THE INDIAN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE SOUTHWESTERN FRONTIER, 1830 - 1845

By

Joseph Abner Hill

A. B. (University of Texas) 1902

THESIS

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

History

in the

GRADUATE DIVISION

of the

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

May , 1916

Approved Herbert E. Bolton
Instructor in Charge

F J Teggart

Deposited in the University Library May 13, 1916.
Date

J C Rowell
Librarian

THE INDIAN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE SOUTHWESTERN FRONTIER, 1830 - 1845.

Table of Contents

* * * * * *

or all other causes.[1] When the Spanish expedition, which was sent out from Mexico in 1689 in search of the French colony, was received by the Hasinai tribes with unexpected hospitality, Spain felt a new impulse to missionary activity in Texas and immediately adjusted her administrative machinery to thie end.[2] Colonists were sent out, missions set up, and officers appointed. But the Indians were not as anxious to be converted and civilized as the Spaniards had hoped and hence these first efforts of Spain in this region resulted, for the most past, in failure.[3] In 1714, when the French, through St.Denis, sought to open trade between Louisiana and northeastern Mexico, again the Indian had to be considered and consulted;[4] and, when the Spaniards sought to counteract the influence of the French in this region, they resorted to the establishment of missions and posts and to the

---

[1] Bolton, Athanase de Mézières and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1768-1780, I, 29; Clark, The Beginnings of Texas, 20-21; Garrison, Texas, 23-24; Yoakum, History of Texas, I, chaps. I-III.

[2] Clark, The Beginning of Texas, chaps. I and II; Bolton, The Spanish Occupation of Texas, 1519-1690; Yoakum, History of Texas, I, chaps. IV, V.

[3] Garrison, Texas, p. 30; Clark, The Beginnings of Texas, pp. 25-26.

[4] Garrison, Texas, pp. 38-47; Yoakum, History of Texas, I, chap.VI.

courting of favor with the savages.[1] Indeed, from this period may be dated the successful beginning of the system of mission building in Texas.[2] It is hardly necessary to state that it was the everlasting presence of the Indian in Texas that gave character to all the Spanish institutions and activities there for more than a century.[3] The international rivalry on this border between France and Spain from 1714-1762 was in large measure a matter of controlling the natives ~~in this region~~.[4] Moreover, it is well known that down to 1762 the French enjoyed a lucrative trade with the Texas Indians and greatly promoted their commercial and national designs through the friendship of the so-called northern nations.[5] After the downfall of French power in America at the conclusion of the Seven Years' War, the gradual movement of the British southward from Canada and westward from the Atlantic slope drove the Indian against the weaker defences of the Spanish in the Southwest and compelled Spain to adopt a more vigorous

---

[1] Bolton, Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century, introduction; Clark, The Beginnings of Texas, pp. 68-70.

[2] Bolton, Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century, chap. I.

[3] Ibid., 1-133; Yoakum, History of Texas, chaps. VII-XVII; Garrison, Texas, chaps. VI-X.

[4] Bolton, Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century, 1-10.

[5] Gayarre, History of Louisiana, I, 442-527; Bolton, DeMézières Historical Introduction.

frontier policy in Texas in the second half of the eighteenth century.[1] As a part of this policy and for the additional purpose of forestalling a probable English advance into Spanish territory, Spain now sought the friendship of the Indians of the Red River district who had formerly been under the thumb of the French.[2] Though availing herself of French traders and administrators for this purpose, her policy cannot be said to have been entirely successful, for she was neither able to win and hold the friendship of the Indian nor to keep out the avaricious Anglo-American.[3]

Toward the close of the eighteenth century emigrants and traders from the far east began to make their way into the province of Texas and to seek profitable relations with the Indians. Such were William Warden, John Cross, John Hamilton, and others of their kind.[4] These adventurers naturally raised international questions in which the Indian was no inconsiderable factor. His importance in problems of this kind is illustrated in the dramatic close in 1800 of Philip Nolan's career of fifteen years as a trader in this region.[5] This importance was greatly increased when, in 1803, the United States, through the purchase of Louisiana,

---

[1] Bolton, Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century, 102-133.

[2] Bolton, DeMézières, I, 71-75.

[3] Ibid., I, 109-110.

[4] Ibid., I, 77,et seq.

[5] Yoakum, I, 111-116.

moved her western boundary line into the heart of the country of the southwestern Indian and stood face to face with the Spaniard along a border of several hundred miles. The constant reduction of the territory in which the savage felt most free, the continual driving of the eastern and more civilized tribes into the region already occupied by their wilder brethern, and the increasing frequency with which the Anglo-Americans penetrated the Indian country, were not calculated to pacify the Indian; nor, from an international standpoint, to render his control either less difficult or less necessary. The vital character of the problem which now arose on this new Hispano-Anglo-American border by reason of the presence of the Indian there, is well illustrated in the Pike expedition up the Red and Arkansas rivers to treat with the Comanche in 1806,[1] in the Magee plot for the establishment of an independent republic in the province of Texas in 1812-13,[2] in Long's expedition into Texas in 1819,[3] and in the Lafitte episode of the same era.[4] The Indian was the most important disturbing factor in the settlement of Texas by Anglo-Americans, whether viewed from the standpoint of the purposes and policies of the Mexican government,[5] or from that of the colonists

---

[1] Coues, The Expedition of Zebulon Montgomery Pike, II, chaps. I-III; Yoakum, I, 134-135.

[2] Yoakum, I, 162 et seq.

[3] Ibid., 200-202.

[4] Ibid., chap. XV

[5] Folsom, Mexico in 1842. To which is added, an Account of Texas, p. 155; Kennedy, Texas, I, 342.

In 1820 Arkansas had a total population of 14,273, of which 88.13% were white. In 1830 the number had risen to 30,388; in 1840, to 97,574; in 1850, to 209,897, the per cent of the whites gradually decreasing to 77.27% of the total.[1]

In Louisiana the total population in 1810 was 76,556, of which 44.82% were white. By 1830, 215,739; in 1840, 352,411; and in 1850, 517,762 when the proportion of whites to the whole was 49.35%.[2]

The figures for Texas during the same period are much less ~~accurate~~ exact, for no enumeration was made until the state census of 1847, and the United States made none until 1850. For years prior to these dates, therefore, we are compelled to rely upon estimates, some of which seem to have been warped by preconceived prejudices or infatuations. Mrs. Mary S. Helm, who moved to Texas in 1829, gives the population as "counted in 1828", including "negroes, friendly Indians and all", as 10,000.[3] Olmsted who travelled in Texas in the '50s, states that the American population in 1830 was 20,000, and in 1834, 30,000.[4] Almonte, the Mexican Commissioner to Texas in 1834, estimated that there were 21,000 "civilized inhabitants" in the province at that time, 5,000 of whom were Mexicans.[5] Woodsman, who wrote a "Guide to

---

[1] Seventh Census of the United States: 1850. Progress of the United States Statistics, 1790-1850, p. 584.

[2] Ibid., p. 475.

[3] Scraps from Texas History, 1828-1843, p.5.

[4] Olmsted, Texas Journey, p. 473.

[5] Texas Almanac, 1859, p. 110.

Texas Emigrants" in 1835, stated that Texas was then "estimated to have a population of 30,000 Anglo-Americans."[1] Morfit, who was sent to Texas in 1836 by President Jackson, reported that "The population within that territory is said to have been 70,000; but from all that I can learn, it should be estimated at about 50,000, or less. ..... Of these there are perhaps 30,000 Anglo-American settlers ..."[2] In the same year D.B. Edwards, a school-master, estimated the American population at 35,000.[3] In 1840, according to Stiff, Texas was thought to have"upwards of 140,000 inhabitants, exclusive of Indians".[4] In the same year, one who signed himself "An Emigrant", said that the population of Texas was variously estimated from 150,000 to 200,000.[5] Kennedy, a British official in Texas, fixed the Angb- American population in 1841 at 200,000,[6] while Folsom the nest year stated that the population was variously estimated from 100,000 to 300,000 and that the Anglo-American population had more than quadrupled since the Texas Revolution.[7] But

---

[1] Woodman, Guide to Texas Emigrants, p. 174

[2] Morfit to Forsyth, August 27, 1836, Sen Docs., 24th Cong., 2d Sess., I, no.20,12-15. Serial 297.

[3] History of Texas, p. 270

[4] Stiff, The Texan Emigrant, p. 9.

[5] Texas in 1840, p. 226.

[6] Kennedy, Texas, II, p. 390.

[7] Folsom, Mexico in 1842: to which is added an account of Texas and Yucatan; and of the Santa Fe Expedition, p. 199.

Maillard, an English barrister with a big spleen, who so-journed in Texas for a brief time, gave the following analysis of the population in 1842: Anglo-Americans, 54,088; Indians 80,000; Negroes, 10,000 to 12,000 - a total of 146,088.[1] The state census of 1847 gave a total white and negro population of 143,205[2] and the United States census for 1850 gave Texas a total population of 212,592, of which 72.46% were white.[3]

In all this variety of estimates and census reports on Texas some things are nevertheless clear. The Anglo-American movement into Texas began to gather strength and energy in the decade between 1820 and 1830. It grew rapidly during the next two decade and doubtless most rapidly from 1836 to 1840.

From the statistics above given for the whole southwestern region, as it was then known, a number of significant conclusions may be safely reached. First, the Anglo-American population moved very rapidly into the southwest during the first half of the nineteenth century - a fact which naturally cut across the gra with both the Indian and the Spaniard. Second, this tide of emigration became a flood in the period from 1830 to 1850. Third, the southern end of this movement swung farther to the west and occupied the territory of a foreign power. Fourth, a fact never

---

[1] Maillard, History of Texas, p. 202.

[2] Olmsted, p. 472.

[3] Progress of the United States Statistics, 1790-1850, Census of 1850, p. 506.

to be forgotten in this study, this frontier, though astride an international boundary line, was in all other respects a unit from the Gulf of Mexico northward. Fifth, and finally, it may be said that the facts exhibited in these statistics foreordained an Indian problem on this frontier that would not suffer in comparison with that already existing on the east side of the Mississippi.

The Removal of the Indians to the Southwest

There was yet one other very important factor in the making of the problem. This was the policy of Indian removal which comtemplated the permanent separation of the Indians from the whites[1] and which had gradually taken shape during the first quarter of the nineteenth century.[2]

In 1830 the movement was definitely and vigorously begun when Congress passed an "act to provide for an exchange of lands with the Indians residing within any of the States or Territories, and for their removal west of the Mississippi."[3] As soon thereafter as the machinery could be put in motion, the removal process was systematically carried out. Year by year large numbers were conducted to their new homes beyond the Arkansas and Missouri

---

[1] Monroe to Congress, March 30, 1824, in Richardson Messages and Papers of the Presidents, II, 235-236; Jackson to Congress, December 8, 1829; Ibid., 456-459.

[2] Jackson to Congress, December 5, 1837, in House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, 19. Serial 321.

[3] Sen.Docs., 22d Cong., 1st sess., II, no.90, Serial 213; Dunlap, Laws of the United States, 1789-1856, pp.782-783. See also Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Dec.1,1835, Sen. Docs., 2d sess., 25th Cong., I,no.16,p.526, Serial 314.

and north of the then Mexican province of Texas. It is not necessary for the purposes of this study to give the details for the various years, but enough will be given to show the progress of the movement.

On February 19, 1836 the secretary of War reported to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs that there had been removed to the southwest from the country east of the Mississippi 31,348 Indians.[1] On December 1, 1837, the same officer reported that 51,327 Indians had been removed. In his annual message to Congress December 5, 1840, President VanBuren said that more than forty thousand had been removed to their new homes west of the Mississippi since the spring of 1837.[2] On November 24, 1841, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reported that 87,615 Indians had been transferred to the west and that only 623 had been removed since the report of the previous year.[3] On September 26, 1842 the Secretary of War said: "The policy of removing the Indians from their native homes to make room for the white man, and of collecting them in large bodies on our Western frontier, is not now debatable. It has been long settled, and it may now be considered as having been executed. There is no more land east of the

---

[1] Report of Secretary of War, February 19, 1836, Reports of Committees, 24th Cong., 1st sess., no 401. Serial 294.

[2] House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no. 3, p.641. Serial 331.

[3] Sen. Docs., 26th Cong., 2d sess., I, no. 1, p. 15. Serial 375

[4] Sen. Docs., 27th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.1, p.269. Serial 395.

Mississippi, remaining unceded, to be desired by us. ....."

It appears that 88,134 have been removed to the regions west of the Mississippi; and that, of the once numerous tribes east of that river, less than 28,000 souls remain."[1] As a matter of fact removal had been practically completed by 1839,[2] and to all intents and purposes the policy was now abandoned.

The number thus removed consisted of seventeen different tribes, arranged according to their numerical strength as follows: Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, Chippewas, Ottowas and Pattawatomies, Chickasaws, Winnebagoes, Florida Indians (Seminoles), Shawnees, Delawares, Kickapoos, Ottawas of Maumee, Senacas of Sandusky, Weas, Senecas and Shawnees, Stockbridges and Munsees, Piankeskaws, Peorias and Kaskaskias, and Swan Creek. A few of these never reached the Southwest, but nevertheless contributed their share to the disturbances on the new frontier.[3]

The exact locations of these tribes in their new homes would be difficult to determine, for, although in most cases the territory for each was fixed by treaty, scarcely one of them went directly to the place agreed upon, and remained there without interruption. Moreover, in some cases territorial assignments were changed for one reason or another and in a few cases mistakes

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 27th Cong., 3d sess., no.2,p.188, Serial 41

[2] Textor, Official Relations between the United States and the Sioux Indians, in Leland Stanford Junior University Publicatio History and Economics, no.2, p.24.

