal of the Indians mainly on the basis of the latter's interference with the sovereignty of the states. In reply to the action of the Cherokees who, in 1827, had adopted their own constitution and declared themselves a sovereign and independent nation, the President declared that the Constitution forbade the erection of a new state within the territory of an existing state without that state's permission.\(^2\) He advised the Cherokees to submit to the laws of the state of Georgia or emigrate. The President warned the Indians that they would be degraded or destroyed if they
remained in close contact with the whites and for this reason, they ought to remove to the West. President Jackson also indicated that he intended to use his influence to persuade Congress to enact a law providing for removal of the Indians. There was no intimation, however, that force would be used to remove the Indians to the West.³

The House and Senate referred the President's recommendations to the Indian Affairs Committees. On February twenty-second, a bill was introduced into the Senate calling "for an exchange of lands with the Indians residing in any of the States or Territories, and for their removal west of the river Mississippi" and on the twenty-fourth, a similar bill was brought before the House. The Senate bill came for debate on April 6, 1830, and until its passage on the twenty-sixth, it was the main topic of discussion. The House bill, which contemplated not simply exchange of lands but removal in express terms, was dropped by common consent and debate on the Senate bill began on May 13, 1830. The whole range of Indian history was gone over in the debate. The arguments were concerned with the sovereignty of the state, Indian treaty rights, and the progress of the Indians in civilization.⁴

It was inevitable that the missionaries who resided among the Indians would have been involved in the debates on Indian removal. They were, however, sharply divided on the removal issue. The Baptists gave vigorous support to the proponents of the removal plan. On May 9, 1829, the corresponding secretary of the Baptist Board of Missions had informed the Secretary of War that the Baptists were in full accord with the government's plan to remove the Indians to the West.⁵ Isaac McCoy, Baptist missionary, promoted the idea by speaking and writing in behalf of Indian removal.⁶ During the months from
November, 1829, to June, 1830, McCoy was in Boston, New York, Washington and other eastern cities promoting the cause of Indian removal. The Baptist General Association of Pennsylvania, in a memorial to Congress, stated that the only hope of rescuing the Indians from "total extermination" was to be found in the "plan now before your honorable body, of giving to them a permanent home in the West, under suitable regulations." During the Congressional debate on the Indian Removal Bill, Rev. H. Lincoln, corresponding secretary of the Baptist Board of Missions, informed the Secretary of War that the Baptists had felt for a long time that the idea of settling the Indians in the western country was "expedient." To further these views, they had repeatedly memorialized Congress on the subject and for the last several years had "contributed all in our power for the promotion of this object." In behalf of the Baptist Board, Lincoln requested federal aid for any new mission schools to be established by the Baptists in the West.

Further support for Indian removal came for an Indian Board in New York City which had been organized in July, 1829, by a committee made up of both members of the clergy and laymen. At that time a resolution was passed stating that the Board approved "of a plan proposed by the Government of the United States, as intimated in the letter of the Secretary of War, to remove the Indians beyond the river Mississippi as the best means for their preservation and improvement . . . ." Rev. Eli Baldwin on August 14, 1829, informed the President of the support of the clergymen, who were members of the Board, for Indian removal. The President expressed his appreciation through the Secretary of War, who stated that "the President is much gratified, and desires me so to declare to you. He cannot be appreciate
highly the views taken by you of a course of policy, which justice to
principles recognised, and humanity towards our Indian brethren, constrained
him as a matter of conceived duty to adopt." 12

According to an article published in the Religious Intelligencer and
reprinted in the May 1, 1830, issue of the Cherokee Phoenix, the Indian Board
was projected by the Rev. Eli Baldwin of the Reformed Dutch Church. The
denomination had only 185 churches and 150 pastors in the United States. The
article saw in the formation of the Indian Board a sinister plot on the part
of a small group of clergymen to "support the National Government through
thick and thin and at the same time have the pleasure of "thwarting the plans
and destroying the works" of those churches that had mission schools among the
Indians. The Board was accused of using this kind of subterfuge to "obtain the
disposal of the vast sums of money which the government would apply for the
civilization of the Indians..." 13 The main purpose of the Board was to
secure passage of some removal bill and once Congress began debate on the
Indian Removal Bill in 1830, the Indian Board of New York used its influence
toward effecting its passage in Congress. 14

Correspondence from individual missionaries represented another source of
support for Indian removal. Missionary W. F. Vaill of the Union Mission,
informed McKenney that "it has been and is still a principle with me, and I
believe with all my fellow laborers in this part to promote the views of the
general government." Vaill had reference to the removal plan of the
government. 15 Robert Bell, missionary among the Chickasaws, wrote to McKenney
on October 30, 1829, expressing his approval of the removal of the Indians to
the west of the Mississippi. He assured McKenney that he had used his
influence "to impress on the minds of the Indians with whom I have had an opportunity of conversing, the friendly views of the government toward them." He further stated that he agreed that the Indians' compliance "with the measures of government, on the subject of their removal over the Mississippi, is the only means that can assure their future prosperity and happiness." Solomon Davis, Episcopal missionary to the Oneidas, informed the Secretary of War that although there had been progress in civilization among the Oneidas, he thought removal to be the best solution: "I am decidedly of the opinion that the fruit would be much more abundant, could they be transplanted to a different soil . . . ." Speaking of removal, he declared that he was convinced that it was the "only measure which can rescue this interesting portion of the human race from oblivion." Elijah Kellogg, missionary to the Indians in Maine, expressed his approval of Indian removal: "I have all along thought well of the plan." Although these missionary sentiments in favor of removal were expressed several months before the debate on the Indian Removal Bill in Congress, they indicated sources of missionary influence favorable to Indian removal.

The most formidable missionary opposition to Indian removal came from the American Board of Missions and its corresponding secretary, Jeremiah Evarts. Although Evarts spoke out against removal of the Indians in general, his particular concern was for the Cherokees and Choctaws. After an interview with President-elect, Andrew Jackson, on February 23, 1829, Evarts wrote in his journal that he saw no possibility of Jackson defending the Cherokees from Georgia. On February 26, Evarts met with the Cherokee delegation in Washington and helped them draft a memorial to Congress on the subject of
removal. The contention of Evarts was that the government should first present the Indians with an entire plan for removal, including some promise as to the kind of government that would be set up in the Indian Territory. No appropriations should be approved by Congress for removal, Evarts declared, until the Indians were fully satisfied with the proposed plan. 23

In the latter part of 1829, Evarts concluded that the government was determined to remove the Indians and that no appeal to the contrary could be successful. He then decided to take the Cherokee cause to the American people by publishing a series of essays on the problem. 24 On July 7, 1829, Evarts accused Thomas L. McKenney of deliberately distorting the "meaning of the treaties" with the Indians. Evarts stated that "our nation will lose nothing by giving an honest and fair interpretation to the language of the numerous treaties." 25

In April, 1830, Evarts advised the Cherokees, Choctaws and other tribes to hold the United States to its treaty commitments. He urged the tribes to send some of their most able men to Washington; "men whom they can trust, who can neither be deceived, nor misled, nor frightened, by any agents or officers of the government." Evarts suggested that they should have able lawyers and insist on being heard before the Committees on Indian Affairs in the Congress and be allowed to produce witnesses to show the real condition of their respective tribes. Evarts concluded by stating that the Indians' "best friends" had come to the opinion that "if the government cannot protect the Indians where they are, they cannot protect them anywhere else." 26

The involvement of missionaries on both sides of the Indian removal issue was evident also in the debates on the Indian Removal Bill, during the months
of April and May of 1830, on the floor of Congress. The case for Georgia was presented by Wilson Lumpkin, a leading Baptist layman, who, at one time, had been a member of that denomination's committee set up to organize mission schools among the Creek Indians. In his speech, Lumpkin asserted that the larger portion of the religious community was on the side of Indian removal. As for the Baptists and the Methodists, the Georgian Baptist declared that he had had "an extensive and intimate intercourse" with them through his whole life and he was confident that they would never lend themselves to aiding "political factions or designing demagogues." The Baptists had supported the emigration plan as one that "afforded the best and most permanent prospect for success of their missionary efforts." The former Georgia governor was confident that the Quakers would all "come right, as soon as their misapprehensions are corrected."²⁷

Lumpkin accused the political opponents of the Removal Bill of availing themselves of the "aid of enthusiastic religionists to pull down the administration of Andrew Jackson." He stated further that "these canting fanatics have placed themselves upon this Indian question behind the bulwarks of religion and console themselves with the belief that the Georgians, whom they have denounced as atheists, deists, infidels, and sabbath-breakers, laboring under the curse of slavery, will never be able to dislodge them from their strong position."²⁸ Lumpkin attacked Evarts, secretary of the American Board of Missions, for his stand against Indian removal. Quoting from a pamphlet which Lumpkin asserted was written by Evarts, he read: "'It would be better that half of the states of the union were annihilated, and the remnant left powerful in holiness, strong in the prevalence of virtue, than
that the whole nation should be stained with guilt. . . ."29 Continuing, Lumpkin quoted another line which declared that "we would rather have a civil war, were there no other alternative, than avoid it by taking shelter in crime."30

George Evans, representative for the state of Maine, delivered a speech on Tuesday, May 18, 1830, in which he scorned the charge of Lumpkin, namely, that opposition to Indian removal had its origins among enthusiasts in the northern states, who, "under the pretence of philanthropy and benevolence, have acquired a control over the Indian councils, have sent missionaries among them, who are well paid for their labors of love, and who are actuated by sordid desire for Indian annuities." Evans found it rather amusing the the Baptist Lumpkin criticized those persons who "intermingle religious considerations in support of political and public objects." The Maine representative then suggested that if Lumpkin was really concerned about the enlistment of religious societies and associations in the concerns of the government, he might inquire into the origin of the Indian Board in New York City.31 This board had been organized for the specific purpose of supporting the views of the federal government on Indian removal.32 Evans exonerated Evarts of the Lumpkin charge, to the effect that Evarts had involved himself and the mission board in affairs that did not concern them, by stating that the War Department had requested Evarts to disclose his views on Indian removal. Evans expressed surprise over the sudden concern of mixing religion with politics. Mission schools had long existed among the Indians with the approbation and financial support of the federal government. No complaint was heard; Georgia had been satisfied with the arrangement. Other states had been
permitted to send in missionaries and expend their funds in improving the Indians within the borders of the state of Georgia as well as other states. To disprove the charge of Lumpkin that the Indians were anxious to remove, but were kept in awe by the chiefs and white men who resided among them, Evans quoted from a letter of Worcester, missionary to the Cherokees, which stated that all the Cherokees preferred to stay where they were and that they were not "overawed by the chiefs." Some of the other Senators who opposed removal were Theodore Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, Edward Everett of Massachusetts and one southerner, David Crockett of Tennessee.

The debate on the Indian Removal Bill in 1830 raised two important issues. The first was concerned with the nature of the land west of Missouri and Arkansas, the projected future home for the Indians in the East. The second issue related to the degree of progress which the Indians east of the Mississippi had made in civilization. As was characteristic of much of the debate on removal, missionaries were ranged on both sides. A memorial to the twenty-first Congress from the American Board of Missions called for a "more thorough exploration" of the land designated for the Indians west of the Mississippi. It stated that "considerable uncertainty prevails on the subject" and that it had been admitted that possibly four-fifths of the land in the "contemplated new residence" was an "immense prairie, nearly destitute of wood, and deprived of running water four or five months of the year." Furthermore, the memorialists asserted that what little good land remained, had been appropriated to the Choctaws and Cherokees of the Arkansas.

Edward Everett declared in a speech, before the House, on the Removal Bill
that more information of the country west of the Mississippi was needed before any action could be taken. The country had been "crossed by not explored." When the House asked the War Department for more information, Everett said they got "twenty-two lines, from a letter written by Governor Clark, five years ago and he had never seen the country, to which the title of the Osages and Kansas had, when he wrote the letter, just been extinguished." Representative Everett referred to the testimony of the government surveyor, the Baptist missionary, Isaac McCoy. Admitting that the missionary had seen the country, the opponent of removal asked "But how much did he see of it? How far did he go westward? Forty-eight miles only. He admits that the land is good for two hundred miles west from Arkansas: and three-quarters of this he took in trust...." Everett contended that Congress could not depend on a "hasty excursion, for a few miles, into the district, to which we are to transplant the Indians." The Massachusetts representative thought that the Baptist missionary was a "very worthy and benevolent person" but that his experience with the Indians in the Northwest had convinced him that "removal was the greatest good for all Indians, under all circumstances. While the Indians, whom he conducted were evidently dissatisfied with the country, he makes the best of it." Everett insisted that McCoy's report made observations concerning the nature of the land which the missionary could not know to be true. The region under discussion was six hundred miles long and two hundred and fifty miles broad and "Mr. McCoy's whole line of march within it, going and returning, was about four hundred miles."