[3] House Ex.Docs., 27th Cong., 3d sess., I, no.2, p.385. Serial 418.

were made by the surveyors. However, it is possible to give approximate locations for the most of them, and especially for the larger tribes.

Without attempting, then, to be absolutely specific we may say that the Choctaws occupied the region directly west of South Arkansas, immediately north of Red River and south of the Canadian. The Seminoles settled between the north fork of the Canadian and the main stream. The Creeks were given the territory north of the Canadian and the red fork of the Arkansas, immediately west of Fort Gibson. The Cherokees were placed on both sides of the Arkansas, west of southwest Missouri and northwest Arkansas North of these along the Little Arkansas, the Little Neosho, the Arkansas, and the upper waters of the Verdigris were the Osages, an indigenous tribe who were now given fixed limits. At the southwest corner of Missouri on the east bank of Neosho were located the Ouapaws, Senacas and Shawnees, and Senecas. North of the upper waters of the Neosho and south of the Osage rivers were the Ottawas, Peorias and Kaskaskias, and Pienkeshaws and Weas. Between them and the Kansas River were the Shawnees. Across this river to the north and northwest on both sides of the Republican fork were the Kansas and Delawares. Just above the junction of the Kansas and the Missouri and on the west side of the latter stream were the Kickapoos. The Chickasaws settled in the Choctaw territory next to the Texas boundary and the Otta-

was were on both sides of the lower Platte.[1]

We have already seen something of the importance of the Indian of the Southwest, but there was also an Indian of the Northwest who was even more powerful and whose interests were disturbed by the new situation which was developing. It is not necessary to discuss at length his history. Suffice it to say that for long years he had been in more or less friendly relation with the British to the north whose interests conflicted with the westward advance of the Anglo-American.[2]

Speaking of all these wild tribes of the then far West, J. R. Poinsett, Secretary of War, addressed a letter, December 30, 1837, to the Speaker of the House of Rrpresentatives stating that there were "within striking distance of the frontier," twenty-eight indigenous tribes of Indians.[3] Of these the most numerous were the Blackfeet, the Pagans, the Sioux, the Apaches,

---

[1] For the locations of these tribes in 1837 see Letters from the Secretary of War, December 30, 1837 transmitting various reports in relation to the Protection of the Western Frontier, in Exec. Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., II, no. 2, 59, map facing p.18 (Serial 322), upon which this statement is based.

[2] Report of the Sub-agent on the Upper Missouri River, Dec.1, 1831, House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, p. 595. Serial 321.

[3] Ex. Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., II, no. 2, 59, 18 (Serial 322).

the Comanches, the Eutaws, the Pawnees, and the Assinaboins. The estimated total of these so-called wild tribes was 231,806. In November 1842 the Commissioner of Indian Affairs estimated that there were 228,632 "indians indigenous to the country west of the Mississippi river."[1]

Supposing that these estimates, with which various officials at different times substantially agreed, were approximately correc there were in 1839, when the removal had been practically completed, west of the Mississippi and east of the Rocky Mountains, more than three hundred and fifty thousand Indians. Considering that the Anglo-American frontier extended to the Gulf of Mexico we should add to this number the Indians of Texas which were variously estimated at from thirty thousand to eighty thousand.[2]

This would bring the total of Indian population which faced the Anglo-American frontier and which sat, as it were, astride an international boundary line, up to nearly four hundred thousand. We venture to suggest that this situation furnished the key to most of the problems in that region from 1830 to 1845.

---

[1] Sen. Docs., 27th Cong., 2d sess., I, no. 1, 269 (Serial 395).

[2] Kennedy, who, by reason of his seeming admiration for Texas, may have underestimated the number says that "The whole Indian population of Texas, when Austin's colony was planted, may be estimated at 30,000 souls, ..." (Kennedy, Texas, I, 351). However, most of those who were in a position to form fair opinions and who have left estimates, substantially agree with him. An exception to this is the case of Maillard, who fixed the number at 80,000 in 1842, but allowance must be made here for his uncompromising hostility to Texas. (Maillard, History of the Republic of Texas, p. 233).

Chapter II.

THE EFFECT OF REMOVAL UPON THE INDIAN

His Unwillingness to Remove

Whatever the motive that inspired the policy of removal,[1] the immediate effect upon the Indian himself was all but disastrous. He came to the west angry or disheartened, sick unto death in many cases, indigent, and hungry. He suffered from the feeling of impermanence, became the victim of unscruplous liquor vendors, and was preyed upon by the wild tribes. With these various effects this chapter is concerned.

Fisrt of all, most of those who came west did so contrary to their wishes. It is manifestly impossible in this connection to tell the story of opposition in each case, but a few typical examples will suffice to show the ugly mood in which most of the Indians reached their new homes.

In 1819 the government of the United States sought to induce the Choctaws to remove to the west.[2] To this end General Andrew

---

[1] For the most scholarly treatment of this subject see Annie H.Abel, The History of Events resulting in Indian Consolidation west of the Mississippi, in Annual Reports of the American Historical Association, 1906. Important light is also thrown upon it by U. B. Phillips, Georgia and States Rights, in Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1901, vol.2. Also Lucy E. Textor, Official Relations between the United States and the Sioux Indians, in Leland Stanford Junior University Publications, History and Economics, vol. 2, 1896.

[2] American State Papers, Indian Affairs, II, 229.

Jackson held out to them an argument that was characteristically direct, viz: removal, or the certain extinction of the tribe at the hands of their white neighbors. Replying to this, the chief spoke as follows: "We are sorry we cannot comply with our father's request; a man cannot make up his mind at once to suit every object; but we have made up ours to remain where we have always lived. .....

"We wish to remain here, where we have grown up as the herbs of the woods; and do not wish to be transplanted to another soil. Those of our people who are over the Mississippi did not go there with the consent of the nation; ..... I am well acquainted with the country contemplated for us. I have often had my feet sorely bruised there by the roughness of its surface.

"..... If a man should give one-half of his garment, the remainder would be of little use; and take two fingers from the hand, the remainder would be of little use. .... We hope our father will not be displeased; ..... When a child wakes in the night, he feels for the arm of his father to shield him from danger."[1] In spite of this protest, however, and by virtue of a distribution of several thousand dollars among some twenty chiefs and headmen, and by pressure of other kinds a treaty was eventually concluded and submitted by President Monroe to the Senate for ratification December 14, 1820.[2]

---

[1] American State Papers, Indian Affairs, II, 230.

[2] Ibid., 223-245.

A few of the Choctaws migrated as per treaty, but on November 14, 1826 their chiefs and warriors declared that "Your talks. . . . . stating the terms upon which it is proposed that we shall cede away all our lands east of the Mississippi, have been fully interpreted and explained to the chiefs, ..., and it now becomes our duty to give their decision; whish,is, that they cannot accede to your propositions. Regarding the welfare of their wives and children, and that of those of the Choctaw nation who are absent from this council, they have determined not to part with their country. This determination is made with great unanimity on the part of those here present, and we are satisfied we speak the sentiments of nine-tenths of the nation."[1] Two days later, after the government of the United States had varied its proposition, the chiefs declared that "we are compelled to give this decided negative."[2]

In 1824 commissioners from the United States proposed to the Creeks an exchange of lands in the west for their lands east of the Mississippi. The Indian reply, in part, was: "That ruin is almost the inevitable consequence of a removal beyond the Mississippi, we are convinced. It is true, very true, that we are surrounded by white people; and that there are encroachments made. What assurances have we that similar ones will not be made on us,

---

[1] American State Papers, Indian Affairs, II, 713.

[2] Ibid., 715.

should we deem it proper to accept your offer and remove beyond the Mississippi?"

The government of the United States was not discouraged by this answer. Division arose within the tribe over the question of removal and in April 1825 in an address "To the members of the Legislature of Georgia" a part of the chiefs and headmen held the following language: "Brothers and friends: We have to part with you. You are shortly to be possessors of our lands and our homes; homes dear to us, because we were raised and nourished at them: our habitations are simple and plain, but they afford us shelter from the rain and the storm; our fare is plain and wholesome; and affords to us support and health; our people are thinly clad, but our huts shelter them from the cold; we have enjoyed, in a considerable degree, many of the comforts of life, ... , and to a much greater extent than a people like us can again shortly expect when we are removed to the wilderness of the west," etc.[1]

A few days after this Governor Troup of Georgia wrote as follows to the President of the United States concerning the death of the Creek chief, McIntosh: "On the night of the 29th ultimo, whilst reposing in his bed, the savages hostile to the treaty, in great numbers, beset and fired his house; and this chieftain, whose virtues would have honored any country, perished by the flames or tomahawk. ..... . When, ... , he had given his

---

[1] American State Papers, Indian Affairs, II, p. 760.

consent and was on the eve of departure to explore the new home, ... , he met the stroke of the assassin, and the bravest of his race fell by the hands of the most treacherous and cowardly."[1]

When the United States sent commissioners to treat with the Chickasaws in 1826 they found that tribe rather stubborn. The chief said: "We have no lands to exchange for any other. ..... Friends and bothers: we know that our white brothers are crowding upon us daily, which we know is not just. We further consider that there are a number of nations west of the Mississippi that have been enemies to us as well as to our white brothers. It would be as much impossible to unite us with them as it would be to unite oil and water, and we have every reason to believe that those tribes that have left their country are not well satisfied; and, if that should be the case, we are fearful that those tribes will take satisfaction of us for injuries done by us as well as out white neighbors."[2] The commissioners replied that they were disappointed at this attitude on the part of the red brothers and used further argument and diplomacy, to which the Chickasaws responded: "The object of the General Government we cannot understand. It appears from what you say, that all the objections which we, his red children, can make,

---

[1] American State Papers, Indian Affairs, II, 767.

[2] Ibid., 720.

will have no weight with the policy of the General Government. You say, 'Are you willing to sit down in delusive secutiry and see your nation dwindle away until the name of Chickasaw is forever lost?' No, we are not; but if it be the will of the Great Spirit that we should lose our name and language, we must submit."[1]

In the case of the Cherokees their removal to the west had been voluntarily begun before the close of the eighteenth century,[2] and had been carried on with some regularity ever since that time. But there were those of this tribe, who preferred to remain "near the bones of their fathers." With a portion of these a treaty of cession and removal was made in 1817 though not without some "pulling back."[3]

The eastern branch of this tribe in General Council, October 27, 1823, replying to Commissioners from the United States on the subject of removal, said: "Our title had emanated from a Supreme source, which cannot be impaired by the mere circumstance of discovery by foreigners; neither had this title been impaired by conquest or treaty. If it was intended that our original title should be forever lost, why did not the treaties of peace declare it in plain terms; and why should the United States pur-

---

[1] American State Papers, Indian Affairs, II, 720-722.

[2] Winkler, The Cherokee Indians in Texas, in the Texas State Historical Association Quarterly, vol.VII, no.2, p. 95.

[3] American State Papers, Indian Affairs, II, pp.486-504.

chase, time after time, by treaties, lands to which you would wish to convince us we have no title? . . . . You have been told in positive terms, that one foot more of land cannot be sold. .. .. We now consider this a final close of our negotiation," etc. The United States did not so consider it, and J. C. Calhoun, Secretary of War, painted for them a very dark picture of what their lot would be if they refused to cede their lands and migrate. On the other side of the canvas he sketched a rich alternative, all fringed with gold. The reply to this was: "An extent of territory twice as large, west of the Mississippi, as the one now occupied by the Cherokees east of that river, or all of the money now in the coffers of your treasury, would be no inducement for the nation to exchange or to sell their country."[1] There arose discensions among this tribe, as among others, fomented in large part by circumstances connected with the removal policy.[2] The story is a long one and need not be followed in this connection. It is sufficient to notice here that the breach was long in healing and gave rise to terrible atrocities among the Cherokees in the west in the late thirties and caused the white frontier as well as the government of the Umited States much anxiety, no little expense, and some real suffering.[3]

---

[1] American State Papers, Indian Affairs, II, 474.

[2] Abel, Indian Consolidation west of the Mississippi, in Annual Report of American Historical Association, 1906, p. 403.

[3] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1 sess., I, no. 2, 335-340, 417-427. Serial 363.

Considering that these treaties and others of the kind were not carried into effect except in piecemeal, that the body of these Indians was not removed until 1839, and that between twenty and thirty thousand remained east of the Mississippi,[1] it may be well understood that removal cut across the grain and left the Indians in many cases, in ill humor toward the government of the United States and the constantly encroaching white settlers.

Sickness and Death Incident to Removal

In no way diminishing this ugly feeling were some of the physical conditions attending the process of removal. Changes in diet, in water, in climate, and in the general mode of living produced illness and death. A few illustrations will make plain some of these conditions.

On August 22, 1837 the New Orleans True American stated with reference to a body of Creeks encamping at Pass Christian that "Upwards of six hundred Indians arrived at the Pass on Saturday morning, many of them very sick of dysentery, some of whom had died, among the rest, several of the principal men," etc.[2] The commissioner of Indians Affairs, in his report of November 25, 1839, said: "In September, 1838, the chiefs and headmen of the Chickasaws, representing that sickness had prevailed among them,

---

[1] Sen. Docs., 27th Cong., 2 sess., I, no.1, 269(Serial 395).

[2] Niles National Register, Liii, p. 32.

and occasioned many deaths, and that crops had not, from drought and the late arrival of many of their people, been made by them, applied to be furnished with seven months' additional rations."[1] In the same report we find the Acting Superintendent of the Western Territory asserting that "The Creek country had been considered un healthy; the summer after the late emigrants arrived there were many sick, numbers died. The Creeks were very much disheartened; indeed, I have no doubt, if the next year had proved so unhealthy, that a large portion of the late emigrants would have gone to Texas, where they had a strong inclination to go when they left their old country."[2]

In 1837 the Sueprintendent reported concerning the Choctaws: "Some parts (of their tract) are finely watered, while in others it is so scarce that the inhabitants are compelled to use the water of creeks and branches, which becomes nearly dried up or stagnant during the summer, causing fatal sickness among them." I would most respectfully suggest, that the government could render these unfortunate people some medical aid, either from the forts, or from any other quarter, and by funishing medicines, etc. It would be an act of humanity, and go further to convince them of its humane and philanthropic intention, than all the funds expended in endeavoring to educate them. While thousands are lav-

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1 sess., no. 2, p. 334, Serial 363.

[2] Ibid., p. 471.

ished to teach them to live, and love our modes of living, they are suffered to be swept off by hundreds in a settlement, without the hand of charity or of humanity being extended towards their preservation.."[1] Of this same tribe, Farnham, who travelled through the Indian country in 1839, said: "They have suffered much from sickness incident to settlers in a new country."[2] The same writer, in speaking of the Creeks said: "Their country is fertile, and exhibits a healthy appearance; but of the later Creek emigrants who reached Arkansas in the winter and spring of 1837, about two hundred died on the road; and before the 1st of October succeeding the arrival, about three thousand five hundred more fell victims to bilious fever. In the same year three hundred of the earlier emigrants died.[3]

The same authority said of the Seminoles that "In the spring of 1836, about four hundred of them emigrated from the east, and settled on the north fork of the Canadian River. In October, 1837, they were reduced by sickness nearly one-half. During these awful times of mortality among them, some of the dead were deposited in the hollows of the standing and fallen trees, and others, for want of these, were placed in a temporary enclosure of boards, on the open plains. Guns and other articles of property

---

[1] House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, 581. Serial 321.

[2] Farnham, Travels, in Thwaites, Early Western Travels, vol.28, chap. III, p. 122.

[3] Ibid., 128.

were often buried with the dead, according to ancient customs and so great is said to have been the terror of the time, that having abandoned themselves awhile to their wailings around the burial places of their friends, they fled to the western deserts till the pestilence subsided. Of the two thousand and twenty-three emigrants who had reached their new homes prior to October, 1832 not more than one thousand six hundred remained alive."[1]

The Cherokees, who, by reason of their reputed civilization, might have been expected to endure the journey with little loss, suffered experiences similar to those of the other tribes. The Little Rock Times of February 4, 1839, said: "On Saturday last 228 emigrating Cherokees arrived at this place, on the steamer Victoria, ... , on their way west. These are the last of the Cherokee emigrants. ..... nine deaths have occurred since the commencement of their journey ..... . In the company is the celebrated chief, John Ross, who buried his wife in this city on Sunday."[2]

The report of the Acting Superintendent of the Western Territory, October 1, 1840 said of this tribe that they had had many difficulties to contend with since coming west; that the dissensions among them had caused a neglect of their crops, which in turn had produced an insufficiency of food and "sickness usual

---

[1] Farnham, Travels, in Thwaites, Early Western Travels, vol.28, chap. III, p. 130.

[2] Niles, LVI, p. 48.

to all inacclimated persons."[1] The result had been a diminution of the Cherokee population.

Government agents were very cautious in their reports. It must have been so in this case. Thomas Valentine Parker, who has written a charming little monograph on The Cherokee Indians, speaks of the effect of removal upon this tribe as follows: "Much distress resulted from the herding of the Indians in tents, separation of families, sickness, and the many hardships and dangers inevitable in such an undertaking. So severe was the suffering that General Scott, from motives of humanity, decided to suspend further work of removal until autumn. ..... With the coming of the fall, the process of removal was continued ..... and completed. It took several months to complete the removal; the distance was about seven hundred miles, and about four thousand died on the way."[2]

Indigence and Hunger Incident to Removal

It was the policy of the United States government in removing the Indians to provide subsistence during the journey and generally for a year thereafter. But in some cases that subsistence proved inadequate, game was growing scarce in the west, neither the country nor the Indian were as yet dependable in the matter of agriculture, and the result was destitution and its

---

[1] Parker, The Cherokee Indians, pp. 48-49.

[2] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.2, p.312. Serial 382.

attendant hardships. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs on November 25, 1839 reported that he had drawn from the treasury, under an act of July 7, 1838, eighty-five thousand dollars "for affording temporary subsistence to those Indians, whose indigence, traceable to their emigration, required it;" and that most of this had been spent in the Western Territory.[1]

In the report of the Acting Superintendent of the Western Territory under the same date we find this language about the subsistence of the Seminoles: "Those whose time had expired and are destitute, have had additionsal provisions furnished. They still show their bad feeling, notwithstanding they have been treated with so much forbearance."[2]

The Missouri Republican of November 1, 1837 said: "We learn from a gentleman direct from the upper Missouri countries, some further particulars in relation to the apprehended difficulties with the Osage Indians on our border. These Indians are settled on a tract of land which adjoins our western state line, and lately have moved down upon the line. They are represented to be in a very destitute and starving condition, and on several occasions, have killed the cows and hogs of the settlers to assuage their hunger. It is alleged, that they have crossed the line. From these allegations, orders have been issued to

---

[1] House Ex.Doc., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.2, p. 334. Serial 363.

[2] Ibid., p. 472.

drive them from the state line, and our informant says, that on Wednesday last, the troops under the command of Major-general Lucas and Brigadier-general Almond, from Jackson and Saline counties, were to set out for the section where the Indians are encamped... It was the purpose of general Lucas to induce the Indians to remove peacably, if he could, but forcibly if necessary.[1]

One of the most aggravated cases of this kind is related in the St.Louis Argus of July 23, 1841. It follows: "Large numbers of Indians, negroes, and mongrels, from Florida have been placed upon the borders of Arkansas and Missouri. By a gentleman direct from Leavenworth, we learn that some 600 negroes from Florida, and runaways from the Choctaws and Cherckees, and from the whites, united with a few Indians, and perhaps a few white men have been gradually associated in the fastnesses west of Arkansas. Not long since they marched up Red River and camped for the purpose of hunting buffalo. They built a very tolerable fort: with logs, surmounted with a ditch, to protect themselves against all dangers! They caught but few buffalo, and therefore to supply their wants, invaded the possessions of the Choctaws and carried off cattle, poultry, grain, etc. The Choctaws followed,but finding their numbers and fortifications an overmatch, they retired and sent to Fort Gibson for the United States

---

[1] Niles' National Register, Liii, 161

dragoons. Captain Moore of Company D was sent to capture them with three companies of dragoons, but after arriving upon Red River, he found their entrenchments too strong, and their numbers too great to venture an attack. He accordingly sent to Fort Towson and was reinforced with a fine company of infantry and a couple of pieces of cannon.

"The cannon were shortly brought to bear upon the works and soon made the splinters fly and the logs move so queerly, that the refugees, at a signal rushed outside of their fortifications and began to form upon the front of their works. ..... . The carnage that ensued is represented as terrific. - the dragoons routed them in all directions, and, after putting large numbers to the sword, succeeded in capturing the whole body! .....

"This decisive blow will give security to that exposed portion of our frontier and convince the refugee negroes and Indians that our dragoons may not be trifled with ....."[1]

In another connection we have noticed the lack of provisions as one of the causes of sickness among the Chickasaws (pp.23-24). A similar condition seems to have existed at one time, at least, among the Cherokees. On November 28, 1840 the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reported that "Repeated representations were made to the department that a number of Cherokees, from a variety of causes, were in despenate circumstances as to

---

[1] Niles' National Register, LX, p. 360.

the supply of their provision-wants; and entreating that they might be relieved out of their fund. ..... A small party had been to Texas, either with a view to a permanent settlement in that republic, or for some purpose of exploration, desired that they might also be subsisted; but this it was not thought desirable to grant, although a small sum, in view of their exigent circumstances, was expended by General Arbuckle for them, before he was informed of the determination of the department."[1] The Osages "suffered very much for provisions until the government has had them temporarily supplied"[2]; while the united bands of Chippewas, Ottawas, and Pottawattomies, according to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs who describes the circumstances of their removal, had "For five years and more" ... been literally eating to-day without knowing where to morrow's supplies were; uncertain of their own movements, with nothing stable for them but the heavens above and the earth below them, they were in that most wretched of all human conditions, in which there is no object or end but to appease hunger, without regard to the how, and to satisfy the animal passions of our nature, without reflection on the consequences, or commiseration for their victim."[3]

---

[1] House Ex.Docs., 26th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.2 p. 234. (Serial 382)

[2] Ibid., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.2, 472 (Serial 363).

[3] Ibid., 26th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.2, 231 (Serial 382).

The Impermanency of the Locations of the Removed Tribes.

Another disconcerting factor was the impermanency of some of the locations, and the inability of the government to keep the individual tribes from scattering. A case in point is that of the Quapaws. They came west in 1834 and, by a mistake of the agent, most of them were placed upon the lands of the Sandusky Senacas, where they remained four or five years. Having established themselves, as they thought permanently, they had erected their cabins and were cultivating considerable ground. They were naturally difficult to persuade to move when the agent's mistake was discovered.[1] Others of the tribe wandered far to the south, some settling among the Choctaws and others in Texas.[2]

The Pottawattomies likewise became scattered in moving. One division of several hundred stopped on the northeast side of the Missouri, "Two hundred and forty miles from the country designated by the government as their permanent residence." Negotiations for their removal met with persistent and successful opposition and they frequently found themselves at war with their neighbors. The other division, some fifteen hundred strong, got no further than the country of the Snakes on the Mississippi."[3]

On the opposite and south side of the Missouri from the

---

[1] House Ex.Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.2, p.474. (Serial 363).

[2] Farnham, Travels, in Thwaites, Early Western Travels, vol.28, p. 133.

[3] Ibid., 133.

former branch of the Pottawattomies and in unfriendly relation with them, were the Ottoes and Missouries. The agent to these Indians negotiated a treaty between them and the Pottawattomies by which the latter tribe came into possession of the hunting grounds of the former. By this same treaty the United States would agree to feed the Ottoes and Missouries for a term of years. In consideration of these terms these Indians forsook their hunting grounds. After some delay the United States Senate rejected the treaty and the Ottoes became greatly dissatisfied. In commenting upon this circumstance the agent said that "it is very hard to make an Indian understand why, when a treaty has been formally made with them by authorized persons and rejected by higher authorities, the treaty stipulations, as they deem them, should not be fulfilled."[1]

Farnham's report in 1839 that "Three or four thousand Choctaws have not yet settled on the lands assigned to them. A part of these are in Texas, between the rivers Brazos and Trinity, 300 in number, who located themselves there in the time of the general emigration; and others in divers places in Texas, who emigrated thither at various times, twenty, thirty, and forty years ago."[2] This statement was substantiated in part by the Choctaw agent in his annual report in the autumn of 1839, who said that scat-

---

[1] House Ex.Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.2, p. 504 (Serial 363).

[2] Farnham, Travels, in Thwaites, Early Western Travels, vol.28, chap. III, p. 122.

tering Choctaws had emigrated to Texas previous to the last treaty and that ineffectual attempts had been made to induce them to join their nation.[1]

Farnham testified of the Shawnees that they, too, were much scattered. "Besides the two bands of the Neasho, ..., there is one on Trinity River in Texas, and others in divers places."[2] Of the Delawares he wrote: "Some of these people remain in the lake country; a few are in Texas; about one hundred reside on the choctaw lands near Arkansas River, one hundred and twenty miles west of the state of Arkansas."[3]

The impermanence of location is also well illustrated in the case of the Seminoles. When a body of this tribe came over in 1838 to be settled in the Creek country, through a misunderstanding of the agent they were allowed to stop on the banks of the Arkansas. Here they desired to remain, but were nevertheless removed the next year and were in consequence under subsistence for two years and did nothing in the meantime toward establishing themselves.[4] Some of this same tribe purposely settled in the Cherokee country. They stirred up trouble at Webber's Falls and, when Colonel Karney went with his dragoons to induce them to

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.2, 470 (Serial 363).

[2] Farnham, Travels, in Thwaites, Early Western Travels, vol.28, p. 136.

[3] Ibid., p. 138.

[4] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., no. 2, p. 334 (Serial 363).

leave for their own country, he was given a flat refusal. He took most of them by force, but a few "broke away, and succeeded in concealing themselve in the woods"- and there remained.[1] Here they continued to give trouble for some time. On November 19, 1842, a Western Paper carried this brief reference to them: "Colonel Taylor has given notice to the Seminoles, who have taken possession of a portion of the Cherokee country, that they must remove by the 1st. inst. Alligator, who is at the head of the band of Seminoles, has avowed his determination to remain where he is. He says there are not United States Soldiers enough in the country to force him off, and he will not leave. It is therefore probable that the war with the Seminoles will be renewed on our western frontier."[2] The Disbursing Agent for the Western Territory reported concerning a band of four hundred of these Indians in the autumn of 1837: "They are about changing their locations; they go farther west; their object is better hunting grounds."[3]

The Chickasaws were given a district within the Choctaw nation and were allowed to settle anywhere they chose among the Choctaws. Accordingly they scattered themselves promiscuously through the settlements of their friends and only enough went to their assigned lands to receive the annuity for the tribe.

---

[1] The VanBuren (Arkansas) Intelligencer of June 17, 1842, in Niles' National Register, LXII, 336.

[2] Niles' National Register, LXII, 183.

[3] House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., vol. I, no. 3, p. 585 (Serial 321).