The government had fairly well convinced itself by 1830 that the land to be assigned to the Indians, west of the Mississippi, was a fair exchange for
the Indian lands in the East. McKenney in a report to the Secretary of War, in April 6, 1830, quoted from information which he had received from General Clark of St. Louis in 1825. Clark had written:

I find, from information derived from persons to be relied upon, that the country embraced in these cessions is wonderfully adapted to an Indian population in the first stages of civilization. Grass is universally abundant and the winters, in a great portion of the cession, mild enough to winter cattle, horses, and other domestic animals, to subsist themselves without care from their owners. On all creeks and rivers, there are bottoms of rich land easily prepared for cultivation. The country is divided into woodland and prairie, but mostly prairie, and is well watered by springs and running streams, and is convenient to the salt plains, and springs of strong salt water. . . .

John Eaton, Secretary of War, informed the President that from the evidence of those who had visited the country, the soil, climate, and productions are not inferior to the country proposed to be abandoned on the east of the Mississippi. He further stated that the climate was mild and agreeable and "produces cotton to advantage throughout that portion of which it is proposed to locate the southern tribes."

Missionaries were involved in a second issue raised during the debate on the Indian Removal Bill, namely, the civilization-progress controversy. The most potent argument in favor of removal, other than that of state supremacy, was that removal was a benevolent project on the part of the government. In order to support this thesis, it was necessary to prove that the Indians east of the Mississippi were not progressing toward civilization. The missionary reports were the focal point of the discussion with some asserting that the Indians had come a long way in the decade of the 1820's and others insisting that there had been little if any progress.

In 1829, the Senate had requested the Secretary of War to provide them with information respecting the progress of civilization for the last eight
years among the Indians. He was instructed to report on the present state of education, civil government, agriculture, and the mechanic arts. Included in the report to the Senate were statistics compiled by missionary Cyrus Kingsbury detailing the progress of civilization among the Choctaws. Thomas L. McKenney, head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, after reading Kingsbury's reports, added his own comments and sent them to the Secretary of War. McKenney agreed with Kingsbury that some of the Choctaws had made considerable progress in the past eight years toward being civilized, but he commented, these were "like green spots in the desert." He informed the Secretary of War that his recent visit to the southern tribes had convinced him of the necessity of removal for the preservation of the Indians. He also mentioned that the Creeks and Cherokees who had emigrated to the west of the Mississippi were "gratified and benefited by the change" and that no "inducement" would be strong enough to bring them back.

Colonel Hugh Montgomery, in a report to the Secretary of War, dated March 4, 1830, declared that there had been little progress among the "full-blooded Indians." Speaking of the Cherokees, among whom he had resided for several years, Montgomery stated that most of the progress in civilization had been made by those who were descendants of white parentage or of mixed blood. The great mass of the "full-blooded Indians" had made very little improvement. At this same time, Samuel A. Worcester gave a most colorful report of the progress being made among the Cherokees. He contended that agriculture was the principal employment and support of the people. He did not know of any Cherokees who lived "by the chase." He commented, "I do not know of a single family who depends, in any considerable degree, on game for
support." Worcester, missionary to the Cherokees, admitted that only a moderate proportion of population could read and write. Wilson Lumpkin, in his speech on the Indian Removal Bill in 1830, accused the missionaries of deliberately exaggerating the reports of progress. His friend, Baptist missionary Isaac McCoy and supporter of Indian removal, had urged missionaries to guard against "what we may term high coloring." He found that missionaries felt obligated to report progress in order to keep their supporters content. Lumpkin assured Congress that this was not merely his own personal opinion but that it was the sentiment of "one of our most experienced, pious and persevering missionaries [Isaac McCoy]." Senator Frelinghuysen, opponent of removal, in his speech on the bill, placed his faith in the reports of missionaries, Samuel Worcester and Cyrus Kingsbury. He asserted that the "character of these witnesses is without reproach, and their satisfactory certificates of the improvement of the tribes continue and confirm the history furnished to us in the several messages" from which he had just read some extracts. Representative Huntington quoted from the reports of Worcester and expressed his confidence in their veracity and accuracy. Edward Everett, opponent of removal, referred to Kingsbury's report on civilization progress among the Choctaws and gave it his approbation.

The lines were tightly drawn in the debate on the Indian Removal Bill and the attention received by the missionary on the floor of Congress is not to be interpreted as power to influence the outcome. Wilson Lumpkin, former Georgia governor, quoting McCoy for support of the bill, was not unexpected since both were Baptists and in favor of removal. Senator Frelinghuysen's confidence in missionaries Kingsbury and Worcester is not unusual since they
all opposed removal and the Senator was a member of the American Board which employed the missionaries and dictated the official policy of the Board of removal.

The Senate passed the Indian Removal Bill on April 26th; the House on May 26, 1830. The President was given the authority to set aside an area west of the Mississippi, not included in any state or organized territory, to be reserved for the Indians and divided among the various tribes. The second section of the bill authorized the President "to exchange such districts with any tribe then residing within the limits of any of the states or territories." Finally, the bill provided for proper assurances to the Indians that his land would be unnecessary. The Indians were to be paid for any improvements which they had made on their lands in the East; they were to be given assistance in emigrating and the bill provided for $500,000 to implement the provisions of the bill. 52

Indian removal, operating for many years in a haphazard manner, now, with the passage of the Indian Removal Bill, became the official policy of the government, backed by congressional approval and appropriations. Although the bill did not provide for forced removals, during the 1830's the greater part of the Indians east of the Mississippi would be removed to the West. It is this final act of the drama, actual removal by persuasion or force, that is the theme of the following chapter.
Chapter IX

The Final Phase: Indian Removal

During the decade of the 1830's, the greater part of the Indians were removed to the west of the Mississippi. The action of the state of Georgia in extending its laws over the Cherokees and the clear-cut policy of the Jackson administration toward removal facilitated treaty negotiations for removal. The missionaries who had invested their time and energy in attempting to civilize the Indians were often personally involved as advocates of the government removal policy or as leaders in the Indian resistance to removal.

The Choctaw Treaty negotiations of 1830 represented the determination on the part of the federal government to remove the Indians from the states and the division among the missionaries of the removal policy. Greenwood Laflure, a Choctaw chief, presided over a council of that nation in March, 1830, which decided that removal to the West was inevitable. The Methodist missionaries were present at the meeting and endorsed the plan for removal. The American Board of Missions had one missionary present and he refused to take part in the deliberations. Evarts had advised the Choctaws to sign no treaties until the Supreme Court had ruled on the Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi laws. He was confident that the court would find these laws unconstitutional. The Council in March, 1830, drafted its own treaty, with the assistance of the Methodist missionary, Dr. Alexander Talley. The Methodists had appointed
Talley as their missionary to the Choctaws in 1827. The treaty was read to the Choctaw people and declared approved. The document was unique in that it was negotiated by the Indians themselves without the assistance of an official government commissioner.

The treaty of 1830 was not acceptable to all the parties within the Choctaw nation. The removal issue had divided the nation into three groups. Dr. Talley and other Methodist missionaries along with most of the Methodist converts among the Choctaws, thought removal inevitable and favored the treaty. The missionaries of the American Board, and a number of the Choctaw chiefs, opposed removal and the treaty. Evarts charged the Methodist missionaries of going out of their way to support the treaty and asserted that the opponents of the treaty were undoubtedly right "in their indignation at the base manner in which their rights have been taken from them, by bullying, threats, and bribery, ..." The corresponding secretary of the American Board of Missions declared that their missionaries had been "cautious and prudent, as to interfering with the politics of the Indians" and that missionary Kingsbury had told the government "in a dignified manner, that he considers the measure unjust and oppressive." The third party was led by the full-blood chief, Mooshoolatubbe, who was violently antagonistic to all Christian missionaries, their teachings and their converts. He contended that the treaty was illegal since the National Council had not agreed to it. A cry was raised against the missionaries and the role of the Methodists in the negotiations was taken as indicative of the bad effect of religious influences in the nation. Churches were burned, Christian books destroyed and threats of violence were made on the lives of the missionaries and Choctaw
converts to the Christian religion. Mooshoolatubbe assailed the use of government funds for schools saying that the money had been paid to the "Yankee Missionaries" for twelve years for which the nation had received no return. He urged the Secretary of War to cut off all appropriations to missionaries in the nation. He asked that Dr. Talley, Methodist missionary, be ordered out of the nation.

As a result of the opposition, the March, 1830 treaty was rejected. A council was called for negotiating a new treaty in September of that year. The United States commissioners forbade any missionaries to attend the sessions or to even come on the treaty grounds. The American Board of Mission's request to attend was politely refused. The missionaries informed the War Department that the Choctaws had requested that they be present to provide "religious instruction on the Sabbath and at such other intervals as circumstances may present." The missionaries assured the government that they would not interfere with the negotiations.

The government commissioners notified the missionaries that under no circumstances would they be permitted to attend the treaty sessions. The persistence of the missionaries in attempting to get permission was interpreted by the government as a "determination on the part of the missionaries to be present and to mingle in the councils here at all hazards. . . ." Expressing their appreciation for the "laudable and praiseworthy" work of the missionaries the commissioners did not, however, feel that the treaty grounds was the proper place for teaching the Indians the "necessity of true and evangelic repentance and forgiveness." The commissioners advised the Indians at the treaty negotiations to hear and respect the missionaries only in
matters of "moral duty and religion." "The moment they attempt an interference with your general government relations, reject their counsels. These are subjects with which they have no right to meddle, and, indeed, should not interfere." The commissioners concluded that the missionaries were placed among the Indians "for Christian, not political ends." The American Board of Missions accused the commissioners of using a "mixture of persuasions and threats" to procure a treaty with the Choctaws. After the treaty was signed, the Methodist missionary, Dr. Alexander Talley, conducted a party of emigrants to their new home. Within a few years, all of the Choctaws had emigrated to their new home in the West.

The removal of the Cherokees in the 1830's focused national attention on the Indian's helpless position and the inability of the missionaries to restrain the forces demanding Indian removal. The Cherokee case was considered by many to be more tragic because they had reportedly advanced farther in civilisation than any other Indian tribe. Reorganisation of their government had begun in 1817 and was completed by 1827 with a constitution patterned after that of the United States. Delegates from the various Cherokee towns in four states had met at New Echota in 1827 and adopted a written constitution. It provided for an elective bicameral legislature by making the National Committee of thirteen members coordinate with the National Council. The nation was divided into eight judicial districts with a judge, marshal and local council in each to apply the laws. Governor Forsyth of Georgia, expressed horror over the New Cherokee constitution. He sent a copy of it to the President with a protest from the Georgia legislature. President Adams instructed the Indian agent, Montgomery, to secure, if possible, the removal
of the Cherokees from Georgia. The state of Georgia replied in 1829 with a series of laws invalidating all the statutes and ordinances adopted by the Indians and authorizing the division of their lands. The American Board of Missions interpreted the Georgia laws as an attempt to force the Indians to move to the West. Should this happen the mission schools would be closed and, it was thought, the confidence of the Indians in the white man, shattered. Evarts, secretary of the American Board, advised John Ross, head chief of the Cherokee nation, in July, 1830, to permit one of the Cherokees to be arrested and then carry the case all the way to the Supreme Court.

The State of Georgia passed a law requiring all white residents in the Cherokee country to take an oath of allegiance to the State and obtain a license from state authorities. When some of the missionaries refused to obey the new law, they were arrested and imprisoned. The American Board had advised the missionaries to ignore the Georgia law. The Moravian Mission Board instructed its missionaries "not to interfere in politics." The Moravian Board informed Governor Gilmer of Georgia that they had decided to order their missionaries out of the State of Georgia into Tennessee. Not all of the American Board missionaries resisted the new Georgia state laws. Butrick, missionary of the American Board, contended that to disobey the laws of Georgia would be the same as taking a political stand and to get involved in politics, he declared, was not part of the missionary's duty. Samuel Worcester, missionary to the Cherokees, had refused to take the oath required by the state. He was arrested on July 7, 1831 and sentenced to four years at hard labor in the Georgia state penitentiary. An appeal was taken from the judgment of the Georgia state court to the Supreme Court of the United States.
Chief Justice Marshall held that the acts of the state of Georgia were unconstitutional and that they violated the rights of the petitioners and of the Cherokee Indians under the solemn treaties made with them by the United States. The officers of the state of Georgia refused to accept the decision of the Supreme Court and the President of the United States would not enforce the Court's decision. The missionaries remained in jail until January 14, 1833.