The result of this was constant depredations by the wild and other predatory tribes.[1]

Even the Cherokees, who were reputed to be good farmers and home lovers, were never quite settled. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs reported on December 1, 1837 that "The Cherokees number about eight thousand, but the number varies in consequence of the arrival of emigrants from east of the Mississippi, and the departure of others to Texas."[2] Moreover, their first home in the west by the treaties of 1817 and 1819 was in Arkansas, whereas their permanent location was west of that state and of Missouri.[3]

The Kickapoos were persistent wanderers and indisposed to work for a living. Farnham reported that "Nearly one half of the tribe are unsettled and scattered, some in Texas, others with the southern tribes, and still others ranging the mountains." In a supplementary note Thwaites says that "about 1833 a large band emigrated to Texas, later to Mexico, and have since been known as Mexican Kickapoo. About half of these were brought back, their descendants now living in Oklahoma, near the Shawnee."[4] Hunting and plunder seemed to have been their habitual

---

[1] Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, p. 311 (Serial 328); House Docs., 25th Cong., 3d sess., I, no.3, 582 (Serial 321).

[2] House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, p. 579 (Serial 321).

[3] House Ex.Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., 3, no. 59, 18 (Serial 333); also, Parker, The Cherokee Indians, chap. III.

[4] Thwaites, Early Western Travels, vol. 28, pp. 140-1.

methods of living.[1]

The Swarm of the Whiskey Venders

Still another very disturbing factor on this far-flung border was the swarm of liquor venders that accompanied the Indians in their removal and infested the western borders of Missouri and Arkansas and the south side of the Red river. The most uniform feature of official reports during the whole period is that which complains of the evil influence of whiskey among the Indians.

The Acting Superintendent of the Western Territory reported in 1837 that "the Cherokees show a great degree of improvement, and are still improving, and bid fair at no distant day to rival their white brethern of the West, in point of wealth, civilization, and moral and intellectual improvement, did there not exist one great hindrance - that of intemperance; not only a vice in itself, but the prolific parent of almost every other vice. There are immense quantities of whiskey in the country, and being introduced daily; and unless the intercourse law is rigidly enforced, the evil of intemperance will spread its wide reign, and its effects will be ruinous to the

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.2, p. 501. Serial 363.

morals of the natives, and dangerous to the peace of the country. The Cherokees, more than any other tribe, are disposed to traffic in ardent spirits; the whole extended frontier of Arkansas and Missouri is settled with venders of this pernicious article; and unless the strong hand of government is interposed by the aid of military, the moral and political condition of these people will be lowered to the most degraded state."[1]

In the same report, we are told that "cunning white men" were distributing whiskey among the Chickasaws to such an extent that it was questionable "whether the removal of the Chichasaws to this nation will prove a valuable accession or not. Many of this tribe had "become addicted to intemperance and all the accompanying vices, making the worst kind of members of society.

Those who have come over are mostly of this character, and it is much to be apprehended that the majority of them are but little better. The evil of intemperance has increased of late throughout the Indian country; and when the Chickasaws are removed, and being removed, it would much behoove the Government to render more efficient aid in keeping whiskey from the Indian country. I therefore most respectfully recommend that two companies at least, of dragoons, be ordered to Fort Towson, as that is a very unguarded point, the south side of Red River being settled by a large number of white men, who follow nothing

---

[1] House Docs., 25th Cong., 2 sess., I, no.3, p.580 (Serial 321).

but vending spirits to the Indians, which they can easily do, being so near their settlement."[1]

At the same time similar conditions prevailed among the Senacas, Senecas and Shawnees, and Quapaws.[2] Indeed, it was just as baneful among the tribes bordering the Western Territory on the north and northeast and was one of the factors in keeping up a disturbance between the tribes of the Western Territory and those of the Council Bluffs agency. The agent for the latter district declared that year "So long as the traders and trappers are permitted in the Indian Country, the introduction of spirituous liquor will be inevitable, under any penalty the law may require; and, until its prohibition is certain and effectual, every effort of Government, through the most faithful and indefatigable agent, will be useless!"[3]

Two years later the agent for the Choctaws reported that this tribe had passed a law "against the introduction of spirituous liquors. This is the great barrier to Indian improvement. Benevolent societies for the amelioration of the Indians, may send their missionaries; individual philanthropy may be extended to them, with all the kind attentions and expenditures of money by the government; spirituous liquor is doing more to retard the Indian in his onward march to civilization than all the other evils

---

[1] House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, p. 582 (Serial 321.

[2] Ibid., p. 583.

[3] Ibid., 587.

combined together. If intemperance has, in any measure abated among our own population, it has certainly extended itself to an increased degree upon our borders with the red people.

"The law of Congress which prohibited the introduction of spirituous liquors or wine into the Indian country is defective. It should be made the duty by enactment of every officer or agent of the Government to seize the spirits, as well as the individual who has it; and also the wagon or vehicle upon which it is carried be confiscated. If these enactments were made and carried out, whiskey would cease to be introduced to the destruction of the people; as it is, the law is but partially attended to. It is a rare occurrence for a barrel of whiskey to be brought into the Choctaw nation, but with Texas on one side and Arkansas on the other, where every facility by whiskey shops on the line is afforded, small quantities are introduced, which has a very demoralizing influence upon the people."[1]

The same agent reported at the same time concerning the Senacas that "their residence is so close to the Mississippi line, where whiskey can be so easily procured, that the Senecas have become much addicted to drinking spirits; the natural consequence is that they are becoming indolent" and that while Missouri had good laws regulating the liquor traffice with the Indians they could not be enforced.[2] Of the Quapaws it was said that they were "inclined to be indolent and to drink spirituous liquors."[3]

---

[1] House Ex.Docs.,26th Cong.,1st sess.,I,no.2,pp.468-469 (Serial 363)

[2] Ibid., p. 473

[3] Ibid., p. 474.

In the same year the agent at Fort Leavenworth reported that "The only hindrance now in the way of the Shawnees, Dalawares and Kickapoos is ardent spirits, which they obtain from some of the white people living near the line; these whiskey traffickers, who seem to be void of all conscience, rob, and murder many of the Indians; I say rob - they will get them drunk. and then take their horses, guns, or blankets off of their backs, regardless of how quick they may freeze to death; I say they murder - if not directly, indirectly; they furnish the weapon - they make them drunk, and when drunk they kill their fellow beings. Some freeze to death when drunk; several drunken Indians have been drowned in the Missouri river this season, aiming to cross when drunk. This, sir, your Indian agents can not prevent. Your officers of the army cannot prevent it under the present laws, and it is not to be expected that those that are now, and have been engaged in this traffic will cease; and if they were, that others, equally dishonorable and dishonest, would not take their place, for wherever you find an Indian whiskey-trader, you will find, in my opinion, a dishonest man - a man that will condescend to the meanest of acts."[1]

In his annual report November 28, 1840 the Commissioner of Indian Affairs recommended a reorganization of the system of distribution of annuities and trading methods, placing them under more strict governmental regulation to the end that the Indian

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no. 2, pp. 502 (Serial 363).

might not be defrauded and corrupted by pernicious influences arising from existing conditions. He anticipated, however, that any "improvement, or attempt at benefitting the Indians, will meet the great obstruction of every effort of meliorating their condition -- the inordinate use of ardent spirits. If you could civilize and Christianize them, you might possibly correct the evil; but the misfortune is, that it must be eradicated before you can effect the former." The Indians were incapable, he said, of "redeeming themselves from its fearful thraldom," and the remedy lay "in keeping the poison beyond their reach." The laws of the United States prohibiting the traffic were "generally evaded" and, while state and territorial laws perhaps did some good, they "often fail." He thought it probable that constitutional limitations forbade the United States going further and invoked the States and Territories, within or near which Indian tribes were located, "to exert the power they undoubtedly possess, to whatever extent may be necessary to arrest this worse than pestilence." He recommended that such States and Territories should "declare it a high offence, under severe sanctions, to purchase ardent spirits, or to have them in possession, with intent to sell them to the Indians."[1]

These conditions, which appear very general throughout the Indian country, were not readily corrected. The Acting Superintendent of the Southwestern Territory, in his annual report of

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 36th Cong., 2d sess., I, no. 2, 241-242 (Serial 382).

September 30, 1843, said of the Senecas, Senacas and Shawnees, and Quapaws that "The facility with which they can procure whiskey, by reason of their proximity to the white settlements of Missouri, still exists, and must, as long as it continues, have a tendency to retard their improvement."[1] At the same time the agent for the Chickasaws was reporting that "It is from Texas that two-thirds of the whiskey is brought into the country; it is not brought in by the citizens of Texas, but they keep distilleries and whiskey-shops just on the south bank of Red river, where the Indians go and get drunk, give their guns and horses for two or three gallons of whiskey, which they bring into the nation; but I am happy to say that, for the last two years, the Indians have been much more temperate than previously. But there is a large distillery putting up just on the south side of Red river, where large quantities of whiskey will be made, and I dread the time when it will be in full operation."[2]

In the meantime the agent at Leavenworth was recommending imprisonment as a punishment for even those who were found in the Indian country with ardent spirits or wine, saying that a fine of $300 or $1,000 was no preventive. An Indian whiskey-trader cared no more for this, he said, than for so many cents. "You have all the trouble to go through all the forms of law - recover

---

[1] House Ex.Docs., 26th Cong., 2d sess., I, no. 2, p. 418 (Serial 382).

[2] Ibid., p. 412.

a judgment, pay all the cost, and there is an end to it."[1]

The policy adopted by the government to control the liquor traffic will be discussed in a later chapter. It is only meant here to show the effect of this traffic upon the Indian. It must now be apparent that it added "double trouble" to all the other ills of this unfortunate people.

Trouble with the Wild Tribes

There yet remains one other disturbing factor that must not be passed unnoticed. In another connection (p. 15) we have called attention to the fact that the estimated number of indigenous Indians "in striking distance of our frontier" during this period was considerably above two hundred thousand. Of course, not all of them were immediately contiguous to the removed tribes, though most of them did, either directly or indirestly, exert pressure upon the Western Territory. They were very wild and predatory in their habits, representing a lower stage of civilization than did most of the removed tribes, and were practically beyond all control of the civilized powers. They therefore roamed the great western prairies almost unrestrained and some of them, in their predatory excursions, habitually crossed back and forth between the United States, Texas and Mexico.[2]

---

[1] House Ex.Docs., 26th Cong., 2d sess., no. I, 2, p. 412.

[2] Marshall, A History of the Western Boundary of the Louisiana Purchase, 1819-1841, pp. 129-130.

They conducted trade and intercourse with the British traders to the north and with the Mexicans to the south.[1] They made depredations along the whole frontier of Texas from the beginning of Anglo-American settlement there, through the era of the Republic, and long after that common wealth was incorporated with the American Union.[2] They constantly menaced the traders from the United States who began about 1822 a constantly increasing traffic with Mexico through Santa Fé and compelled our government to send dragoons with the trade caravans.[3] They naturally felt resentment against the intrusion of the civilized tribes and carried their share of the responsibility for whatever troubles the removed Indian had to endure. Only enough of this story will be related here to reveal an attitude and a condition.

In 1837 the Commissioner of Indian Affairs sent a special agent to the Comanches because of their persistent hostilities to both whites and removed Indians. In his instructions to the agent he said that word had been received from the officers in command at Forts Gibson and Towson to the effect that murders were being committed by the Comanches upon other tribes, as well as upon white citizens in that region and that it was important "to ascertain the causes and extent of this hostile

---

[1] House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, p.596(Serial 321).

[2] Roberts, Message to the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of Texas, February 10, 1879, p. 41.

[3] Gregg, Scenes and Thrilling Incidents on the Prairies and Mexico, chap. I.

feeling, and if possible, to allay it, and prevent its infecting other Indians." The Commissioner then informed the Special Agent that Major Chouteau, who had returned from a visit to the wild tribes with a view to observe their movements, had learned from a Comanche chief that that tribe was determined "to be revenged on the whites for many supposed injuries" and were dissatisfied, "because the Creeks and Choctaws have extended their occupation and improvements to the country heretofore used by themselves as a hunting-ground;" that they had killed a woman of the Osage tribe and were threatening the peace of the whole western region; and, that it should be an important part of the duty of the Special Agent "to watch the movements of the tribes upon our Western and Southern frontiers, and to detect the earliest indications of a purpose on their part to form any alliance with the Indians in Texas and Mexico, and on the part of the latter to cross our boundary line."[1]

What this agent accomplished we do not find recorded and it seems highly probable that so far as the relation between the wild tribes and the emigrant Indians are concerned he accomplished nothing.

On September 4, 1843 the Agent of the Chickasaws reported that the various tribes of Indians that made their homes north of Red river and south of the False Washita, were in the habit of committing depredations upon the Chickasaws," and also upon

---

[1] House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, p. 597 (Serial 321).

the northwestern settlements of Texas." He said that negroes would run away from the Chickasaws and find harbor among those wild tribes; that the Comanches often bought them and then sold them back, through the Delawares and Shawnees, to their original owners, the Chickasaws, who sometimes paid "from one hundred and fifty to two hundred and fifty dollars for their own negroes"; that a case of this kind had just recently occurred and that an agent ought to be stationed in that section whose duty it should be to hold "friendly talks" with those Indians and strive to prevent "their stealing from the Chickasaws and Choctaws."[1]

But the pressure from the wild tribes upon the emigrant Indians was apparently greater from the north and northwest than from the southwest. This had a tendency to push the Indians southward across the international boundary line and for that reason a word as to the cause seems apropos.

In the first place, the weaker of the emigrant tribes were in the northern part of the Indian territory.[2] In the second place, the southwestern Indians had, as we have seen (p.), freer range than the wild tribes of the north. The Comanches, for example, felt little hindrance from Mexico, whose northern frontier was but poorly protected and with whom, indeed, they sometimes enjoyed alliances,[3] whereas the Sioux, the Sacs and

---

[1] Ex. Docs., 28th Cong., 1st sess., I, no. 2, 419 (Serial 439).

[2] See Chapter I, p.13.

[3] See Chapter I, p. 14.