The attention of the politicians and the churches was focused on the imprisoned missionaries. South Carolina's talk of nullification caused some to fear that Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi might join the nullifiers should an attempt be made to enforce the Court's decision. On November 27, 1832, the missionaries notified their lawyers that they were desirous of persevering in their suit before the Supreme Court. Dr. Alonso Church, President of Athens University in Georgia, visited the missionaries several times and urged them to give careful consideration to withdrawing their suit before the Court. Church was confident that Georgia could not be coerced and that the Supreme Court decision could be enforced only at the "point of a bayonet." On December 24, 1832, the Secretary of War, Lewis Cass, asked Governor Lumpkin of Georgia to pardon the missionaries so that one more pretext for the Cherokees' refusal to accept the government offer for a treaty might be removed. The missionaries decided that nothing could be gained by further prosecuting their suit and on January 8, 1833, notified their attorneys, William Wirt and John Sergeant, that they should take no motion in their behalf before the Supreme Court. On January 14, 1833, they were released from prison.

The failure of the President to enforce the Supreme Court decision sealed
the fate of the Cherokees. It was only a matter of time before they would be forced to emigrate. Elias Boudinot, John Ridge, Archilla Smith, John West, and William A. Davis, all Cherokee citizens, favored emigration to the West simply because it was inevitable. The American Board missionary, Samuel Worcester, after his release from prison, became committed to the idea of removal. He declared that he was going to Arkansas and that he was praying that the "stiff-necked people would see the light and consent to follow." 

Three treaties were negotiated with the Cherokees, the first on June 18, 1834, a second one on March 14, 1835, and the final one on December 29, 1835. The final treaty, December, 1835, promised to pay the Cherokees $1,500,000 for seven million acres and May 23, 1838, was stipulated as the expiration date for removal. A supplemental article was added in March, 1836, ceding all the remaining land east of the Mississippi. By the expiration date, May 23, 1838, only two thousand of the nearly 17,000 Cherokees had emigrated to the West. The government sent in seven thousand regular army troops under the command of General Winfield Scott to expedite the removal. Some of the Cherokees managed to escape to the mountains. Jesse Bushyhead and missionary Evan Jones carried a message to the Cherokees hiding in the hills. The Baptist missionary, Jones, wrote, "We had no difficulty in finding them. They all agreed to come in, on our advice, and surrender themselves to the forces of the United States. . . ."

Judging from the instructions given by the War Department, to those entrusted with the responsibility of Cherokee removal, the government desired that the emigration proceed in a most judicious manner. The Baptist missionary, Jones, led a party of nearly a thousand emigrants, maintaining the
church organization and services on the way to the West. The extracts from Jones' journals indicated that the removal was a painful experience. The Baptist missionary commended the United States officers for their kind treatment of the prisoners, contending that they were treated with "respect and indulgence." The journal entry of May 21 described the preparations for removal:

Our minds have, of late, been in a state of intense anxiety and agitation. The 24th of May is rapidly approaching. The Major-general has arrived and issued his summons, declaring that every man, woman and child of the Cherokees must be on their way to the West before another moon shall pass. The troops by the thousand are assembling around the devoted victims. The Cherokees, in the mean time, apprised of all that is doing, wait the result of these terrible preparations, with feelings not to be described. Wednesday, the 16th inst. was appointed as a day of solemn prayer.

The entry of June 16 described the first steps of the forced removal:

The Cherokees are nearly all prisoners. They have been dragged from their houses and encamped at the forts and military posts, all over the nation. In Georgia, especially, multitudes were allowed no time to take anything with them except the clothes they had on. Well-furnished houses were left a prey to plunderers, who like hungry wolves, follow in the train of the captors. These wretches rifle the house and strip the helpless, unoffending owners of all they have on earth. . . . The property of many has been taken and sold before their eyes for almost nothing, the sellers and buyers, in many cases, being combined to cheat the poor Indians.

The Cherokees were divided into detachments of about one thousand people and removed under the direction of leaders selected from within the group. They were attended by a physician; wagons and boats were provided for carrying supplies. The journey of six hundred to seven hundred miles required four to five months. The determined opposition of the American Board of Missions to Indian removal makes its observations on the manner of Cherokee removal all the more important. Relying on the reports of its missionaries who were with
the emigrating parties, the Board reported that "the best arrangements appear to have been made for their comfort, and they received many acts of kindness from those in whose vicinity they passed; but in such a work, suffering and death were unavoidable." It was further stated that "no one, white or Indian has ever complained of the manner in which this work was performed. If it had to be done at all, it probably could not have been done better. Through the good disposition of the army and the provident arrangements of its commander, less injury was done by accidents or mistakes, then could reasonably have been expected." 38

The treaty negotiations, aimed at removal, with the New York and Wisconsin Indians in the latter 1830's form a fitting conclusion to the final phase of Indian removal. This is true for two main reasons. First, the missionaries were able in this rare instance, to prevent the eviction of the Senecas from New York and some of the Oneidas and Brothertowns from Wisconsin. Secondly, the Brothertowns managed to achieve that which should have been the objective of the whole civilisation project; they became citizens of the United States. The government opened its negotiations with the New York Indians in 1836 in the hopes of persuading them to exchange their lands in New York for a home in the West. Although by treaty rights the Senecas could not be forced to sell, the Ogden Land Company was using every effort to encourage them to do so. The Quakers assisted the Senecas during the struggle from 1838 to 1842. 39 It was largely through their efforts that the Indians were permitted to retain their land. In 1838, some of the Seneca chiefs signed a treaty agreeing to cede their New York lands. Some of the chiefs, opposed to the treaty, sent a letter to the Quakers stating that
force had been used by the government commissioner, Schermerhorn, in order to get the treaty signed. They stated that they were opposed to any removal of the Senecas to the West. The Quakers had several interviews with the President, the Secretary of War, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, for the purpose of pleading the cause of the Senecas. They presented the case to the public by publishing pamphlets and exposing what they considered to be bribery and fraud. The Senate, however, ratified the treaty on March, 25, 1840. The treaty provided for removal to Kansas but the Senecas never went there in any appreciable number. In 1842, a conference was held between the Ogden Land Company and the Secretary of War. The Quakers used their influence to bring about some modification of the treaty. The Ogden Land Company agreed to a supplemental treaty in which the company was to keep title to the Tonawanda and Buffalo reservations while the Indians received back the title to the reservations at Cattaraugus and Allegheny. The offer was accepted by the parties concerned.

As a result of the intervention of Solomon Davis, Episcopal missionary to the Oneidas, and the persevering efforts of missionary Eleazar Williams, the Oneidas at Green Bay were permitted to keep their lands. Davis wrote on May 18, 1838, to the effect that his struggles in behalf of those Indians "had succeeded beyond his expectations." He further stated that the Senate had confirmed the Oneida treaty arrangement. This success with the Senecas and some of the small tribes in Wisconsin, when considered in terms of numbers, was rather small and insignificant. The fact was that the missionaries had been unable to prevent the removal of the great masses of Indians, many of whom had reached an encouraging level of civilization.
On March 3, 1839, the small tribe of the Brothertown Indians petitioned the Congress for citizenship and that was granted. From then on they lived under the laws of the state and sent some of their own men to the state legislature. This, however, considered in the light of the total Indian population, was only a token success and, as such, represented a symbol of the failure of the civilization program of the last two decades. Schoolcraft hit upon one of the basic weaknesses of the federal government's relation with the Indians, namely, the natives had no vote to give the politician:

If the Indian were raised to the right of giving his suffrage, a plenty of politicians, on the frontiers, would enter into plans to better him. Now the subject drags along as an incubus on Congress. Legislation for them is only taken up on a pinch. It is a mere expedient to get along with the subject; it is taken up unwillingly and dropped in a hurry. This is the Indian system. Nobody knows what to do and those who have more information are deemed to be a little moonstruck.

By 1840, the idea of creating an Indian state in the Northwest had collapsed. Missionary influence, except in isolated incidents, had proved itself powerless against the forces of westward expansion and state resistance, as evidenced in the forced removal of the Cherokees. More importantly, with few exceptions, the plan to assimilate the Indian into the white man's society had been a tragic failure.
Chapter X

Retrospect

After 1825, the history of the Indians was focused on the theme of removal. The determination of the United States government to remove the Indians to the West affected all Indian relations. Removal was foremost in their minds and "the dread of it virtually paralyzed their lives." Civilizing the Indians began as a plan to prepare them for life in the East; it was continued to promote removal to the West. The government after 1825 was committed to inconsistent if not contradictory policies.

The Protestant missionaries, personally involved in the civilization scheme of the government, were caught in the middle of the illogical policies of civilization and removal. The positions assumed by the mission boards varied considerably, being determined by many factors. The Baptists, as a rule, after 1825, were pro-removal. This may be attributed to a number of causes. They labored mainly among the weaker and more primitive tribes in the North. Even in the South, they had a mission among the Creeks, who resented the preaching of the missionaries and the instruction of their children in farming techniques. Furthermore, the Creek mission was supported by the Baptists of Georgia. When their missionary, Compere, defended the right of the Creeks to refuse to sell land to Georgia, the Georgia Baptists cut off his financial support.

The official Baptist position on removal may well have been influenced
by the fact that the Baptists were especially concerned with the needs of western settlers. Many clergymen accompanied their people on their migration to the West from the old states. The typical Baptist preacher had little education; he was usually a farmer working on his own land six days a week and preaching on Sundays. He was self-supporting and received no regular salary. The westward movement, which exerted a powerful influence on the government Indian policy, was made up mainly of small farmers and people of the lower middle class, the kind of people among whom the Baptist farmer-preacher would make a strong appeal. It was not unusual for the whole Baptist congregation to emigrate together with their minister accompanying them and holding church services along the way. The Baptist preacher who cleared the land, split rails, and planted corn on the same terms with his parishioners, may have had the frontiersman's view of the Indian. Removal of the Indians was necessary to the further settling of the West. The establishing of new white communities on the frontier presented a challenging opportunity for the Baptists and Methodists who were sending their missionaries to assist in the settling of towns in the West.

The American Board of Missions, with its headquarters in Boston, far removed from the frontier, tended to be anti-removal. Its work was for the most part among those southern tribes who had advanced quite far in learning and culture. Its constituency, primarily Congregationalists, placed great emphasis on an educated clergy and a dignified church. For this reason, it had experienced little success on the frontier. With the center of Congregationalism being in New England, there was no significant conflict between the interests of its church members and the removal of the Indians such as that
which troubled the Baptists of Georgia.

Two of the best informed men on Indian removal were Isaac McCoy, Baptist missionary who had spent many years among the Indians, and Jeremiah Evarts, New England lawyer and corresponding secretary of the American Board of Missions. McCoy contended that President Jackson was required "both by the necessity of the case and by principle . . . to act in preference to the removal of the Indians."\(^3\) As a missionary, McCoy had labored among the less advanced tribes in the North. He was aware of the accomplishments of the southern tribes but thought that the determination of the Cherokees to create a state within a state had forced the government to remove them. As for the other tribes of the South, the Baptist missionary insisted that they would be better off in the West. For those who argued that the final decision should be left up to the Indians, McCoy said they ignored the fact that "Indians seldom acted for themselves, but were generally under the influence of persons who regarded their own interests more than those of the Indians." McCoy's realism as it related to the Indians east of the Mississippi was not so evident in the missionary's vision of an Indian state in the West. He never came to grips with the question of how the government could be expected to control the whites in the West, who were farther removed from the seat of the government, when it could not control them in the East.

Jeremiah Evarts of the American Board of Missions viewed the Indian situation in the East from the idealistic perspective. Living far removed from the frontier with little contact with real Indians, except for an occasional trip to Washington or to the mission schools in the South, Evarts tended to place the Indian on a pedestal. Insisting that the Indians had
certain rights guaranteed to them by treaties with the federal government. Evarts called on the government to use force if necessary to protect the Indians in their rights. McCoy, however, was nearer the truth in insisting that the Indians were easily influenced by others; Evarts knew this too from personal experience. Evarts could have stated that had it not been for the intervention of the American Board of Missions, the Cherokees would have accepted the government offer of removal and gone West. Evarts and the American Board did have much at stake in the removal controversy. They had invested heavily in missions to the southern Indians and for this reason had much to lose in any plan to move the Indians. It was not so much the financial loss since the government had promised to reimburse them for their property and re-establish them in the West. It was a loss in what was thought to be the consequences of removal on the relations between the missionary and the Indian. There was also the psychological reaction that comes when experimental projects are suddenly uprooted before they have an opportunity to prove their value. It had been difficult enough to interest the Indian in the white man's ways; now it might well be impossible. It was the loss of years of hard work and talented endeavor.