Foxes, the Chippewas, the Pawnees, the Omahas, and others were hemmed in on almost every side. They naturally pressed where the resistance was weakest. In the third place, British traders and agents were active in the north and there is some evidence that their influence was hostile to the United States and calculated to stir up trouble among her Indians.[1]

Whatever the causes the removed Indians and the white settlers alike in that region were kept in constant terror during this period. Warfare was the chronic condition. The Sioux considered themselves the lords of the north and made war upon the Chippewas,[2] upon the Crows,[3] and Snakes,[4] and upon the Pawnees. They terrorized the Pottawattamies on both sides of the Missouri, killing many of this weaker tribe[5] and often met the Sacs and Foxes in mortal combat.[6] The Sacs and Foxes[7] fought the Winnebagoes, while the Kansas and Pawnees bathed their tomahawks in each others blood for years.[8] Moreover, the Comanches, even, had made trouble in this region as early as 1835 for the Superintendent of Indian affairs for the southwest Territory that

---

1 House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, p.574 (Serial 321).
2 Niles' National Register, LVI, p.386.
3 Ibid., 323.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid., LX, 370.
6 House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, p.575 (Serial 321)
7 Niles' National Register, LVIII, p. 356.
8 Ibid., LX, p. 68; LXIV, p. 323.

year suggested that the Comanches and other tribes be invited to Washington; and in the report of the Comissioner of Indian Affairs, December 1, 1837 that officer called attention to what he denominated "the first authentic intelligence of the probable hostilities between the Comanches and the Shawnees, Delawares, and Osages." He further said: "The reports of Major Chouteau, who passed into the Indian country, of subseqenent dates to the middle of April, confirmed this intelligence. The great importance of these aggressions upon each other induced the appointment of Colonel A. P. Chouteau, a gentleman well acquainted with these Indians, and in all respects qualified for a duty of so delicate a character, as a special agent, to travel among them, and, by making proper explanations and representations, and by other means, to endeavor to effect a reconciliation." It was also the idea of the Commissioner that groups of these Indians should be conducted occasionally to Washington with a view of impressing them "with just ideas of the strength and resources of the country" and "of the propriety of remaining at peace with us and with each other."[1]

The Osages, who claimed a large part of the territory to whi the eastern Indians were removed, were given a comparatively smal tract on the north side of the Arkansas River adjacent to the

---

[1] House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, p.567 (Serial 321).

Cherokees and were asked to be quiet.[1] They were obnoxious to all their neighbors, refusing naturally to settle down to the kind of life which the government demanded of the so-called civilized tribes.[2] Enough has now been said on the disturbing influence of the wild tribes.

It must now be evident that the process of removal had left the emigrant tribes in a most deplorable state. They were in a condition and in a mood that challenged the patience, the wisdom, and the patriotism of their more responsible superiors.

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., II, no.59, map facing page 18. (Serial 322).

[2] Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, November 25, 1839, in House Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.2, pp. 329-330.

Chapter III.

THE INDIAN'S REACTION TOWARD HIS NEW ENVIRONMENT.

Trouble Begins

Keeping in mind the mood in which these emigrant Indians came, the sufferings they bore on their westward journey, their lack of food in their new homes, the temporary character of the locations of some of the tribes, the persistent, pervading, and baneful introduction of spirituous liquor among them, and the attitude and conduct of the wild tribes, it requires no stretch of the imagination to picture the general conditions that inevitably followed. Indeed, something of these has been shown in the foregoing chapter. And yet, the story would be incomplete without further description of the Indian's reaction under these untoward influences.[1] This chapter, therefore, purports to elaborate the

---

[1] It should be said here, perhaps, that on the whole the reports of the various public officials charged with duties among the Indians in this region leave the very distinct general impression, if read without a great deal of care, that the conditions among the emigrated tribes were, indeed, most happy. In fact, but for a few "ifs" and "buts" and "althoughs" scattered here and there through the reports, one who reads them hurriedly would probably wish that his lines had fallen in more pleasant places and that he had been permitted to spend his days in this land of culture and of progress, where each day before his very eyes the prophecy was being literally fulfilled: "Their knives they shall convert into pruning hooks and their weapons shall be beaten into plough-shares." It is difficult for one acquainted with the conditions described in the foregoing chapters to put much confidence in the correctness of such reports.

Another character of evidence is found in the newspapers. There is some danger that these may err as flagrantly in the opposi-

general thesis that the result of the foregoing conditions was the reign of inter-tribal and intra-tribal wars, the formation of plots against the peace and safety of the white settlements, and the consequent development of a general alarm on the south-western frontier.

The troubles were not slow in beginning and they multiplied in geometrical progression as the processes of American advance and Indian removal went on. The limits of this chapter forbid a systematic development of this topic. The fact is, there was little system about it and that is one of the explanations of its tragedy. A glimpse of the gathering storm is easily gained from Niles' Register of July 28, 1832, as follows: "It appears by the Arkansas Advocate that the Shawnee and Comanche Indians have had a severe battle, in which the first lost 9, and the last 77 killed and also stated, that the Shawnees, Choctaws, Cherokees, Creeks, etc. located on the borders of Arkansas, had resolved on a general war against the Comanches and Pawnees. And so the work of extermination proceeds."[1]

According to the same journal the Arkansas Gazette carried an account in the summer of 1834 of a bloody fight between the United States Dragoons and the Pawnee Indians in which a number

---

direction, but, in view of the fact that the papers in this section were generally of the same political faith as the party which was in power during most of this period, this danger would seem to be slight. It has therefore been thought fit to rely more upon the public press than upon official reports, though the latter have not been entirely eliminated.

[1] Niles Register, July 28, 1832, XLII, p. 386.

were killed on each side and a considerable band of Indians taken prisoners. Among those taken were several Osages who had been held captive by the Pawnees. Niles concludes: "The object of this expedition was to induce the Pawnees to give up several of our citizens whom they held as prisoners, and of endeavoring to pursuade them to enter into amicable arrangements with the citizens of the United States and the neighboring Indian tribes; but they seem to have preferred the "trial of battle."[1] The story of this engagement was later denied by one of the company of dragoons, but the letter of denial is itself better evidence of the danger in the situation than is the above statement from the Arkansas paper. After describing the purposes of the expedition which was reputed to have had the engagement with the Pawnees, and after having set forth the military movements of the campaign, the letter of denial states that "The Pawnees, (as they have been called), the Comanches and Kioways, roam over a large extent of the Choctaw country, in their hunting excursions; and it is supposed that some of their town are within the Chactaw boundary. They have not been on friendly terms with any of the tribes invited to meet them in council"(the Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws,

---

[1] Niles Register, September 13, 1834, XLVII, p. 221.

Senecas, Shawnees, Delawares, and Osages);" and with the Osages, who also live principally by hunting, they have kept up a continual warfare. Small bands of these tribes meet frequently on the prairies, and they plunder and kill each other at every opportunity. If this hostile feeling can be allayed by the intercession of our government, now commenced, and a friendly understanding be established between the several marauding bands of the western prairies, and our own Indians, it would be worth more to the United States than would pay all the expenses of the dragoon regiment since its organization." The same letter refers to captives among the Osages and describes the recovery by Colonel Dodge of a white boy, the son of the Judge of Miller county, Arkansas. The father and his servants had been killed only a short time before. The expedition also learned of the fate of a ranger who had been captured by Indians, living south, "near St. Antoine, in Mexico," and that "they had killed him near their hunting camp, on Red River." Reference was made to Spanish captives among the Indians and the Osages had recently murdered a large number of women and children of the Kioways. Among other things accomplished by this expedition, troops had been stationed at various places in and around the Indian territory to suppress depredations and hostilities.[1]

At the same time that these things were taking place, the Missouri Republican was speaking in no uncertain terms of the condition of the Indian. On September 2, 1834 it carried a long

---

[1] Arkansas Gazette, September 9, 1834, in Niles Register, October 4, 1834, XLVII, pp. 74-76.

article which had for its object the drawing of public attention to the Indians on the frontier. After describing the conditions obtaining among the Indians this paper said: "As regards the peace and safety of our own citizens, no prudent man can shut his eyes to the danger which threatens the whole line of our western frontier. The exiles that now inhabit that region are discontented and sullen. They hate us, because they feel that we have wronged them. They fear us, because they see that we are strong enough to wrong them with impunity, and believe that we will wrong them whenever interest prompts. Most of them are in squalid poverty -some die of starvation every year. Is there safety for the scattered people of our borders, with such men for their neighbors?"[1]

The same paper thought in the following February 1835, that the whole circumstance of sending the dragoons among the Indians had proven not only disastrous to the regiment, but equally so to the Indian, and that the dragoons ought to be disbanded and no more such excursions made.[2]

The situation grew more and more desperate. In his message to the Legislature, September 17, 1836, Governor Conway of Arkansas recalled the removal policy of the United States, the mood and general condition of the Indian, and the revolutionary state south of Red river in Texas, and expressed the belief that the United States would be unable "to insure in perfect safety against the

---

[1] Niles Register, October 4, 1834, XLVII, pp. 76-77.

[2] Ibid, February 7, 1835, XLVII, pp. 403-404.

tomahawk and scalping-knife." He, therefore, recommended the encouragement of independent companies under proper military regulations and urged, that the legislature represent the situation to the general government,"and, in energetic language, ask them for those indispensable means of defence." He thought the state was entitled to "sufficient garrisons to insure us protection and safety" on the frontier, that the Militia ought to be adequately supplied with munitions of war, and that an arsenal ought to be established at a convenient place.[1] A month later he issued a proclamation ordering all the Indians within the State, who did not have a fixed residence, to "depart forthwith," and called upon the Militia of the State to aid in carrying into effect the order.[2]

On January 7, 1837, Niles Register stated that according to information at hand Fort Gibson was completely encircled by Indians- "Creeks, Cherokees, Chactaws, Osages, etc., and that 12000 more Creeks were expected from the south in a few weeks." There were only two hundred and sixty men at Fort Gibson and some of them not fit for duty. This was "criminal negligence" and ought to be remedied at once. The emigrating Creeks were then scattered along the roads in little predatory bands, "killing hogs and stealing as they go." One company of three thousand two hundred of this tribe had dwindled to two thousand,"the rest having fallen into straggling parties."[3]

---

[1] Message of the Governor of Arkansas, September 17, 1836, in Niles' Register, October 29, 1836,LI, pp. 139-140.

[2] Ibid., p. 195.

[3] Ibid., p. 289.

Trouble with the Osages

The year 1837 saw the worst situation on the southwestern frontier that had yet appeared. There was a variety of hostilities between Indian and Indian, and between Indian and white. We give space to the Osages only.

A clew to their conduct during this year can perhaps be best gained from the report of the Acting Superintendent of the Western Territory in his annual report December 1, 1837. Among other things he said: "The Osages are the same wild predatory beings as ever. They show not the least sign of improvement." All of the surrounding tribes were continually complaining "against the many depredations committed upon them by this tribe," and claim had been "laid against them to the amount of several thousand dollars for horses, cattle, and hogs stolen by them." Such was the conduct of this tribe that it had been very difficult to restrain war-parties of Choctaws and others from going out on retaliatory expeditions.[1]

Ante-dating this report a few weeks was an article in the St. Louis Republican as follows: "We have conversed with a gentleman just arrived in the city from Independence, Jackson county, Mo. We learn from him, that great excitement was prevailing amongst the citizens of that quarter, who were expecting an attack from the Osage Indians. They had sent several threatening messages

---

[1] House Documents, 25th Cong., 2d. Sess., I, no. 3, p. 582. Serial 321.

to the frontier inhabitants and had already committed some depredations on their property; having stolen several hogs and cattle, and reports say, some negroes. Application had been made to the governor for troops, and instructions had been issued by the secretary of state - - - - - - - to General Lucas to raise instantly six hundred men from his division which, we believe, consists of Jackson, La Fayette, and Van Buren counties.- - - - - -. The Osages say they can bring one thousand warriors into the field, and that they have no fear of the consequences of the war - - - - -."[1]

The St. Louis Bulletin of November 14 following ascribed the trouble with the Osages to a few self-seeking and alarmist whites. It thought that the Indians were ignorant and misled. It further stated that "Gen. Lucas left Independence immediately on receiving the rumor with about 500 militia to oppose the aggressors. Gen. Kearny, the Commandant at Fort Leavenworth, fearing unneccessary difficulty, and believing the motives of the Indians to be entirely pacific, immediately despatched Capt. Summer with one hundred dragoons, a few days after fifty more, to drive the Indians without the boundary of the state for their hunting purposes, and to interpose his command, and keep separate the whites and Indians. - - - It is believed, however now, that all difficulties have been settled; the Indians retreated to their own hunting lands, and the militia to their homes."[2]

---

[1] Niles' National Register, October 14, 1837, LIII, p. 97.

[2] Ibid., p. 195.

But the Bulletin's optimietic view was not concurred in by the Booneville (Mo) Herald which published, January 24, 1838, an account of General Lucas's experience with the Osages. This paper stated that the dragoons had driven the Osages and other tribes without the limits of the State and scoured the region in the vicinity of the Arkansas, for some distance; that the Indians had "evinced great stubborness and obstinacy, so much so, that many of them had to be knocked down before they would give up their guns;" that the Indians were in a surly mood, and were unquestionably meditating a desperate descent upon the frontier. A rumor had come only the day before to the effect that "a party of Osages followed close upon the retrograding footsteps of Gen. Lucas, and took possession of Sarcoxio, in Barry county." The Herald closed its account of the situation with the significant statement that "The apprehension of a combined attack upon the frontier, in the spring is now universal in the dismayed southwest. Let us be ready, for come it will.[1]

The General Plot against the Whites, 1838.

The rumor above reported was circulated with alarming rapidity and was given credence because of a number of circumstances. Throughout the year 1838 the air was rife with reports that the Indians were combining for a general joint attack upon the white settlers.

---

[1] Niles Register, LIII, p. 385.

On April 9 the Arkansas State Gazette printed a story, which it had received through a Choctaw Indian, concerning the effort of the Comanches to enlist the Chactaws and other tribes against the whites, and particularly the Texans. It was reported that there were Mexican officers among them with the purpose of forming a confederation against the whole frontier; that when dragoons appeared among the Indians, these Mexican officials would hide and were fed by the Comanches. It was the plan "to remain neutral until they received their arms and ammunition from Mexico, and then to commence their war of extermination against the Taxans (or white people, as the Choctaw relates) kill all or drive them across the '<u>great red water</u>'(no doubt meaning Red river), where they came from.

They were friendly to the Choctaws, and told him they did not wish to fight with any other tribe of Indians, but wished all other tribes, and particularly the Choctaws to join them in their work."[1]

On August 14, 1838 the St Louis Republican carried the following item: "We are informed that an important despatch has been forwarded by Major Mason of Fort Gibson to General Gains, the Commander of this division. The substance of this communication is, that the Cherokees have built a council house, which is said to be considerably larger than any heretofore erected by any tribe of

---

[1] Niles' National Register, LIII, p. 181.

Indians. They have sent messengers, with the black and red wampum, to all the tribes from the Red river to the Sacs and Foxes on the Mississippi -omitting only the Kansas and Osages- inviting them to meet in council at the Cherokee council house in September next. The movement is believed to be but an incipient step to further difficulties, and made with a view of enlisting and uniting all the tribes along the fromtier in such manner as may be adopted. They have proceeded with great caution and secrecy in the measure, and have endeavored to keep all their proceedings from the knowledge of their agents and of the officers of the posts.- - - - - - - -. All the information elicited goes to confirm the opinion expressed some time ago, by General Arbuckle, of the hostile intention of several of the tribes, though it is not believed that any movement is intended by them until the opening of spring. General Gaines, we are told, has forwarded the despatch of Major Mason to the proper department with a request that he be permitted to attend the council with an armed force. This would probably be the most effectual means to awe them into compliance with their duty, and would effectually prevent the formation of any plans for a general and united uprising. It is greatly to be desired that his request should be granted.[1]

This story was confirmed by the Nashville Banner of the 18th of the same month. Commenting upon the article in the Banner,

---

[1] Niles' National Register, LIV, p. 401.

Niles' Register said: "Should the fears of the editor of the Banner be realized, scenes of blood unparalleled in the history of the states, would ensue. There are now congregated on our western fromtier, in the neighborhood of one hundred thousand Indian warriors, who need but little to fan them into excitement. They feel that they have been cheated and outraged by the people of the United States, and nothing would be more acceptable to them than an opportunity to enjoy a revenge -the greatest delight a red man knows. We know not what measures the government has taken to meet this anticipated avalanche, but the most prompt and efficient should be immediately resorted to."[1]

Concerning this council there were numerous denials of any malicious purpose. The agent of the Cherokees, in his annual report in the autumn of 1838, denied with some vehemence the hostile intent of the council, stating that he wrote the invitation to the other tribes and with Colonel Logan, the agent for the Creeks, and General Arbuckle, attended the council at which not one hostile word was uttered. The representatives of various tribes likewise disclaimed all hostile purpose and the Arkansas Gazette admitted that though its informant was a thoroughly reliable and well-meaning citizen, he had been misinformed.[2] At

---

[1] Niles' National Register, LIV, p. 401.

[2] Ibid., LV, 17,133.

the same time the report of the Secretary of War, November 28, 1838, stated that "The Council convened by the Cherokees had no object unfriendly to our people or government. This belief originated from a misapprehension of the condition and temper of these Indians.- - - - - - - - . It appears, from subsequent information, that the Cherokees hold an annual council for the purpose of legislation, and that, in order to revive an ancient association of the tribes, formed for the preservation of peace among themselves, they invited, in 1837, the Creeks, Senecas, and others, to meet them, and in 1838, renewed their invitation and extended them to more distant nations. - - - - - - . Notwithstanding, however, the peaceful appearances which characterized these preliminaries some of the northern tribes suspected the object of the council to be hostile to the whites, and refused to attend."

When in the same report, this officer states that his own lack of experience in and knowledge of Indian affairs forbids his making any suggestions upon a subject which is "confessedly the most difficult and complicated under the supervision of the department" he does not add weight to his argument as to the purpose of this council; and when, in another connection, he recommends that agents be not "attached to any one tribe, as ex experience proves that they become so identified with those whose peculiar interests are confined to their care, that they imbibe their prejudices and espouse their quarrels" he does not increase

one's confidence in the vehement assertions of these agents, concerning the pacific feeling of their respective tribes and the immediate purposes of the Council.[1] Moreover the presence of Mexican emissaries among the Indians of the United States gives weight to the story of joint attack upon the whites. The same Secretary of War in the same report as quoted above said that he had been called upon again by the commanding officers of the western division of the army to send more troops to protect the southwestern frontier from apprehended attacks "from the Indians residing in Texas, circumstances having led to the belief that these Indians had been excited by the Mexican authorities to attack the Texians." Only one conclusion can be drawn from this statement, viz, that the military officers in the southwest thought there was danger of a general attack by Indians and that this was being encouraged by Mexicans. To avert such a calamity he had warned the Indians within the United States that they should not "take part in any contest between Mexico and Texas," or enter the territory of the latter with any hostile intent; and that their ammunition would be cut off if they disobeyed, "without prejudice to other measures which will be taken to enforce its observance."[2] Evidently the Secretary of War intended to keep the Indians of the United States from helping against the Texans, if he did not have in mind the

---

[1] Niles' Register, December 28, 1838, LV, 262-263, Report of the Secretary of War, November 28, 1838.

[2] Ibid.

cooperation of the Texas Indians with those of the United States against his own fellow citizens of the southwest.

If we add to the above circumstances the well-known fact that the Cherokees were the leaders in the movement for a council of all the tribes, that they were the most persistent and stubborn opponents of removal, and that on August 1, 1838, just a few weeks before such a general council was held for some reason, this tribe met in executive session and passed a series of vigorous and vehement resolutions upholding their rights and denouncing the treatment they had received at the hands of the United States (from which meeting the veil of secrecy was not removed for a year)[1] it requires some charity for one to believe that the council was so innocent and patriotic in its purpose as its friends represented it to be. That such a plot was ripening in Texas at this very time is shown in a subsequent chapter.

The truth, no doubt, was, that at this time there was a general movement among the Indians from the Gulf of Mexico northward at least to the Platte; that it was incited by Mexicans; and that it had for its object a combined attack upon the whole southwestern frontier. Texas was in revolt and Anglo-Americans were to blame for it. The Mexicans hated Anglo-Americans as heartily as did the Indian. Hatred for a common enemy spelled cooperation.

---

[1] House Executive Documents, 26th Cong., 1st Sess., I, no. 2, 417. Serial 363.

The Terror of 1839

The year 1839 set a new high water mark in the history of Indian troubles in the southwest. On March 16th the Mobile Journal stated that "there are unpleasant rumors in town, of hostilities among the Indians west of the Mississippi. The Georgia Creeks, headed by McIntosh, are reported to be in arms, with the determination of making war upon another tribe, the Osages, we think; and some of the troops of the United States have been despatched from Fort Gibson to the scene of the hostilities, with a view of preserving peace. These accounts are brought direct from that country and though we do not know that they are implicitly to be relied upon, they are credited by those more familiar than we are with the scene of action."[1]

In the following June the St. Louis Republican gave a report from Captain R.D.C.Collins of the United States army and principal distributing agent for the Choctaws, written to the editor of the Arkansas Gazette, in which he describes the murder of two citizens from Mississippi. Circumstantial evidence indicated that the perpetrators of the crime were Kickapoos, Osages, or some wild tribe, though it took place in the Choctaw country. The affair created no little excitement and "rendered the travel from here (the Choctaw agency) to the depot (Boggy) somewhat precarious."[2]

---

[1] Niles' National Register, LVI, p. 67.

[2] Ibid., 283.

In the month of September so manifest became the "spirit of hostility exhibited among the Missouri Indians" that "Colonel Kearney made an expedition with four companies of his regiment up the Missouri, on its right bank, as far as the Otos Nation and the new country of the Pattawatomies ....., which had the effect of quieting the apprehensions of difficulty in that quarter;" and, in order to better control the situation near the line of the state of Arkansas the United States in the same autumn built a fort, called Fort Wayne, "about half way between forts Leavenworth and Gibson."[1]

In the preceding July a Little Rock paper had complained that "There is trouble brewing among the Indians on our frontier, and if they once get agoing, our situation here will not be enviable, as we are only about 150 miles from the line, and it is said they can raise, if combined, 20,000 men."[2] This was followed in a few weeks by another alarm from the Little Rock Times to the effect that "Rumor, with her 10,000 tongues, has been busy for the last few days in spreading reports concerning hostilities among the Indians, threatening attack upon the arsenal at Fort Gibson, etc. etc. ..... . It is also stated that gen. Arbuckle has called on gen. Drennen, of Van Buren, to have his company of 75 volunteers in readiness at a moment's warning, on which account col. Drennen has sent to this place for a qunatity of arms, ammu-

---

[1] Report of the Major General Commanding the Army, Nov. 27, 1839, in House Exec. Docs., 26th Cong., 1se sess., I, no. 2, 56. Serial 363.

[2] Niles' National Register, LVI, 342-343.

nition, etc. Another rumor is, that the ladies have all been requested to leave Fort Gibson, in order to prepare for the worst. This, ..., is all rumor, and we give it to our readers as we get it."[1]

In his annual report under date of October 18, 1839, the agent at Council Bluffs told of great dissatisfaction among the Otoes, Missouries, and Pattawatomies; regretted that efforts towards civilization had had no better results; and, that "The disposition of these Indians towards the whites does not appear to be friendly"; that they were "morose and sullen" and experience had taught that they could be "troublesome neighbors" if they chose. He hoped that, from the recent warning given them by Colonel Kearney and himself, they would "conduct themselves better for the future."[2] According to the Superintendnet of the Western Territory the Osages were at the same time committing "many depredations, by killing stock belonging to other tribes as well as out own people";[3] and the Kanzans were "a lawless, dissolute race" who had lately "turned their predatory operations upon their red neighbors"[4] and were now involved with the Pawnees and Ottoes.[5]

---

[1] Niles' National Register, LVII, 3.

[2] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no. 2, 504, Serial 363.

[3] Ibid., 472.

[4] Farnham, Travels, in Thwaites Early Western Travels, XXVIII, 138

[5] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no. 2, 502, Serial 363.

But the worst Indian trouble of this year was among the Cherokees. We have already seen something of their aversion to removal, dissensions within the tribe consequent upon the policy of the United States, and the terrible suffering they endured in passing to their new homes. The sequel of these troubles was a long series of intra-tribal wars, thefts, burnings, and murders which broke out with savage fury in the summer of 1839 and did not cease for more than a decade.[1] It is such an important part of this story as showing conditions on the southwestern border that a brief summary of it follows.

The removal policy had created three distinct parties of Cherokees - the Old Settlers, who came over at various times prior to the Treaty of New Echota in 1835, the Treaty party who had accepted the Treaty of New Echota and had migrated in the interval between that act and the final removal in 1838 and 1839, and finally the Ross party which was the last to come and constituted a large majority of the tribe.[2] As the newcomers arrived, hungry, sick, and mad troubles began to arise among the parties as to matters of government and ownership. Appeal was made to Washington and while matters were in this condition the leaders of the Treaty Party, Major Ridge, his son John, and Elias

---

[1] For a clear treatment of this episode see Parker, The Cherokee Indians, Chapters IV, V, VI.

[2] Ibid., p. 51.

Boudinot were murdered in the latter part of June 1839.[1] The whole frontier was thrown into great excitement. Prominent members of the Old Settlers and of the Treaty Party fled to Fort Gibson for shelter and the United States took steps to settle the disorder. The President demanded that the murderers be apprehended and turned over to the Federal authorities for punishment, while the Ross party in council deprived members of the Treaty party of the right to hold office for five years and gave umbrage to the murderers. A delegation was sent to Washington to confer with "the Great Father", and found difficulty in getting an audience because of the presence of Ross in the company. When Ross tried to justify the murder by a Cherokee law of long standing the Department of War took steps to rewrite the legal system of the Cherokees in terms of the constitution and laws of the United States.

Matters went from bad to worse for several years and reached another high water mark in 1843 when a whole string of murders took place.

In the meantime, on November 30, 1839 the Secretary of War had said in his annual report that "The causes which call for the speedy completion of the chain of posts upon the western frontier have been so often stated, that it appears unnecessary to repeat them here. But it is proper for me to add, that these

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no 2, 358. Serial 363.

dangers have become more imminent from the presence there of the Seminoles and Cherokees, who lately emigrated under circumstances not calculated to render them friendly to the whites. The turbulent and ambitious character of some of these chiefs, and the cold-blooded and cruel murders, committed by their orders, upon their unoffending countrymen, whose only crimes were their friendship for the whites, their love of peace, and their devotion to the best interests of their nation, may lead to fatal consequences, in spite of the prudence and forbearance of the public authorities. In virtue of the stipulations of the treaty, and in pursuance of our duty as guardians of the redmen, and our obligations to see the laws of the country duly enforced (for one of these chiefs was murdered with circumstances of savage barbarity within the State of Arkansas), orders have been issued to demand the murderers, and to take measures to extend the protecting arm of Government over the unfortunate men who signed the treaty of New Echata, and who are proscribed and outlawed by the willing instruments of the vengeance or ambitious projects of John Ross and other chiefs of the nation. It is, therefore, of the importance that the fortresses on the frontier should be completed and the force strengthened."[1] He went on to say that in his opinion something ought to be done at once to prevent the Indians

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., I, no.2 p. 42, Serial 363.

assembled west of the Mississippi from destroying each other; that the last summer had witnessed "a council, composed of the most civilized portions of a tribe, whose long residence among the whites had, it was hoped, taught them the elements of self-government and first principles of religion and justice, assembled together to license the most atrocious crimes, and sending forth from its bosom a gang of desperadoes to murder their peaceful and unoffending brethern; an order which was like a note of dreadful prepartion. There are said to be 20,000 Indian warriors upon our frontier."[1]

Without pursuing further the story of the contest between the parties in the Cherokee nation let us conclude our discussion of this unhappy tribe by giving a single example of a more or less general condition. The story is from the Little Rock Times of January 23, 1840. "On Saturday last Major E. Rector arrived at this place with five prisoners from the Cherokee nation - three Indians and two white men, who are all safely lodged in jail. . . . . An Indian named Terrill and two white men named Shrum and Newman, were taken by a command under lieut. Northrop, of the dragoons, for unmercifully treating and leaving for dead, a teamster named Ballard, because, as they said, he worked cheaper than they would. .... . The same party also attacked and dangerously stabbed a son of colonel

---

[1] Niles' National Register, LVII, 165.