When Evarts turned his eyes to the West, he became a realist. He wanted to know how the government planned to protect the Indian in the West where there would be a line of seventeen hundred miles bordering the desert or the white man's country which would "require more men than now belong to the regular army of the United States." How long would it be before the whites moved to the west of the Mississippi in great numbers? It had been only fifteen years before the Cherokees were forced to remove that the government
had talked about an Indian state in the Northwest and had encouraged the New
York Indians to move there. The New York Indians were just beginning to
settle in Green Bay when the federal government sent orders to the effect that
perhaps it would be better for them to move to the west of the Mississippi.
The Cherokees who had earlier removed to Arkansas were now being moved the
second time. Evarts and the American Board of Missions had concluded that if
the government could not protect the Indians in the East, it would be less
able to do so in the West. 4

The division of opinion among the missionaries diluted what influence
they had which might have been used to effect a better deal for the Indians.
Although the Protestant missionaries had never been able to alter the basic
pattern of Indian policy, they had been successful in protecting the rights of
the Indians in certain given situations. It would seem that had the American
Board of Missions taken a more realistic approach to the Indians' plight in
general and the Cherokees' in particular, it might have been able, together
with the pro-removal missionaries to have arranged a more suitable removal.
At least, the trail of tears experience might have been prevented with more
realistic foresight and proper planning. Missionary Samuel Worcester seemed
to have manifested such realistic insight. He had resisted the Georgia laws
relating to the Cherokees; his case was taken to the Supreme Court and the
Court ruled in his favor. Convinced however, that President Jackson and the
state of Georgia did not intend to obey the Court's decision, Worcester read
the handwriting on the wall correctly. He concluded that the Cherokees had
lost and that the sooner they accepted this defeat and prepared for their new
homes, the better. To Worcester, it was obviously the better of two evils.
To continue to resist when all was lost; it could serve no useful purpose.

There are other lessons to be learned from this study. First, it must be noted that church-state relations have varied through the years. The missionary interests used all available techniques to influence policy in both the executive and legislative branches. Missionaries and their reports were often used for political gain. Humanitarian endeavors were often thwarted by forces outside and beyond their control. It must be observed that the conclusions of missionary "experts" on Indians were apparently no more objective than those of other observers, being affected by personal interests. Men who often are avowed idealists in one sphere of life are manifestly practical in another. Finally, God, as usual, was invoked by all parties in support of their particular cause.
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93. In the treaty of 1805 with the Wyandot, Ottawa, Chippewa, Munsee, Delaware, Shawnee and Potawatomi Indians, the United States acquired, according to Harrison, the "finest lands along the Ohio and the Wabash rivers." They got it for the sum of $825 annuity and a further sum of $175. The latter sum was not really paid by the United States but held in trust for the seven nations by the President (Kappler, Treaties, 77, 78). Harmon contends that Harrison "fitted in admirably with the Jeffersonian policy and the demands of the frontiersmen" (Harmon, Indian Affairs, p. 87).
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11. Thomas L. McKenney takes most of the credit for the action on the part of Congress to provide this appropriation for Indian education. He had been appointed to the post of Superintendent of Indian Trade in 1816 and became a supporter of mission schools. He stated in his Memoirs that after reading a letter written by a Moravian missionary, John Gambold, he saw the light and determined to get congressional support for schools. He then wrote to various religious groups and urged them to memorialize Congress on the subject (Thomas L. McKenney, Memoirs (New York: 1846), I, 33-35). McKenney became head of the newly-created Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1824 and served until dismissed in 1830. It would seem that McKenney overlooked certain other influences at work which perhaps contributed more to the new interest of the government in schools for the Indians than did his efforts. Furthermore, although most missionary work was disrupted by the War of 1812, some efforts such as the Quakers among the New York Indians and the Moravians among the Cherokees continued. Neither had the government completely discontinued its support of civilization measures as evidenced by donations of money and implements to some missionaries in the early 1800's and more recently, the overtures of President Madison to the American Board of Missions.


13. It was generally agreed by the Puritan Divines that the Indians were of the race of man and that they were descendants of those Asiatic Tartars who supposedly had come to America by a land-bridge from northern Asia. The Indian was, however, the farthest of all God's human creatures from God Himself. He had lost his sense of civilization and law and order. As a result of this loss, he was in the power of Satan, to be reclaimed if possible and if not destroyed. The Puritan writer was less interested in the Indian's culture than in the fallen spiritual state which the culture manifested. In the 1680's Daniel Gookin, who was in charge of the Christian Indian settlements for the United Colonies, gave a most despairing account of their culture (Daniel Gookin, Historical Collections, Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, (1792), pp. 111-226.


15. One of the detailed studies of the noble savage concept in literature is Hoxie Neal Fairchild, The Noble Savage: A Study in Romantic Nationalism (New York: 1961). The chapter on "Eighteenth century Travelers, Rousseau" is particularly helpful (Ibid., pp. 97-139). Fairchild contends that the rather common restriction of the term 'noble savage' to American Indians has no logical basis. He says, "To me, a Noble Savage is any free and wild being who draws directly from nature virtues which raise doubts as to the value of civilization (Ibid., p. 2). For the shaping of the

16. This is not to infer that all missionaries had such a conception of the Indian but that generally speaking, they believed that there were some good qualities to be found in the savages. There were some, however, such as the Anglican catechist who thought that the white man's effort in running "up the woods after miserable creatures [Indians]" was a lost cause and suggested that the chief object of the missionary's concern should be the whites and Negroes (Frank J. Klingberg, "The Noble Savage as seen by the S.P.G. Missionary" in Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York /Philadelphia: 19407, p. 86; "Leading Ideas in the Annual S.P.G. Sermons," Ibid., pp. 11-48). The Anglican missionary regarded the Indians as persons who were capable of receiving the impressions of the Christian religion.

17. Wilcomb E. Washburn, The Indian and the White Man (Garden City, New York: 1964), Document 97, p. 115. Rousseau stated that the Europeans, toiling with savages in different parts of the world, had not yet, even with the assistance of the Christian religion, been able to make civilized men of them. He commented: "Missionaries sometimes make Christians, they never make civilized men of them" (Ibid., p. 117). Fairchild contends that Rousseau did not want mankind to return to the woods and lead the life of savages. He points out that in his later life, Rousseau changed his conception of the natural man and was no longer a believer in the noble savage idea (Fairchild, The Noble Savage, p. 131). Washburn in discussing the 'myth of the Noble Savage' finds it unfortunate that both the creators and destroyers of the 'myth' were for the most part literary men "whose assertions were only slightly supported by first hand knowledge of the subjects of myth." They apparently knew little about the Indians as they are or as they were (Wilcomb E. Washburn, "A Moral History of Indian-White Relations," Ethnohistory, IV /1977, 53.

18. Klingberg asserted that the fact-finding missionary in the eighteenth century had contributed to the cult of "natural happiness" but that he also checked the "growth of the wholly idealized primitive man of Rousseau and other eighteenth century critics of the ills of civilization." The great issue, the writer contends, is whether the Indian had sufficient "inner motive power and strength to maintain and develop an independent civilization" now that he had come into contact with the whites. He concludes that the North American Indians were too few in number and too different in culture to resist the attacks of the traders and land-hungry settlers. This negative answer, namely, that the Indian would not be able to develop an independent civilization, was being developed, so Klingberg contends, in the eighteenth century. This, in turn, would give further weight to the frontiersmen's contention that the savage was inferior (Klingberg, Anglican Humanitarianism, p. 86).


23. It must be noted that Isaac McCoy had reached the decision that the only hope for the Indians was to move them all to the west of the Mississippi and there organize them into an Indian Territory. Although there had been missionaries among the Cherokees since 1800 and the government agents had been providing instruction and supplies to them, McCoy contended that all of this came at a late date. The Cherokees had already proved that they could do it without any outside help (Isaac McCoy, Remarks on Indian Reform, pp. 9, 10, 29).


25. This was part of an address delivered at the Anniversary Meeting of the South Carolina Methodist Conference Missionary Society in Charleston, January, 1824, by Olin (Methodist Magazine, VII, 1824, 301-310).

26. This is an expression used by Washburn who suggested that the idea of 'noble savage' developed its greatest force when the white man was dependent on Indian help for his safety and sustenance (early years of exploration) and the idea of 'treacherous savage' was popular when both groups were powerful and a threat to each other with the idea of 'filthy savage' coming in later toward the latter part of the nineteenth century when the Indian was dependent on the will of the white man (Washburn, Ethnohistory, IV, 5).


28. Forbes contends that many of those Americans far removed from the frontier in the nineteenth century developed a real sympathy for 'book' Indians, but that this did not significantly change the actual treatment of even those remnants of eastern Indians and it did not "really ameliorate conditions on the western frontier, where actual warfare and conquest were then in progress and where the negative image of the native dominated" (Jack D. Forbes, The Indian in America's Past (Englewood, New Jersey: 1964), p. 11. For a study of the impact of the Indian on white society see Alfred Irving Hallowell, "The Backwash of the Frontier: the Impact of the Indian on American Culture," Walter D. Wyman and Clifford B. Kroeber (eds.), The Frontier in Perspective (Madison: 1957).
Roy H. Pearce in his study of the American Indians came to the conclusion that there was little question in the minds of most nineteenth century Americans that the Indian must be civilized or he would perish. This was true of the "pioneering anthropologists and ethnohistorians" and other who were concerned about the welfare of the Indian. Savage society with its system of communal ownership and rule by custom must be surrendered up to an agrarian and urban civilization based on the system of private ownership and rule by law. This thinking, we are reminded, was not so much in the form of an argument as it was an accepted assumption. As the settlers moved westward, Indians would have to give way. In the process, through certain plans calling for an Indian territory or in other instances, reservations, some of the Indians might be introduced into the dynamic nineteenth century white man's civilization. Should the aborigines resist, they would have to be dealt with on their own level, that of the savage. As Jefferson indicated, the 'beasts' would have to be driven back into the mountains (Roy H. Pearce, "Metaphysics of Indian-Hating," Ethnohistory, IV /1957, 28-35). It is only within the framework of this kind of thinking, that the statements of men such as Jefferson can be assessed, for no matter how pious his pronouncements concerning the nature of the Indian, it was the Jefferson administration that saw the beginning of what might be called a "harsh" policy toward the Indians. For the Jefferson policy in survey form see Harmon, Indian Affairs, pp. 59-93.

Stanley Vestal, New Sources of Indian History 1850-1891 (Norman, Oklahoma: 1934), pp. 188-193. Although this is a few years beyond our period, the description is relevant to the settlers of the early nineteenth century. This raises one of the difficulties encountered in the study of the American Indian history, that of source materials and their reliability. Stanley Pargellis wrote that "observers were for the most part unskilled, often prejudiced and were necessarily concerned with setting down surface description accounts of Indian behavior, life and customs." He pointed out that those who came into contact with the Indian and for this reason could offer some first-hand information, "had different business of their own with the Indian and looked at him from a different background." To make the situation more difficult, the Indians kept no historical records themselves so we know them only through "literates who belonged to another race, spoke another language, and had another culture" (Stanley Pargellis, "The Problem of American Indian History," Ethnohistory, IV /Spring, 1957, 113-124). Washburn has concerned himself with this problem and sets forth certain questions relating to the Indian culture which have yet to be answered. For example, the Indian captivity narratives were read voraciously during the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Washburn contends that these served a purpose and satisfied various needs but that they also "served to classify an entire segment of American society, the Indian, and to provide good reason why he
should be treated the way he was treated by that society." While not always confined to just the 'facts,' a "martyrology was created that helped sustain the ire of those exposed to the 'cutting edge' of the frontier as well as gain the support of those who were not." At the same time they served to help erase the image of the noble savage "while at the same time the concept of the noble frontiersmen was enhanced." (Washburn, Indian and White Man, p. 276). Pearce points out that the captivity narrative varied with the interests of the narrator (Roy H. Pearce, "The Significance of the Captivity Narrative." American Literature, XIX /1947, 1-20). Another viewpoint is set forth in Nathaniel Knowles, "The Torture of the Captives by the Indians of Eastern North America," American Philosophical Society Proceedings, (1940), pp. 151-225.

33. Vestal, New Sources, p. 189.

34. The Reverend waxes eloquent as he tells of the aftermath of Indian wars for the benefit of those who, he observed, might be tempted to charge the whites with barbarism: "Let him, if he can bear the reflection, look at helpless infancy, virgin beauty, and hoary age, dishonoured by the ghastly wounds of the tomahawks, and scalping knife of the savage. Let him hear the shrieks of the victims of the Indian torture by fire, and smell the surrounding air, rendered sickening by the effluvia of their burning flesh and blood. Let him hear the yells, and view the hellish features of the surrounding circle of savage warriors, rioting in all the luxuriance of vengeance, while applying the flaming torches to the parched limbs of the sufferers..." (Washburn, The Indian and White Man, Document 61, pp. 272, 273, 274). Friederici points out that it was the white man's firearms and steel knives that gave the strong impetus to scalping in North America and that the acme of the custom was reached after the institution by the whites of scalp premiums, accompanied by employment of natives by whites for scalp gathering and scalping by whites themselves (Georg Friederici, Scalping in America, /Washington: 1907, pp. 432-437).