Whinnery, of Washington county, and threw a Missouri hog-driver into a fire and shockingly burned him. Jack Nicholson was taken by a command under lieutenant Porter of the infantry, for sometime since whipping and cutting off the ear of a man named Laxton. He is the man . . . . declared to be concerned in the murder of the Wright family. George Waters was indicted last summer, with others, for the murder of a white man in the nation. ..... . Leonard Randolph, also concerned in the same murder, is now in Texas, near Jonesborough, of which fact major Rector has apprised the commanding officer at Fort Towson, so that he will probably be taken."[1]

Brief and fragmentary as this sketch is it plainly shows a serious condition on the southwestern border, growing out of removal. It must be evident now that toward the close of the decade ending in 1840 the policy of dumping into the Western Territory contrary to their wishes, some eighty thousand Indians of divers standards of living, with mingled feelings of hunger, sickness, and anger, surrounded on three sides by wild and predatory savages and on the fourth side by a constantly encroaching white frontier, had resulted in something far worse than the traditional "tempest in the teapot." The Indians made war among themselves, resisted the authority of the United States wherever and whenever there was "the ghost of a show" of success, and

This paragraph should follow Misc. Depredations.)

---

[1] Niles' National Register, LVII, 354.

cared not a whit for the international problems that were created along the southwestern border by their hunting and depredating forays into Texas and their cunning alliances with the tribes of that republic.

Miscellaneous Depredations

To the north, in 1841, there was bloody war between the Kansas and Pawnees,[1] While in the south the Kickapoos were making trouble again for the Choctaws. According to the Little Rock Gazette of March 24, 1841 the Kickapoos had been for a number of years encroaching upon Choctaw lands; they had persistently refused to heed repeated warnings to desist and finally the Choctaw council commanded them to leave the country. The Kickapoos refused to go and "assembled their tribe, numbering twelve hundred warriors", as a means of resistance, and "sent the war hatchet to the numerous wild and savage tribes who inhabit the extensive tract of country lying between the Choctaw line and the Rocky Mountains." The situation had become so serious that, according to reports, all traders in that region "were busily engaged in removing their goods to the vicinity of Fort Towson for protection." A runner had been despatched to the Indian agent, presumably for help. The Gazette did "not wish to create unnecessary excitement or alarm", but was compelled to "confess that ..... a large force will be required to bring the Indians'

[1] Niles' National Register, LX, 68.

to their senses. Should the Kickapoos succeed in obtaining the assistance of the wild tribes who can tell how long the defenceless inhabitants on our frontier will remain unmolested?" This paper concludes by urging the government to take precaution against depredations or hostilities against the whites and by insisting that troops be sent to Arkansas "for the protection of her citizens, to say nothing of what the government is in justice bound to perform in regard to matters of this kind."[1]

At about the same time that this was occurring Pottawattomies and Sioux were fighting near Council Bluffs and the Governor of Iowa was unsuccessfully trying to rid that territory of the Sioux and Foxes by removal across the Missouri.[2] Early in the next year came reports of a proposed Indian council to be composed of chiefs and head men of the Seminoles, Choctaws, Chichasaws, Creeks, Cherokees, Senecas, Ouapaws, Osages, Shawnees, Cows, Pawnees, Sioux, Sacs, Foxes, Piankeskaws, Pottowattomies, Wuandots, etc. It was supposed that the object was to "oppose any further emigration of the whites west, to prevent the erection of any more forts in their country, and never more to part with another foot of their land, whether by force or treaty, at the peril of their lives and the total extinction of their race." It was said that the Indians claimed they could "bring a force

---

[1] Niles' National Register, LX, p. 120.

[2] Ibid., p. 370.

of 40,000 warriors into the field."[1] Whether such a council actually assembled or not we find no record, but Niles' National Register of July 29 of the next year carried this item:[2]

"THE GRAND INDIAN COUNCIL. Tallequah, June 18, 1843. About 4,000 persons meet here daily, 2,500 of whom are fed at thepublic tables ..... . The council comprises 212 individual representing 18 tribes, as follows, viz: Cherokees, 17; Creek and Seminole, 62; Chickasaw, 12; Osage, 9; Delaware, 24; Shawnee, 18; Kickapoo, 4; Iowa, 5; Pottawattomis, 34; Chippewa, 4; Stockbridge, 6; Wichetow, 1; Piankashow,2; Wea, 6; Seneca, 10; Peoria, 6; Ottawa, 4."

Brief and fragmentary as this sketch is it nevertheless shows something of the seriousness of conditions on the southwestern border and the Indian's reaction in his new environment.

Omit this paragraph. Hill.

It must now be evident that the Indians on this border made war upon each other and upon the white settlements; and these wars kept the frontier in a great uproar.

---

[1] Niles' National Register, LXII, p. 48.

[2] Ibid., LXIV, p. 341.

Chapter IV.

THE INDIAN ALONG THE SOUTHERN END OF THE FRONTIER

Introductory

Thus far we have approached the subject from the standpoint of the frontier in Missouri and Arkansas -- a frontier which was far within the territorial limits of the United States. It now becomes our purpose to approach it from the standpoint of that part of the frontier which had pushed across the international boundary line and was now advancing rapidly into that territory which was at first a province of Mexico and which later became the Republic of Texas, for it must not be forgotten that colonization and territorial expansion were not coordinate movements here; and, as a consequence, the Indian policy of the United States on the southwestern frontier was complicated with international problems. In Chapter I we summarized the Anglo-American movement into Texas. It is here only necessary to speak of those results of that movement that related themselves to the Indian situation in the southwest, excluding therefrom and reserv- for a later chapter the question of the diplomatic complications that arose out of the situation in this quarter. As thus delimited the field presents two phases: The conflict between the whites and the Indians in Texas, and the attempts at political control of the Indians.

The Conflict between the Anglo-Americans and the Indians in Texas

The trouble between the white and red races along the southern end of the Anglo-American frontier was in some respects similar to that further north. In fact, the elements were the same in kind, but different in degree and mixed in different proportion. There were the native tribes, wild and predatory, among whom the Comanches were chiefest of sinners. With these the whites in this section were in closer immediate contact than was the case further north. Then there were the "intruding Indians" - those who had come from the United States at various times, but who, as has appeared in Chapter II of this study, increased greatly between 1830 and 1840 in consequence of the removal policy of the United States. Among these immigrant Indians the Cherokees were the most troublesome and the Caddos were a close second. Apparently the trouble with these tribes was little different either in kind or degree from that of the frontier of Arkansas and Missouri with their kindred to the north. A third factor in the situation here was the Spanish influence with the Indian - an influence which was both stronger and more persistent than in the Indian Territory. No attempt is made here to discuss these factors separately, but all will appear in the course of the story. The basis of the organization of the first division of this chapter is to be found rather in a change in the character of hostilities. Prior to 1836 Indian attacks upon

the whites were, for the most part, local, tribal, and predatory. After that date they were more general, cooperative to a degree, and had for their object the expulsion or extermination of the whites.

The Carancahuas Indians, who inhabited the country above Galveston Islands and who were an especially savage tribe[1] were the first of the Texas Indians to write themselves into the history of Anglo-American colonization in Texas.[2] Before the coming of Austin's colony in 1821 the natural savagery of these Indians had been aroused, intensified, and embittered by the expeditions of Lafitte and Long a few years before.[3] On the arrival of the first Anglo-American colonists the Carancahuas became their implacable enemies.[4] Only the severest chastisements, at frequent intervals, sufficed to restrain the savages from the worst of cruelties, but by 1830 their power had been broken.[5]

---

[1] Yoakum, History of Texas, I, 222-223; Brown, Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas, p. 6.

[2] This statement does not take into account the various traders, adventurers, and isolated settlers that had come into Texas with gradually increasing frequency for something like a half century before Austin's colony settled on the Brazos in 1821.

[3] Yoakum, History of Texas, I, 197.

[4] Brown, Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas, pp. 6-8; Yoakum, History of Texas, I, 221; Baker, A Texas Scrap-Book, pp. 145-146.

[5] Kennedy, Texas, I, pp. 353-354; Foote, Texas and the Texans, I, 294-297.

In 1836 a revolution against Mexico broke out in the Edward's colony of eastern Texas, known as the Fredonian revolt. The Cherokees in that region, allying themselves at first with the revolutionists, soon deserted them and assisted a designing American by the name of Bean to drive the Anglo-American colonists across the Sabine.[1]

After 1830 the whites drifted into Texas rather rapidly and, as a consequence, Indian depredations, captivities, and murders became more frequent. In 1833 a surveying party sent out by Beale's colony was attacked and many of them killed by the Snake Indians somewhere near the northern border of what is now the Panhandle of Texas.[2] In the same year a man named Reed from the United States was killed by the Indians near the Falls of the Brazos.[3] Near the same time Josiah Wilbarger, a former citizen of Lincoln county, Missouri, had a horrible and fatal experience with the Indians above the location of the present city of Austin.[4] In the winter of 1835-6 a number of new-comers to the Beale colony were killed in southwest Texas, and others mysteriously disappeared.[5] These incidents are illustrative of the character

---

[1] Yoakum, History of Texas, I, pp.330-250; Kennedy, I, pp. 361-364; Winkler, The Cherokee Indians in Texas, in Texas State Historical Association Quarterly, VII, pp. 95-165.

[2] Brown, Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas, pp. 37-38.

[3] Ibid., p. 35.

[4] Ibid., p. 33.

[5] Ibid., p. 30.

of Indian hostilities down to the Texan Revolution. They lacked organization and intelligent leadership and had little permanent effect upon the history of Texas. It now became the purpose of Mexico to supply these factors.

The success in suppressing the Fredonian revolt, referred to above, had been due in large measure to the help the Indians had given, and now that the Texan Revolution was brewing, Mexico began to send emissaries among the Texas savages.[1] The nascent Texas government, too, had agents at work, seeking friendship and forming treaties. Apparently, however, the Mexicans must have been, on the whole, more successful, for such became the danger from the Indians in the spring of 1836 that the United States, in order to preserve her treaty obligations, sent a detachment of soldiers under General Gaines to the vicinity of the international boundary line. This action temporarily defeated the plan of Mexican intrigue, but did not stop it. Chafing under the results of San Jacinto and determined yet to retain Texas Mexico encouraged the Indians to every form of hostility. In 1836 they made a joint attack upon the Beale Colony and completely broke it up.[2]

Something of the terror they inspired many be gained from a quotation from Brown, who based his statement upon what he termed absolutely reliable information. The statement is also valuable as showing the range of the Indians and the unity of the white frontier. In speaking of the treatment of the prison-

---

[1] Yoakum, II, p. 63.

[2] Brown, Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas, pp. 28-37.

ers taken in the attack upon the Reale settlement, he said: "Here they (the Indians) remained till next morning, tying the ladies' hands, feet, and arms, so tight as to be extremely painful. Next morning before starting, a savage brute amused his fellows by tossing the infant of Mrs. Harris in the air and letting it fall to the ground till it was killed. Next they brought into the presence of the ladies, Mr.Harris and a young German, whom they had supposed to be dead, but who were only wounded. Compelling the heart-broken wife, and the already widowed Mrs.Horn to look on, they shot arrows and plunged lances into the two men until they were dead, all the while yelling horrid.shouts of exultation."[1] Of the ransom of these ladies Brown quotes Mrs.Horn as follows: "Some of Captain Coffee's[2] men came to trade with the Indians and found me." When the Indians refused to accept ransom "He expressed the deepest concern at his disappointment and wept over me as he gave me clothing and divided his scanty supply of flour with me and my children, which he took the pains to carry to them himself. ... Mrs.Harris was equally the object of his solicitude."[3] Though the result of this undertaking was immediately disappointing, a brighter day was not far ahead. In June, 1837 "a party of Mexican traders visited

---

[1] Brown, Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas, pp. 30-31.

[2] Brown says that Coffee was from southwest Missouri and was the founder of Coffee's Trading House on Red River. Ibid., 34.

[3] Ibid., p. 34.

the camp and bought Mrs. Harris. In this work of mercy they were the employes of that large-hearted Santa Fe trader, who had previously ransomed and restored Mrs.Rachel Plummer to her people, Mr.William Donoho." ... "They tried in vain to buy Mrs.Horn."[1] It appears, however, that this same large-hearted Missourian did not forget Mrs.Horn, for a little later, we are told that after prolonged negotiation, through a Mexican again, he gave for her "two fine horses, four fine bridles, two fine blankets, two look-glasses, two knives, some tobacco, powder and balls, articles then of very great cost."[3] After a rather happy sojourn of more than a year with Anglo-Americans in New Mexico, in 1838 "she received a sympathetic letter from Texas, accompanied with presents in clothing, from Messrs. Workman and Rowland, Missourians, so long honorably known as Santa Fe traders and Merchants."[3] ..... "Mrs. Harris and Mrs. Plummer reached Missouri under the protection of Mrs.Donoho."[4] After vain efforts by Anglo-American friends to recover the captive children, Mrs. Horn accepted the hospitality of a train under the protection of Messrs Workman and Rowland and arrived at Independence Missouri, September 30, 1838.[5]

---

[1] Brown, Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas, p. 34

[2] Ibid., p. 35.