36. Robert Baird, Religion in America (New York: 1845), pp. 295-299. Although Baird's volume was published after the period considered here, it draws upon years of experience with the Indians prior to the publishing date. Baird was an outstanding Presbyterian clergyman of his day. He had been instrumental in assisting the establishment of common schools in New Jersey. He was the general agent of the American Sunday School Union. His opinions concerning the Indians must be understood in the light of the fact that he was more concerned with establishing churches and Sunday schools for the whites on the frontier. Universally, Americans could see the Indian only as a hunter in spite of the fact that the culture of the eastern Indians whom they knew best had been and was as much agrarian until the second quarter of the nineteenth century as it was hunting. It is true that hunting was an important part of their economy and an
integral segment of their social and religious life, but agriculture was also an essential part of Indian subsistence among the Indians of the eastern coast. The Indians had taught the early settlers the techniques of agriculture and instructed them on how to plant crops and how to retrieve food from the rivers and bays. Pearce concludes that the whites' "idea of order, so informed their thoughts and their actions that they could see and conceive of nothing but the Indian who hunted" (Pearce, Savages of America, p. 64). The Americans had always tended to lump all Indians together as men with neither government or science, with hardly anything human about them but their faces. For a list of the contributions of the Indians to western civilization see Alain Locke and Bernhard J. Stern (eds.), When Peoples Meet: A Study in Race and Cultural Contacts (New York: 1946), p. 26.

37. Very few whites could appreciate the role of the woman in the Indian culture. The Moravian missionary, Heckewelder, contended that the women had no more than their fair share, "compared with the tasks imposed upon females in civilized society. . . ." He found that they cheerfully consented to their role and enjoyed doing the outside work which consumed about six weeks of the year whereas the man had to support the family for twelve months of the year (Heckewelder, An Account, Chapter XVI). The Quakers failed to appreciate this viewpoint. One of their representatives wrote concerning the Indian women that they "having most of the drudgery to perform. . . while their men are sporting with their bows and arrows. . . ." (Jackson, Civilization of the Indian Nations, p. 12).


39. Here again is the idea of mission or 'manifest destiny.' It may be impossible to close the gap between the two cultures. In such an event, the Indian culture will perish since the nineteenth century white did not question the superiority of his own culture (Ibid., p. 297).

40. Meigs was agent to the Cherokees for 22 years, beginning in 1801. He was a friend and benefactor of the Moravian mission in the Cherokee nation. It was through his intercession that the chiefs permitted the mission to be established. A survey account of his activity among the Cherokees may be found in Henry T. Malone, Cherokees of the Old South: A People in Transition (Athens, Georgia: 1956), pp. 57-73; Schwarze, History of Moravian Missions, p. 172.

41. Pearce finds this defect in American thinking to be a major cause of want of success in the civilization attempts. He observes that Americans have always thought that the process of acculturation, "of throwing off one way of life for another, would be relatively simple. To be civilized the Indian would have merely to be made into a farmer; this was a matter of an education for a generation or two. Christianization would follow inevitably; perhaps Christianization itself was the way to civilization." The author points out that this matter of fusing one culture into another
is not a simple process, "For a culture is a delicately balanced system of attitudes, beliefs, valuations, conditions and modes of behavior; the system does not change and reintegrate itself overnight, in a generation or two." Furthermore, he concludes that the "civilized, Christian life did not raise up all savages as it should have. Rather it lowered some savages and destroyed others" (Pearce, Savages of America, p. 66). Apparently the difficulty had two sides for the missionaries found one of their greatest problems to be that of "retaining the children long enough to fix their habits, and finish their education." One report commented, "Many of these ignorant people appear to think that their children can become learned in a few months" (Missionary Herald, January, 1819, p. 42). Some writers were aware of this thinking that called for immediate results and insisted that the change from one pattern of life to another would require them. Halkett wrote that to take a woman from her work in the open air and "suddenly to fix her at the irksome task of a spinning wheel, will only have the effect of disgusting them with the beginnings of civilization and inevitably prevent its progress" (John Halkett, Historical Notes respecting the Indians of North America: with Remarks on Attempts made to Convert and Civilize them /London: 1825/; p. 358). For further study of the problems of acculturation see Ruth Benedict, Patterns of Culture (New York: 1960); Alain and Bernhard J. Stern, When People Meet: A Study in Race and Culture Contacts (New York: 1946); William Newcomb, The Culture and Acculturation of the Delaware Indian (Ann Arbor, Michigan; 1956).
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1. This does not mean to imply that the government had not been appropriating funds for Indian civilization prior to 1819 but this was the first time that there had been an appropriation specifically designated for education. Congress had provided the Washington administration with a sum of $20,000 annually to be used for Indian gifts and payment of the agents (Statutes at Large, I, 331, 472, 746, 747). The amount was reduced to $15,000 a year in 1796 but the measure was continued in the Intercourse Acts of 1799 and 1802 (Ibid., II, 143). Some of the appropriation was used to supply the Cherokees, Creeks, Chickasaws, and Choctaws with spinning wheels, looms, agricultural implements and domestic animals (Calhoun to Monroe, February 21, 1822, ASPIA, II, 326; "Statement of Disbursements on account of the Indian Department, March 3, 1811 to March 3, 1815," ASPIA, I, 31-34). The procedure to be followed in the implementation of the education program was a departure from the earlier civilization efforts of the government. During the years 1789 to 1815 some civilization funds were given to religious organizations, who had missions among the Indians, in the form of implements or sometimes an outright subsidy, but the general practice was to channel gifts of implements to the Indians through the government agent. The practice of using missionaries as the only persons to be employed in the education system represented a new arrangement. Rather than hire men to go among the Indians to civilize them, the President determined to apply the education funds in conjunction with benevolent associations.

2. This raises the question of jurisdiction in Indian affairs. The Constitution simply provided that the Federal Government had exclusive power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and with the Indian tribes." The Federalists had contended that even though the Constitution did not confer on Congress the exclusive right and power to manage Indian affairs, the fact that the tribes had all along been dealt with by treaties, gave the Federal Government exclusive authority over the Indian tribes, including those within the boundaries of the states. Although the status of the Indians was never fully defined, the federal government continued to treat with them as "wards" of the federal government, allowing them a measure of self-government within the limits of states but promising the states to extinguish the Indian titles as soon as practicable. The administration of Indian affairs was committed to the War Department and in 1824 the Bureau of Indian Affairs was created to handle the office work. The Bureau head was responsible to the Secretary of War and could not speak officially on questions of policy dispute or other problems. The practice of dealing with the Indians through treaties...
gave the Executive branch of the government considerable authority along with the Senate while the House exerted its will in Indian Affairs when there was need for additional appropriations. This problem is treated in Lawrence F. Schemeczkeibier, The Office of Indian Affairs (Baltimore: 1927); Ruth A. Gallaher, "The Indian Agent in the United States before 1850," Iowa Journal of History and Politics, XIV (1916), 3-56; George D. Harmon, Indian Affairs (Chapel Hill: 1941).

3. The Act of March 3, 1819, stated that the purpose of the education effort was to provide "against the further decline and final extinction of the Indian tribes adjoining the frontier settlements of the United States, and for introducing among them the habits and arts of civilization. . . ." The bill provided that "the President of the United States shall be, and he is hereby authorized, in every case where he shall judge improvement. . . practicable, . . . to employ capable persons of good moral character to instruct them in the mode of agriculture suited to their situation; and for teaching their children in reading, writing, and arithmetic. . . ." ASPIA, II, 151). The circular issued by the War Department on September 3, 1819, stated: "such associations or individuals who are already actually engaged in educating the Indians, and who may desire the co-operation of the government will report to the Department of War. . . ." (ASPIA, II, 201).

4. This document may be found in The United States and the Indians, 20th Congress, Vol. V, Document No. 72, Article 20.

5. Ibid.

6. Occasionally an exception was made but this was to be only for a limited time. The Choctaw Academy at Great Crossings, Kentucky, which was not located within the Indian country, applied for aid from the President's fund. The Secretary of War, John Calhoun, informed the school officials on March 3, 1821, that the location of the Academy left it outside the benefits of the civilization fund. He authorized, however, a grant of $150 for that year with the understanding that the allowance was to be considered "temporary only, as the whole appropriation will be applied as intended by the regulations, so soon as there shall be a sufficient number of schools to require it" (Calhoun to School at Great Crossings, March 3, 1821, SW IA LS, Vol. E, p. 61).

7. The letter sent to all the mission boards in 1819 listed the necessary requirements (Circular of the War Department, SW IA LS, Vol. D, p. 319). The Civilization Act of March 3, 1819 is printed in Statutes at Large, III, 516, 517.

8. Some of the treaty funds were used to support schools such as the Choctaw Academy in Kentucky and to pay the tuition for some Indian students who attended white institutions. All expenditures had to meet with the approval of the War Department. James L. McDonald writing from the
Choctaw Agency in Mississippi, stated that he had two young men who wished to go to some college in Tennessee or Kentucky and requested support for them out of the fund that was being used to pay tuition for students at the Choctaw Academy in Kentucky (McDonald to McKenney, September 30, 1826, IA LR S, pp. 360, 361).


10. The Treaty of Chicago made with the Potawatomies and Ottawas in 1821 provided for this kind of education fund (Kappler, Treaties, II, 200). The Cherokee Treaty of 1819, stipulated that a tract of land should be sold and the money received, invested in stocks. The interest or dividends from the investment would be used for the purpose of education, under the direction of the President (Kappler, Treaties, II, 177-179). The treaty with the Potawatomies of October 16, 1826 stated that an annual sum of $2,000 would be expended on education as long as Congress thought it proper (Ibid., II, 273-277). The amount was reduced to $1,000 annually in 1828 (Ibid., II, 295).

11. This was obviously a requirement but the missionary was only permitted to use the land; he could not acquire title to it.

12. One missionary reported that the "natives and whitemen residing in the nation, subscribed 85 cows and calves, and more than $1300 for the benefit of this school" (Missionary Herald, February, 1820, p. 81).

13. It is apparently impossible to document the entire amount of money and property supplied by church people for the benefit of Indian education. In a report of 1831, the American Board of Missions stated that during the past 13 years, it had expended $62,000 of its own funds on schools in the Choctaw nation. During the same period, the President's civilization fund had spent $20,000 on the same schools and the Choctaws provided $64,000 out of their annuities (Evarts to the War Department, December 14, 1831, IA LR S, p. 72; American Board Report to the War Department, The United States and the Indians, 22nd Congress, Document No., 19h, pp. 1-5). In 1824, the mission schools received a total of $12,708.48 from the government, $8,750.00 from Indian annuities and under treaty provisions, and the report showed $170,147.52 from private contributions in money, property, and stock. In 1825, the record showed an increase with totals of $13,620.41, $11,750.00, and $176,700.44 respectively. It is important to point out that amount indicated under private contributions carried the statement, "... and including the value of the houses and other improvements on the site of the respective institutions" (ASPIA, II, 669; Alice C. Fletcher, Indian Education and Civilization, Washington: 1888, p. 197).

14. The War Department circular had indicated the desire of the government to work with the benevolent agencies but it was up to each missionary organization to make proper application for the funds.
15. McCoy was born in Fayette County, Pennsylvania, in 1784. About 1790 his father moved westward and settled in Shelby County, Kentucky. In 1803, McCoy married the daughter of Captain E. Polke, a pioneer of that country. Years before this, the wife and three children of the Captain had been taken prisoners by the Ottawa Indians and were not rescued until some years later. It was among these Indians that McCoy and his wife were to spend several years in an attempt to educate them. In 1817, McCoy received his appointment from the American Baptist Board as their first missionary exclusively to the American Indians. He was appointed to minister to the tribes in Indiana and Illinois. Before moving to Fort Wayne in 1820, he worked among the Indians on Raccoon Creek, north of Terra Haute (William E. Sprague (ed.), Annals of the American Pulpit/New York: 18607, VI, 541).

16. Staughton to Secretary of War, August 3, 1819, quoted in Morse, A Report, pp. 166, 167.


18. The report of the War Department indicated that there were some fifty students in attendance as of October, 1820 (ASPIA, II, 272); Paul Wallace Gates (ed.), The John Tipton Papers /Indianapolis: 19427, I, 308).

19. Kappler, Treaties, II, 198-201; ASPIA, II, 258, 259. The tract ceded to the United States, located in the southwestern part of the present state of Michigan and below the Grand River, is in map form in Royce, Indian Land Cessions, Map 29, cession designation 117. A report of the proceedings may be found in the letter of Cass to the Secretary of War, February 1, 1822, in SW IA LR. A description of the colorful gathering of Indians is given by Henry R. Schoolcraft in Travels in the Central Portions of the Mississippi Valley (New York: 1825), pp. 370, 371.

20. From the "Journal of Isaac McCoy, September, 1821," quoted in Lela Barnes, "Isaac McCoy and the Treaty of 1821," Kansas Historical Quarterly, V (1936), 137. Most of this material in Barnes' article is taken directly from the journals of McCoy.

21. Ibid., p. 132.


23. McCoy was the Baptist missionary to the Potawatomies and he assumed that the government would appoint him to the position of teacher and give him the direction of the civilization work among them. He was concerned that some other denominational mission might receive government approval to establish a mission among the Ottawas and receive the treaty funds. McCoy wanted the Baptists to have both missions.
24. McCoy knew that the government often provided for such items out of the President's civilization fund, that is, the $10,000 appropriated by Congress. Since both schools would be located in the Indian country, they would be eligible for such additional subsidies (Kansas Historical Quarterly, V, 139).

25. Ibid., p. 140.

26. McCoy to Governor Cass, September 2, 1821, Ibid., p. 137.

27. The correspondence relative to the establishment of schools in accordance with the Chicago treaty may be found in Cass to the Secretary of War, July 25, 1822, SW IA LR.

28. Cass to McCoy, July 16, 1822, SW IA LR; McCoy, Baptist Missions, p. 149; Peck, History of the Baptist Convention, p. 364.

29. Report of the school is in, Luther Rice to the Secretary of War, February 12, 1821, IA LR S, pp. 307, 308. Cass is instructed to give every possible aid to the school (Mckenney to Cass, August 7, 1824, IA LS).

30. History of the Baptist Denomination in Georgia. (Atlanta; 1881), p. 70. Rathbun became governor of Georgia in March, 1817; he died in October, 1819 (Gammell, History of American Baptist Missions /Boston: 1849, p. 327; Morse, A Report to the Secretary of War, Appendix, p. 166.

31. One writer referred to Lumpkin as "one of the noblest men our State ever produced." Lumpkin was governor of Georgia and member of the United States Senate; he took an active part in the debate on the Indian Removal Bill (History of Baptists in Georgia, p. 69).

32. Ibid., p. 94.

33. Compere was born in England in 1789 and died in Texas in 1871. He was educated in Bristol, England and for some time was a missionary to Jamaica (Gammell, History of Baptist Missions, p. 328; History of Baptists in Georgia, pp. 133, 134).


36. This is the $10,000 annual appropriation for Indian education provided by Congress but placed under the direction of the President.

37. Great Crossings was near Blue Springs in Scott County, Kentucky, seven miles from Georgetown.
38. The members of the Board included: "Dr. Staughton, Secretary of the Baptist Board at Washington; William Suggett, who had commanded a mounted battalion in an engagement near Fort Wayne when an Indian chief of some distinction was killed; Jacob Creath, a famous preacher and Indian fighter. . .; Benjamin Chambers, a soldier and legislator; James Fishback, D.D., one of the founders of the Bible Society; Major John T. Johnson . . a member of Congress. . .; Elder Barton Stone, noted for his theological dissensions; General David Thompson, legislator from Scott County; James F. Robinson, Governor of the State. All were veteran Indian fighters" (Shelley C. Rouse, "Col. Dick Johnson's Choctaw Academy; A Forgotten Educational Experiment," Ohio Archaeological Historical Quarterly, XXV (1916), 92). Richard M. Johnson had been a lawyer, state legislator, and member of Congress during the years 1807 to 1819; later he became a member of the United States Senate and from 1837 to 1841 was Vice President of the United States. His father had been a Baptist minister at Great Crossings, Kentucky, and Richard was a member of the Board of Directors of the Kentucky Baptist Society (Leland W. Meyer, The Life and Times of Colonel Richard M. Johnson [New York: 1932], p. 343).

39. Occasionally revenue was secured from other sources, but the money set aside by the Indians for education was the basic support for the school. A nation would be permitted to send a certain number of its youth, based on the amount which they paid to the school for that year.

40. In many instances, Negroes were hired to do the necessary farm work and to do the house work (Report to the War Department, September 10, 1828, IA LR S, p. 1018).

41. Cyrus Kingsbury, Missionary to the Choctaws, was not very pleased with the new arrangement which called for sending the better students to the school in Kentucky for advanced education. He wrote to the War Department on October 11, 1825, stating that a number of students had been sent to Kentucky; that he had known nothing about the planned new school; that the boys sent to Kentucky were his best scholars and that he had preferred to have them finish their education in the nation (Kingsbury to the War Department, October 11, 1825, IA LR S, pp. 579-582).

42. During the 1830's there were complaints concerning the food, the coffee, the manner in which the boys were selected to go to the Academy, the distance and expense involved and the results of the education as seen in the lives of the graduates.

43. Supra, p. 63.


45. Ibid., p. 395.

The War Department report for 1826 showed 54 students enrolled at the school. It stated that the Creeks had been so impressed with the results that they had appropriated money for the students who wished to attend the Academy from their nation (Creek delegation to the War Department, April 1, 1826, IA LR S; "Expenditures of the Indian Department and state of our Relations with the General Tribes," War Department to Congress, November 20, 1826, ASPIA, II, 671, 672). The Creek treaty may be found in Kappler, Treaties, II, 214-217.

Tipton was Indian agent at Fort Wayne. Since the Creeks and Potawatomies were enemies of the United States in the last war, he thought that educating their youth at the same school in Kentucky was a good way to prevent any further hostility against the United States (Tipton to Barbour, June, 1827, IA LR S, p. 818).

Report to the War Department, November 22, 1826, IA LR S, pp. 2124, 2135.
Report to the War Department, August, 1827, Ibid., pp. 648, 686.
Report to the War Department, April 30, 1830, Ibid., p. 377.
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Compere to Barbour, September 10, 1827, IA LR S, p. 570.

Bolles to McKenney, January 5, 1828, IA LR S, p. 914.

Bolles to McKenney, July 8, 1828, IA LR S, p. 920.

Message of December 2, 1828, Richardson, Messages and Papers, II, 415, 416.

Report to the Senate, January 27, 1825, ASPIA, II, 544.


Tracy, Life of Evarts, p. 268.

Ibid., pp. 271, 272.

Ibid., pp. 274, 275.

Ibid., p. 306.

Evarts to McKenney, August 18, 1828, IA LR S, p. 978.

Notes
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1. William C. Dawson (comp.), A Compilation of the Laws of the State of Georgia (Milledgeville, Georgia: 1831), pp. 198, 199; Woodward, The CheroKees, pp. 158, 159; James Mooney, Myths of the Cherokee (Washington: 1900), p. 117. The laws of the Georgia state legislature may also be found in United States, Congress, Senate, Indian Removal, Document No. 512, 23rd Cong., 1st Sess., II, 232, 235, 290. This series of five volumes and more than 4,000 pages were compiled in response to a resolution of the Senate. They contain the correspondence in the War Department relating to Indian removal from November 30, 1831 to December 27, 1833. Hereafter they will be cited as Indian Removal.7 An account of the discovery of gold in Georgia may be found in F. M. Green, "Georgia's Forgotten Industry: Gold Mining," Georgia Historical Quarterly, XIX (1935), 93-111; 210-218.


3. Annual Message, December 6, 1829, Richardson, Messages and Papers, II, 457, 458. For Jackson's Indian policy, see Foreman, Last Trek, pp. 59-88; Royce, Cherokee Nation, 2h1, 242, 258, 259.


5. Bolles to Secretary of War, May 9, 1829, IA LR S, pp. 26-27.

6. McCoy was missionary to the Potawatomies in Michigan Territory, who had made little progress in civilization. In 1827, he published a small booklet, Remarks on the Practicability of Indian Reform, in which he called for the gathering of all the Indians into an area West of the Mississippi where they could be formed into a Territory and possibly a state at some future date (Ibid., p. 30). He thought that even the more advanced CheroKees would be better off in the West (Ibid., p. 34). For a study of the condition of the Indians in the Northwest, see Foreman, Last Trek, pp. 17-30.

8. Memorial of Baptist General Association of Pennsylvania for Missionary Purposes, The United States and the Indians, 21st Congress, 1830-31, VI, Document 64. For a memorial presented to Congress by the Quakers, see Register of Debates, VI, 590-594.

9. Lincoln to Secretary of War, May 24, 1830, IA LR S, pp. 508, 509.

10. For a study of the formation of this Board, see Francis Paul Prucha, "Thomas L. McKenney and the New York Indian Board," Mississippi Valley Historical Review (March, 1962), 635-655.


13. Cherokee Phoenix, May 1, 1830. Prucha states that "the precise origin of the plan to organize church support for the Jacksonian program is not clear. The proposal may have come from Jackson or from Eaton, or from McKenney himself but there is no doubt the work was done by McKenney." The Board did not actually exert much influence and it soon ceased to function due to insufficient finances and other factors (Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLVIII, 635, 645).


19. Headquarters for this mainly Congregational Church missionary agency was in Boston, Massachusetts. Its Indian missionary activity was primarily among the Cherokees and Choctaws. For a study of its work among the Cherokees, see Edward S. Dale and Gaston Litton, The Cherokee Cavaliers (Norman, Oklahoma: 1939); for its work among the Choctaws, see W. A. Love, "The Mayhew Mission to the Choctaws," Publications of Mississippi Historical Society, XI (1910), 363-402.
20. Evarts was not a clergyman or a missionary but a lawyer. He did have the responsibility of directing the American Board's work among the Indians and he formulated its basic policy, to be followed by the Board's missionaries, toward the government removal policy.

21. Evarts contended that none of the Indians should be forced to remove to the West. It should be a decision made by them and not by the government.

22. The Cherokees and Choctaws had advanced so far in learning and culture as to establish farms, build houses, cultivate the land, raise herds and crops. They raised cotton which they carded, spun, and wove into cloth. They laid out roads, built mills, engaged in commerce and sent their children to the mission schools. They had even established some form of representative government (Foreman, Indian Removal, preface, p. 2). For Evart's interview with the President, see Tracy, Life of Evarts, p. 325.

23. Tracy, Life of Evarts, pp. 326, 327.

24. The Essays reviewed the government's relations to the southern tribes and more particularly, the Cherokees. They were published in the National Intelligencer and later in book form under the signature of William Penn (Tracy, Life of Evarts, p. 339). The full title is Essays on the Present Crisis in the Condition of American Indians: First Published in the National Intelligencer under the Signature Penn (Boston: 1829).


26. Lumpkin became a Baptist in early manhood and remained so to his death. He was a member of the state legislature of Georgia, then member of the House of Representatives in Congress, governor of the state of Georgia, and then member of the United States Senate. Frelinghuysen, Senator from New Jersey, contended that Lumpkin confessed in 1844 that he had been wrong in the matter of Indian removal (T. W. Chambers, Memoir of Theodore Frelinghuysen /New York: 1862, p. 82).

27. Lumpkin opened his speech by stating that "on no former occasion, had he ever felt more deeply impressed with a sense of that responsibility, to God and his country, than he did at the present moment." He urged the Congress to pass the Removal Bill for in only this way could they save the Indians (Register of Debates, VI, 1018, 1019; Wilson Lumpkin, The Removal of the Cherokee Indians from Georgia /New York: 1907, I, 67-69).

28. Register of Debates, VI, 1020.

29. This statement is not found in the collected William Penn Essays and it was never determined whether Evarts was the author or not.

30. The pamphlet was a reprint of an article from the American Monthly Magazine (Register of Debates, VI, 1021).
31. Ibid., p. 1037.

32. McKenney to Baldwin, July 13, 1829, IA LS, Vol. IV, p. 30. The American Board was invited to cooperate in the activities of the New York Indian Board but refused. Baldwin had proposed admitting Congressmen as honorary members of the Board but McKenney thought this might be considered "indelicate" (McKenney to Baldwin, October 27, 1829, IA LS, Vol. VI, p. 133).

33. Register of Debates, VI, 1037.

34. The letter stated: "There is one other subject on which I think it is due to justice to give my testimony, whatever it may be worth. Whether the Cherokees are wise in desiring to remain here or not, I express no opinion. But it is certainly just that it should be known whether or not they do, as a body, wish to remain. It is not possible for a person to dwell among them without hearing much on the subject. I have heard much. It is said abroad that the common people would gladly remove, but are deterred by the chiefs and a few other influential men. It is not so. I say with the utmost assurance, it is not so. Nothing is plainer than that it is the earnest wish of the whole body of the people to remain where they are. They are not overawed by the chiefs. . . . The whole tide of national feeling sets, in one strong and unbroken current, against a removal to the West." (Register of Debates, VI, 1048).

35. Senator Theodore Frelinghuysen was a respected and prominent advocate of the cause of religion. He declared that since the time in 1807 that Jefferson refused to recommend the proposed day of humiliation and prayer, there had been an increase of what he called "political irreligion" in this country. He wanted to re-establish the religious character of the state and the supremacy of religious interests. He had opposed the Sunday transmission of the mails; he backed the temperance movement in Congress and fought for a national fast day. A staunch conservative, he defended the United States Bank, and supported the Whig economic program. It is not surprising to find him opposed to the Indian Removal Bill of the Jackson administration. He was prominent on the American Board of Missions and no doubt exerted considerable influence on the Board's opposition to the removal policy (Chambers, Memoir of Prelinghuysen, p. 71).

36. Representative Edward Everett of Massachusetts was later to share the platform with Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg. At the time of his speech in the House in behalf of the Indian cause, he was planning to take part in the Black Hawk War.

37. David Crockett, representative from Jackson's home state and veteran of the Creek campaign, paid for his support of the Indians; he was not returned to Congress. He returned to introduce a bit of satire, a bill calling for the removal of the whites in eastern Tennessee beyond the Mississippi lest they impede the territorial designs and sovereignty of the state of Georgia (Marion L. Starkey, The Cherokee Nation / The New York

38. These Indians had removed from the East, several years before, to the Arkansas and now they were being prevailed on to move again, this time to the Indian Territory.

39. McCoy, for many years, was the Baptist missionary to the Potawatomies and a strong advocate for Indian removal. He was appointed government surveyor for the lands in the West and after 1828, made several expeditions to the West for that purpose.

40. In December, 1827, Congress appropriated $15,000 to pay the expenses of exploring the country west of the Mississippi. Isaac McCoy and Captain George Kennerly conducted the expedition. McCoy took with him a delegation of Potawatomies and Ottawas (McCoy, Baptist Missions, pp. 326, 327; McKenney to McCoy, June 10, 1828, Vol. IV., pp. 10, 11). The expedition referred to by Everett left for St. Louis on July 2, 1828, and arrived in that city, July 16. The delegations of Chickasaws, Choctaws, and Creeks had not arrived so McCoy went ahead without them and returned later to take them on an observation tour in the latter part of that year. The expedition lasted only forty-nine days, from August 19 to October 7, averaging twenty-four miles a day. They covered what is now eastern and central Kansas, eighty miles north to south and one hundred fifty miles east to west, the farthest point west being fifty miles west of Fort Leavenworth (Lela Barnes, "Journal of Isaac McCoy for the Exploring Expedition of 1828," Kansas Historical Quarterly, V (1936), 227-277). For McCoy's expedition of June, 1830, see McKenney to McCoy, June 3, 1830, IA LS, Vol. VI, pp. 446, 447; Lela Barnes, "Journal of Isaac McCoy for the Exploring Expedition of 1830," Kansas Historical Quarterly, V (1936), 339-377. For the Secretary of War's instructions to McCoy, in 1831, for running the boundaries in the Indian Territory, see *The United States and the Indians*, 22nd Congress, Document 17, pp. 57, 58.

41. *Register of Debates*, VI, 1072, 1073. This is the report referred to in the speech by Representative Everett. It is included in the report of the Secretary of War to Congress, April 6, 1830, *The United States and the Indians*, 21st Congress, 1830-31, VI, Document 91, p. 7. Clark had also reported in March, 1826: "The condition of many tribes west of the Mississippi is the most pitiable that can be imagined. During several seasons, in every year, they are distressed by famine, in which many die for want of food, and, during which, the living child is often buried with the dead mother, because no one can spare it as much food as would sustain it through its helpless infancy. This description applies to Sioux, Osages, and many others, but I mention those because they are powerful tribes, and live near our borders, and my official station Clark was superintendent of Indian Affairs for the
territory west of the Mississippi enables me to know the exact truth. It is vain to talk to people in this condition about learning and religion" (Register of Debates, VI, 357). The travel accounts of Zebulon M. Pike, Henry M. Breckinridge and the Stephen H. Long expeditions published in 1810, 1817, and 1823 respectively, pictured the area beyond the Missouri and Arkansas as an arid, treeless waste; it was marked as the "Great American Desert" and held unsuitable for occupation by American farmers. These reports were used in the debate on Indian Removal to support the argument of those who were opposed to the plan to move the Indians to the West (Register of Debates, VI, 1072, 1073). For a study of this problem, see Francis Paul Prucha, "Indian Removal and the Great American Desert," Indiana Magazine of History, LIX (December, 1963), 299-322.

44. Report of Secretary of War, April 13, 1830, The United States and the Indians, 21st Congress, 1830-31, VI, Document 91, 1, 2. The Secretary of War was referring to the Clark letter and the McCoy expedition of 1828. Apparently Eaton had reservations about his own report for in the instructions to McCoy in 1831, the Secretary of War wrote that as of "now we have no satisfactory information. Hereafter, through your labors, we hope to be able to inform the tribes of Indians, when they propose to treat, of the precise nature and character and resources of the country" (The instructions were included in report of the Secretary of War to Congress in 1831, The United States and the Indians, 22nd Congress, Document 17, pp. 57, 58). In his report of February 16, 1832, the Secretary of War, relying mostly on McCoy's reports, stated that there was "an imperfect state of knowledge concerning some of the land west of the Mississippi" (Report of Secretary of War to Congress, February 16, 1832, Indian Removal, II, 769). For reports of McCoy's findings, see Ibid., III, 230, 231; Herring to McCoy, May 21, 1832, IA LS, Vol. VIII, pp. 392, 393; Tipton Papers, III, 231, 398. The government had decided that the land would be suitable for the Indians. Later scholarship, however, still leaves this an open question.

45. McKenney was Superintendent of Indian Trade from 1816 to 1822 and head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs from 1824 to 1830. He came from a Quaker background. From the year 1817, he had supported the efforts of the missionary societies in educating the Indians. In 1818, he took an Indian boy into his own home. He had a son of his own about the same age and raised the two boys together, providing them with the same clothes and education. After finishing his studies in Georgetown, McDonald, the Indian boy, was sent to Ohio to study law. He became a skillful lawyer, representing his people in treaty negotiations with the federal government. All of this was a source of great encouragement to McKenney who had expressed confidence in the ability of the Indian to be civilized. McDonald, however, became an alcoholic and while drunk, wandered to a nearby river and either fell or leaped to his death (McKenney to Tyson and Elliot, March 27, 1818, IT LS, Vol. E, p. 5; McKenney, Memoirs, II, 109-116, 118, 119; McKenney to McKee, April 15, 1818, IT LS, Vol. E, p. 19).
By 1824, McKenney was beginning to change his views, thinking that removal of the tribes to the West was the only humanitarian solution (McKenney to Johnson, May 11, 1824, IA LS, Vol. I, p. 69). In 1827, he was sent on an extensive tour of the Indian country to participate in treaty negotiations and to ascertain actual impressions of the Indians toward removal. He visited the Chicasaws, Choctaws, Creeks and Cherokees and returned most disturbed because, to him, it seemed that the Indians were given over to vices. He was now firmly convinced that only removal could save them (McKenney to Barbour, November 29, 1827, IA LS, Vol. IV, p. 155; McKenney, Memoirs, I, 60; McKenney to Evarts, May 1, 1825, Ibid., Appendix F, p. 335; McKenney to Kingsbury, IA LS, Vol. VI, pp. 515, 516).

For the reference to the Kingsbury's report and its contents in the debates, see Register of Debates, VI, 1070. The complete report is in Report of Secretary of War to Congress, The United States and the Indians, 21st Congress, 1830-31, VI, Document 110. The resolution of Congress asking for this information is found in Register of Debates, VI, 42, 43, and dated January 25, 1830.

Included in reported and cited above as Document 110.

Register of Debates, VI, 319, 1069, 1070; Missionary Herald, May, 1830, pp. 153-155. There had been considerable progress among the Cherokees and Choctaws but the accusation of exaggeration levelled at the missionaries was not without some foundation (Register of Debates, VI, 1019). Cotterill contends that the Indian, generally speaking, did not accept the white man's religion or his idea of holding land in severalty. Many of the half-bloods were affiliated with frontier religious denominations but the full-bloods "remained almost to a man skeptical and intolerant" (Cotterill, Southern Indians, p. 230).

He stated: "I rejoice that we may safely repose upon the statements contained in the letters of Messrs. J. L. Allen, R. M. Livingston, Rev. Cyrus Kingsbury, and Rev. Samuel A. Worcester. The character of these witnesses is without reproach, and their satisfactory certificates of the improvement of the tribes continue and confirm the history furnished to us in the several messages from which I have just read" (Register of Debates, VI, 319).

Register of Debates, VI, 1049; Speeches on the Passage of the Bill for the Removal of Indians, Delivered in Congress of the United States, April and May, 1830 (Boston, 1830), p. 212.

Register of Debates, VI, 1070. Lumpkin, in favor of removal, quoted from McCoy's booklets. McCoy was a fellow Baptist and one of the most ardent supporters of Indian removal (Register of Debates, VI, 1019).

Register of Debates, VI, 1135-1136; United States Statutes, IV, 411, 412.
Notes

Chapter IX

1. For a detailed study of the removals in the 1830's, see Grant Foreman, Indian Removal: The Emigration of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians (Norman, Oklahoma: 1932); and The Last Trek of the Indians (Chicago: 1946).

2. Greenwood Laflure, half-breed of the tribe, was chief of one of the three districts into which the Choctaw Nation was divided. He had considerable influence and was intelligent. He had joined the Methodist church in 1829. He had 400 slaves on his cotton plantation and spent $10,000 to furnish the salon of his Mississippi mansion with elegant French chairs, tables, mirrors and carpeting (Foreman, Indian Removal, p. 22; Tracy, History of American Missions, pp. 540, 541).

3. Laflure called a meeting of some of the head men of the tribe friendly to him and told them that they must change their form of government and unite the whole nation under one chief. He then presided over the Council that made a decision in favor of emigration (Foreman, Indian Removal, p. 23; Missionary Herald, August, 1830, pp. 253, 254).

4. Evarts was the corresponding secretary of the American Board of Missions.

5. Laws enacted by Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi declaring that the Indians in those states were now subject to laws of states in which they resided.

6. The treaty was signed by some of the chiefs and more than 200 warriors who were present. The treaty was then delivered to Major Haley, the President's envoy who happened to be present and he took it to Washington (Indian Removal, II, 4, 240; Tracy, Life of Evarts, pp. 362, 363).

7. Talley was also a medical doctor. As a missionary among the Choctaws, he had reported considerable success in winning converts to the Methodist faith. By 1830, according to his report, there were some four thousand Choctaws enrolled in the Methodist missions out of an approximately population of twenty thousand. The Methodists had three missionaries, three interpreters, and four school teachers employed in their Choctaw missions (Methodist Magazine, September, 1828, p. 353; Bangs, History of Methodist Church, IV, 63).
8. The treaty provided that the Choctaws would surrender their land for $1,000,000 provided that each man be given 640 acres of land with the power of alienation, compensation for all domestic animals, provision for emigration to the West and new land in the West with a guarantee that would eventually form them into a state and be admitted into the union on equal terms with other states (Indian Removal, II, 240; McKenney to White, April 9, 1830, Vol. VI, p. 381; Missionary Herald, August, 1830, p. 253; L. F. Schmeckebier, The Office of Indian Affairs /Baltimore: 1927, p. 92).

9. Evarts' "cautious and prudent" statement is hard to accept since no mission board was more involved in advising the Indians on both political and moral matters than the American Board and Evarts, himself (Tracy, Life of Evarts, p. 398).

10. Mooshoolatubbe and Nitakechi, chiefs to two of the Choctaw districts, and a large number of the other principal men addressed a memorial to the Secretary of War saying that Laflore did not represent the sentiment of tribe and they attacked the treaty which Laflore, Folsom, and Talley had secured (Indian Removal, II, 58; Tracy, History of American Missions, pp. 206, 207; Missionary Herald, August, 1830, pp. 253, 254.)

11. Mooshoolatubbe to Secretary of War, June 15, 1831, IA LR S; Tracy, History of American Missions, p. 239.

12. Eaton and Coffee arrived in the Choctaw Nation on September 15 and began negotiations. They warned the Indians that their best interests demanded removal to the West. The council began on September 18, 1830 (Indian Removal, II, 252).


14. Since the American Board of Missions and the Methodist missionaries had been advising the Choctaw Indians in political matters, the approach of the commissioners to the real reason for the missionary request to be present at the treaty was far from realistic. Obviously the missionaries were fooling no one; they were concerned about their own missions and schools and the future of their work among the Choctaws. They apparently thought that the commissioners could not be trusted to deal justly with the Indians. The accusations of the American Board of Missions as to the method employed by the commissioners to get the treaty signed seems to give credence to this observation (Indian Removal, II, pp. 252, 254).

15. Ibid., p. 256.

16. The Indians refused to sign the treaty and many of them went home. These who remained were finally persuaded to sign the treaty on the basis that they could send an exploring part to the West and that General Gaines would be intrusted with their removal. The treaty, known as Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, was signed on September 27, 1830, and ratified on February 24, 1831, by the Senate. The three chiefs (Laflore, Nitakechi
and Mooshoolatubbe) were given four sections of land. An effort was made to win the old full-blood chief, Mooshoolatubbe, by launching his candidacy for Congress. The Post Gibson Correspondent of April 1, 1830, contained his announcement. This press comment was calculated to influence the Indians and impress them with the fact that by a recent act of the legislature, they had become citizens of Mississippi and subject to her laws (Indian Removal, IV, 504; Miles Weekly Register, XXXVIII, 327, 362). The treaty is printed in Statutes of United States, VII, 334, 341; Kappler, Treaties, II, 313. For the reaction of the American Board of Missions to the treaty, see Tracy, History of American Missions, p. 206.

17. Lafore informed the War Department that it was impossible for him to prevent his people from emigrating. He wrote: "Dr. Talley will also go immediately on to reorganize his church and afford such assistance as may be in his power" (Indian Removal, II, 391; Lafore to Eaton, October 5, 1830, IA LR 8). Talley relates the difficulties encountered along the way (Indian Removal, II, 453; Mudge, Methodist Missions, pp. 540, 541). For a study of the Creek and Choctaw removals, see Angie Debo, The Road to Disappearance (Norman, Oklahoma: 1941).


20. Evarts to John Ross, Ross Papers, quoted in Woodward, The Cherokees, pp. 163, 164; Tracy, Life of Evarts, pp. 197-199. For a study of missions among the Cherokees, see Edward S. Dale, and Gaston Litton, The Cherokee Cavaliers (Norman, Oklahoma: 1939). John Ross was born in Rossville, Georgia, October 3, 1790. He died in Washington, D.C., August 1, 1866. He was the son of an emigrant from Scotland by a Cherokee wife who was herself three-fourths white. He went to school in Kingston, Tennessee. In 1809 he was sent on a mission to the Cherokees in Arkansas and from that time on was in public service. He was chosen a member of the National Committee of the Cherokee Council in 1817. He was president of the National Committee from 1819 to 1826. From 1828 to the removal to the Indian Territory, he was the principal chief of the Cherokee nation (F. W. Hodge ed., Handbook of American Indians /Washington: 1912), II, 396).

21. The missionaries contended that the sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the Cherokees was vested in the people and they were accountable to them and the United States government as specified in treaties (Memorial of the American Board of Missions to the War Department, November 3, 1831, Indian Removal, II, 641-646; Missionary Herald, March, 1831, pp. 79-84; Tracy, Life of Evarts, p. 409). Isaac Proctor, Rev. Samuel Worcester and
Rev. Thompson, teachers and missionaries at Carmel, New Echota, and Hightower were seized by twenty-five members of the Georgia Guard. They were released on the basis that they were agents of the federal government. The Secretary of War, Eaton, informed Governor Gilmer of Georgia that only the Moravian and Baptist missionaries were government agents since it was through them the $10,000 was now been expended. Sometime before the government had withdrawn its support of the schools of the American Board of Missions (Indian Removal, II, 451; Gilmer to Jackson, June 20, 1831, Ibid., 479).

22. Shulze to Cass, October 11, 1832, IA LR S; Cherokee Phoenix, September 21, 1831; Schwarze, Moravian Missions, p. 205.

23. Tracy, History of American Missions, p. 207; Starkey, Cherokee Nation, pp. 134, 171, 244. Featherstonehaugh tells of visiting the American Board's mission and found all of the missionaries there opposed to removal. Thinking the traveler to favor removal, they treated him "coolly enough" and refused to loan him a horse (G. W. Featherstonehaugh, A Canoe Voyage up the Mimay Sotor [London: 1847, II, 214]).

24. Opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States at January Term, 1832, ... (Washington: 1832). The missionaries at first thought the decision of the Court had settled the controversy about the Cherokee lands (Indian Removal, III, 381).


26. Church was a Vermonter by birth. He asked the missionaries if they thought the local Cherokee cause was worth a national disaster, referring to the nullification threat (Starkey, The Cherokees, p. 201; Missionary Herald, March, 1833, p. 111). On April 4, 1832, the attorneys for the missionaries had presented to Governor Wilson Lumpkin a memorial asking him to use his executive power to release the missionaries and the governor refused.


28. Tracy, Life of Evarts, pp. 238, 239. President Jackson had made it clear in his message to the Senate on February 22, 1831 that he was the champion of Georgia in the controversy. He did not intend to enforce the treaties with the Indians if they conflicted with the pretensions of Georgia (Richardson, Messages and Papers, II, 536). He later warned the Cherokees that they could expect no help from him to protect them (Indian Removal, II, 14).
29. One of the American Board's missionaries, Dr. Butler, was disturbed over Worcester's change of mind since the Court decision (Starkey, *The Cherokees*, pp. 243, 244).

30. After the treaty session in March, 1835, a full council was held at Red Clay, Tennessee to consider the treaty in October, 1835. A second meeting was held at New Echota in December, 1835 with only 300 to 500 present out of a population of nearly 17,000. A committee was appointed to arrange for a treaty which was signed December 29, 1835 (Mooney, *Cherokee Myth*, p. 126; Foreman, *Indian Removal*, pp. 269 - 272; Woodward, *The Cherokees*, pp. 182-191). For all the treaties made between the United States and the Cherokees, see Peters, *The Cherokee Case*, Appendix II, 249-273.

31. United States Statutes, VII, 478, 479; Kappler, *Treaties*, II, 439-447; George D. Harmon, "The North Carolina Cherokees and the New Echota Treaty," *North Carolina Historical Review*, VI (1929), 237-253. The Cherokees were the largest tribe of the Iroquoian family. In 1820 their tribal territory was 250 miles in length with a width of 100 to 150 miles with excellent soil in a healthy climate. The population in 1820 was 14,500. The Cherokee country included the Northwest part of Georgia, Northeast corner of Alabama, Southwestern section of North Carolina and the Southeast part of Tennessee (Morse, *A Report*, Appendix, p. 152). In December, 1835, there were 16,542 Cherokees in Georgia, North Carolina, Alabama, and Tennessee, exclusive of 1,592 Negro slaves and 201 whites who had intermarried with the Cherokees. They were distributed as follows: Georgia 8,946 with 776 slaves; North Carolina, 3,644 with 37 slaves; Tennessee, 2,528 with 480 slaves; Alabama, 1,424 with 299 slaves (United States, Congress, Senate, 25th Cong., 2nd sess., Document No. 120). The migration of the Cherokees to the West began long before 1835. In 1813 a considerable party voluntarily moved to the West and in 1818, 1819, a still larger number. The Cherokee population of Arkansas in 1825 was approximately 6,000 (Report of Secretary of War, 1826, *ASPIA*, II, 546; Tracy, *Life of Everts*, pp. 85, 111).

32. Jesse Bushyhead was a native Baptist missionary. After the signing of the treaty at New Echota, Georgia, December 29, 1835, Bushyhead and a fellow native Baptist preacher, Oganaya, were selected to go to Washington for the purpose of working out some better agreement between the Cherokees and the United States. They were gone for six months and were obviously unsuccessful (Eugene C. Routh, "Early Missionaries to the Cherokees," *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, XV/December, 1937, 453; Tracy, *History of American Missions*, p. 498). In the fall of 1837, Bushyhead was named by Chief John Ross as a member of the deputation to the Seminoles in Florida to seek to adjust the difficulties between that nation and the United States. The Seminoles who came to St. Augustine under a flag of truce to make overtures of peace were imprisoned. Bushyhead was mortified and indignant at this "civilized treachery" (Grant Foreman /ed.7, "Report of Cherokee Deputation into Florida," *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, IX/1937, 432-442; Tracy, *History of American Missions*, p. 500).
33. Evan Jones, Baptist Missionary to the Cherokees, contrary to the official position of his denomination, was opposed to removal. Featherstonehaugh contended that most of the Georgians and other white settlers had a "decided antipathy to him on account of the advice he gave to the Cherokees, which had frequently enabled them to baffle the machinations of the persons who were plotting to get their lands (Featherstonehaugh, A Canoe Voyage, II, 235).

34. Chronicles of Oklahoma, XV, 454, 455; Tracy, History of American Missions, p. 504.


38. Tracy, History of American Missions, p. 305. Foreman, after making a careful study of the removal controversy, does not indict the people of the South for their mistreatment of the Indians. He comments: "whatever may be charged against the white people in this regard is not sectional. The Indians have suffered at their hands throughout the country from north and south and from east to west." As for the removal of the Cherokees, Foreman observes that "lack of experience should have requisitioned extraordinary ability and concern for the helpless objects of their decrees, which they were denied. Inadequate preparation by the government and the appointment of a horde of political incompetents to posts of authority, resulted in woeful mismanagement and cruel and unnecessary suffering by the emigrants." He further states that much suffering, however, was inevitable (Foreman, Indian Removal, preface, p. 2).

39. The Senecas in New York state were about 2,000 in number and had 230 square miles of excellent land in that state. They were noted for their military achievements; they had conquered the Delawares, Shawnees, Wyandots and other tribes. They had a long and bloody conflict with the Cherokees, Choctaws, and Chippewas and this may have influenced their determination to stay where they were. In 1795 the Quakers began their civilization efforts among the Senecas. During the years 1807 - 1817, they became interested in work among the Oneida, Onondaga, Stockbridge, and Brothertown Indians. By 1830, most of the Indians among whom they labored had gone to the Northwest Territory. Red Jacket of the Senecas liked the Quakers because they made no attempt to convert the Indians to another religion. For the other Protestant missionary, Red Jacket had only contempt, and to the Quakers, he accused them of stealing horses, driving away his cattle, and other crimes (William L. Stone, Life and Times of Red Jacket /New York: 18417, p. 343).
40. Rev. John F. Schermerhorn, a Dutch Presbyterian minister, had negotiated the Cherokee treaties and a number of other removal agreements with the Indians. Featherstonehaugh, who was present in the Cherokee nation at the time of negotiations, referred to Schermerhorn as a "sort of loose Dutch Presbyterian Minister" who had taken up the "calling of a political demagogue" and had been "rewarded with this situation by the President, Mr. Van Buren, a Dutchman also by birth." (Featherstonehaugh, A Canoe Voyage, pp. 240, 241). John Howard Payne was a classmate of Schermerhorn and renewed this acquaintance at the Cherokee treaty sessions. Payne contended that Schermerhorn was willing to use bribery and other such devices in order to get treaties signed with the Indians (Battey, Rome and Floyd County, pp. 56, 57; Clemens de Baillou /ed. 7, John Howard Payne to His Countrymen /Athens, Georgia: 1961, pp. 15, 17). In accepting the post as commissioner, Schermerhorn had informed the Secretary of War that he had thought for some time that the only hope for the Indians was to place them in the West beyond the influences of the white population. He assured the government that it would afford him the "highest gratification" to be instrumental "in the least degree to carry into effect the benign and philanthropic views of the government with regard to the civilization and the moral and religious improvement of the Indians." He looked forward to the day when the Indians would enjoy the "rights and privileges of American citizens, and finally to be incorporated as a state in our federal union" (Indian Removal, III, 506, 507).


42. Foreman, Last Trek, pp. 330-338.

43. Proceedings of an Indian Council Held at Buffalo Creek Reservation, April, 1842 (Baltimore: 1842); The Case of the Senecas Indians in the State of New York (Philadelphia: 1840).

44. Schermerhorn was the government commissioner and he credited the success to the missionaries (Foreman, Last Trek, p. 330; Hanson, The Prince, Appendix L, pp. 471, 472).


Notes

Chapter X

1. Cotterill, Southern Indians, p. 231; Supra, pp. 155-162.

2. William W. Sweet, Religion on the American Frontier, I, 33; Theodore Roosevelt, Winning of the West (New York: 1900), II, 101; Colin B. Goodykoontz, Home Missions on the American Frontier (1939), p. 185. Smith speaks of the discovery of gold in Habersham County and later on the Chestatee River, one mile from Dahlonega, Georgia. He wrote: "Immediately numbers flocked to these mines. There was the wild gambler, the wealthy speculator, the shrewd land-trader, and, now and then, some sober settler who sought a home in one of the charming valleys among the mountains, as well as the gold hunter who had come to mine. The missionary was sent with these adventurers." He spoke of the new villages springing up; "Here crime held daily carnival. Gambling, cock-fighting, drunkenness, debauchery of all kinds, did not condescend to seek a cover" (Smith, History of Georgia Methodism, p. 215).
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