[3] Ibid., p. 36.

[4] Ibid., p. 36.

[5] Ibid., p. 36.

The Mrs. Plummer referred to in the above quotation was one of a number of captives of the well-known Parker-Fort tragedy of 1836, in Limestone County. The settlement at this place had been made only a year and a half before under the initiative of the Parker family from Cole County, Illinois. Without going into a recital of the details of the incident it will suffice to know that, according to Brown, who is substantially corroberated by a Mr. Anglin (a member of the settlement)[1], the Indians, having killed five of the little colony and severely wounded others carried into captivity Mrs. Elizabeth Kellogg, Cynthia Ann and John Parker, and Mrs. Plummer, and infant. As shown above Mrs.Plummer was rescued by Santa Fe traders and restored to her people. Her infant son was ransomed in 1843 and taken to Fort Gibson. From here he was returned to relatives in Texas.[2] Cynthia Ann Parker was rescued,nearly twenty-five years after her capture, by General L. S. Ross with a company of Texas Rangers and a small body of United States Dragoons.

In the meantime, Mexican intrigue went on apace. In the spring of 1837 Mexican emissaries visited all the Indian tribes on the frontier for the purpose of inducing them to make war upon the Texans. To this end they offered all the spoils - arms, ammunition, women, children - that should be taken. They persuad-

---

[1] Baker's, A Texas Scrapbook, pp. 198-203.

[2] Brown, Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas, p. 41.

ed the Indians that if Texas succeeded in her revolt they would drive all the tribes from the land of their fathers.[1] The principal chief of the Comanches is said to have told the Texan agent to that tribe in April 1837, that "so long as he continued to see the gradual approach of the whites and their habitations to the hunting grounds of the Comanches, so long would he believe to be true, what the Mexicans had told him, viz: that the ultimate intention of the white man was, to deprive them of their country; and so long would he continue to be the enemy of the white race."[2]

If we are to believe contemporary accounts almost every day in the latter half of 1837 had its own story of theft, arson, and murder, and there was actual, open warfare between Indian and white. "The constant incursions of the savages rendered it necessary during the year 1837, to formally declare war against them."[3]

The story of 1838 was not different in kind. In the spring of that year one Pedro Julian Miracle received instructions from General Filisola of the Mexican army to proceed to Texas, gather the chiefs of eight or ten tribes to a council, smoke the pipe of peace, and, in the name of the Mexican Government, to distribute among them arms, ammunition, and tobacco. He should

---

[1] Yoakum, II, p. 287.

[2] Ibid., p. 288.

[3] Baker, History of Texas, p. 332; Morphis, History of Texas, p. 385.

"Make them understand that as soon as the campaign is over, they will be able to proceed to Mexico, to pay their respects to the Supreme Government, who will send a commissioner to give each possession of the land they are entitled to." He was also to maintain frequent communication with Matamoras to the end that coordinate attacks might be made.[1] According to Miracle's Memorandum he left Matamoras May 29, 1838, accompanied by a number of citizens." 34 soldiers of LaBahia, and two Cherokee and Caddo Indians." On the journey the party met Kickapoos, Kichis (Keechis), Woeos, Tehuacanos, and other tribes. They traded horses with "Boll," the Cherokee, slept with the Caddos, dined on a "plenty of beef, honey, etc." at a Chickasaw village, and held council with them all. Miracle apparently journeyed far into the United States and was killed about August 30 near the Cross Timbers on Red River by a citizen of that region, whether in Texas or in the United States it is not known. On his body were found his original instructions from Filisola and his own Memorandum of his journey.[2]

It was in this very year that the storm of Indian hostilities broke in all its fury and even the pacific Houston could not avert its terror. Early in August of this year a rebellion took place

---

[1] Miracle's Journal in Sen. Docs., 33d Cong., 2d sess., III, 14, 13-17. Serial 660.

[2] Irion to Jones, November 29, 1838, Texan Diplomatic Correspondence, I, 351-353, in Annual Reports of the American Historical Association, 1907.

in the country around Nacogdoches in which Mexicans and Indians figured as leading confederates. It was quickly put down by General Rusk and Major Augustin, but created such general excitement as to demand of the government some very watchful waiting in that quarter.[1] In less than three months after this incident a fierce conflict took place at the village Jose Maria, in which a number of Comanche warriors were slain;[2] and, in a few days more, a party of Comanches killed two surveyors near Bexar.[3] Almost immediately another engagement took place in the same vicinity, in which eight Texans were killed and four wounded. In the meantime, General Rusk had broken up a body of allies on the Trinity;[4] and in the autumn of the same year he dashed across the border near Shreveport, overtook a body of Caddos who had lately striken terror to northeast Texas, captured them, and delivered them over to the United States Indian agent in that quarter, after having deprived them of their arms and exacted a treaty by which this tribe agreed to remain neutral pending the existing conflict in Texas.[5]

But these untoward circumstances had not discouraged the Mexicans. Already, in July 1838, before the Nacogdoches rebellion above referred to, one Vicente Cordova had addressed a

---

[1] Brown, History of Texas, II, 143.

[2] Morphis, History of Texas, p. 399.

[3] Brown, History of Texas, II, 144.

[4] Ibid., 143.

[5] Rusk to Johnston, February 25, 1839, Sen. Docs., 32d Cong., 2d sess., III, 14, 22-25. Serial 660.

letter to Manuel Flores, the Indo-Mexican agent at Matamoras, telling of instructions he had received from Filisola and of his desire to cooperate with Flores. He stated that he had already begun to carry out his instructions and that a personal consultation ought to be held to the end that they might understand each other. Cordova communicated with Filisola from the headwaters of the Trinity in the autumn of 1838, Flores having been delayed until the following spring. Replying to Cordova's communications, Brigadier-General Conalizo, who had succeeded Filisola at Matamoras, instructed Cordova to arouse the frontier Indians against the Texans, incite them to burn the homes, lay waste the fields, steal their property and otherwise and in every way harass and destroy the rebels. They were to keep in touch with the Mexican authorities and as soon as hostilities with France should terminate Mexico would joint them in the attempt to recover Texas. These instructions were in substance the same as those previously given to Miracle and to Flores. Messages were sent by Flores from Canalizo to the chiefs of the Cherokees, Caddos, Seminoles, Biloxies, Kickapoos, Brazos, Towokanaes, and others. These tribes were assured that they could "expect nothing from those greedy adventurers for land who wish even to deprive the Indians of the sun that warms and vivifies them, and who would not cease to injure them while the grass grows and water runs", but that as soon as the rebels should be put down the Indians might expect to come again into possession of the lands which rightfully

belonged to them.[1]

Flores in May 1839 started across Texas with a small band of Mexicans and Indians with the purpose of putting into execution the plots referred to above. Before reaching his confederates in East Texas he was intercepted by a handful of Texans under Lieutentnat James O. Rice, with the result that his party was completely routed. Flores himself was killed, and, what was more important, his plans and instructions fell into the hands of the enemy. The Cherokees, with whom the Mexicans had been conspiring, were already charged with a long list of atrocities of almost every kind, and the revelation of the official correspondence between the Mexicans and chiefs of this tribe, was all that was needed to fan the flames into a conflagation. "Long as mamory holds her seat will the early settlers of Texas remember the events of 1839," wrote one of the citizens of that day.[2]

Only a few months before the discovery of the Mexican-Indian plot President Lamar had issued orders to the Cherokees to make their arrangements to remove in the following autumn beyond the border, giving assurance, at the same time of remunneration for immovable property, lands excepted. The chiefs demurred at first then half-way agreed, and went on with their predatory activities.

---

[1] Sen. Docs., 32d Cong., 2d sess., III, no. 14, pp. 31-32. Serial 660.

[2] Z. N. Morrell, Flowers and Fruits, or 46 Years in Texas, p. 133.

With the secret correspondence of the confederates before him, President Lamar and his counselors thought it was no time to temporize. Texas now determined to expel or exterminate the Cherokees.[1] "Commissioners were accordingly appointed to negotiate for an immediate removal; and, as difficulties were anticipated, troops were ordered to move towards the Indian district. After making the customary professions of satisfaction, Bowles demonstrated an intention to resist; on notification of which, the Secretary of War (General Sidney Johnston) ordered Colonel Douglas to advance upon him. Douglas came up with the Indians on the 15th of July, and defeated them with considerable loss. They retreated, were pursued and overtaken on the 16th, and again discomfited and dispersed. Bowles, then leader and main dependence, being numbered among the slain. In these conflicts, the Indians, who had collected all their strength, including volunteers from the United States, had about fifty-five killed and eighty severely wounded. The Texan loss was five killed and twenty-five wounded.

---

[1] As to the justice of the treatment of the Cherokees by the administration, there is perhaps room for debate. Yoakum, Texas, Vol.II, pp. 266-267, condemns it. Bancroft, who seems to follow Yoakum rather closely, in his North Mexican States and Texas, vol. II, pp. 332-333, is rather vigorous in denunciation of this policy. For the most authoritive account of the origin of the Cherokee claims to the country they occupied see E.W.Winkler, The Cherokee Indians in Texas, in the Texas Historical Association Quarterly, vol.VII, p. 95-165. For an account of the above episode as seen by one who participated in both the negotiations for a treaty of removal and in the war that followed, see John H. Reagan, The Expulsion of the Cherokee from East Texas, in Texas Historical Association Quarterly, vol.I, pp. 38-46.

In twenty days the northeastern frontier of Texas was cleared of 4,000 savages, who had disturbed its tranquility for years. Of these, some crossed the Red River and joined their brethern in the Indian appropriations of the United States; others dispersed in small parties, in places remote from the settlements.

Apparently the failure of this plot broke the backbone of Mexican intrigue, for, although there was considerable activity after this, it could never gain headway again and Indian depredations hereafter are lacking in coordination. Some of these are here related.

In the spring of 1840 there occurred at San Antonio the well-known Council House fight in which a dozen Comanche chiefs and a number of braves were killed, because of their refusal to surrender white captives.[1] As a retaliatory act the Comanches swept across Texas like a cyclone in the following August, killing, burning, and taking captive.[2] Apparently the Comanches did not soon forget these incidents, echoes of which were heard far to the north. In August 1841 the United States sub-agent of the Osages wrote to the Houston Telegraph as follows: "Gentlemen: The Osage people have not long since returned from their summer's hunt on the southwestern part of the Grand Prairie, bringing with them two white persons which they purchased from

---

[1] Garrison, Texas, 334; Yoakum, History of Texas, II, 398-399; Morphis, History of Texas, 424.

[2] Yoakum, History of Texas, II, 300-301; Morrell, Flowers and Fruits, 134; Brown, History of Texas, II, 178-183.

Comanche Indians while out: one a young Spanish woman, the other a girl of nine or ten years old, said to have been taken from the people of Texas. The Osages say these people have many white prisoners among them. They say further that the Comanches are only waiting for the leaves to fall from the trees, to make a general attack upon the whole frontier of Texas. Propositions were made for the Osages to send them four hundred warriors, which the Osages refused on account of their friendship for white people. A pipe has been sent to many, if not all the tribes on this side the mountains. How far they may succeed time will show alone. They have appointed a place of general rendezvous somewhere not far from you, but of what precise place, I am unable to learn from the Osages.

The fall season is close at hand, and fearing you might not be apprized of these movements, has induced me to give you this statement, which I now have from the Osage people."

In a postscript this agent adds that he had learned the same things from another source; that several hundred other men, supposedly Mexicans, were cooperating with the Comanches, and that these Indians were reported to "have some 75 or 100 white children."[1]

While south and west Texas were thus harassed by the ubiquitous Comanches north Texas was undergoing similar trials

---

[1] Niles' National Register, LXI, 66.

at the hands of the civilized tribes. Brown[1] says that "From the first settlements along and near Red river in the counties of Fannin and Grayson, covering the years from 1837 to 1843, the few and scattered inhabitants were at no time free from the sneaking savages, who in small parties, often clandestinely entered the vicinity of one or more of the new settlers and lay in wait till opportunity should offer for their murderous assaults under circumstances promising them greater or less immunity from danger to themselves. The number of such inroads during those years was considerable, and relatively many lives were lost, besides quite a number of women and children were carried into captivity.[2]

The same author tells[3] of the capture of the two daughters of a Dr.Hunter in 1840 who had just located near Old Warren on Red River. One of them was killed on the spot. Of the other Brown says: "Months passed and no tidings came of the missing one; but perhaps a year later the father and son learned that a party of Choctaws had bought such a child from the wild Indians. The son hastened into the country of those friendly people and after three or four days' travel, found and recovered his sister." In the latter part of 1840 Indians attacked the home of Captain

---

[1] Brown, Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas, 100.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., 100-101.

John Yeary in Fannin county. In the following spring they fell upon the Ripley family in Titus county, killing the mother and several children and burning the house. The whites organized a retaliatory expedition, captured a squaw and child, killed one Indian woman, and carried away "eighty horses, a considerable number of copper kettles, many buffalo robes and other stuff. ... the Indian woman escaped on the way in. Gen. Tarrant kept the child, but it was restored to its mother some two years later, at a council in the Indian Territory. .... On returning from this fruitless, indeed unfortunate, expedition, measures were set on foot for a larger one, ... Simultaneously with this assembling of the people two little boys on the Bois d'Arc, lower down, were captured and carried off by the Indians, to be recovered about two years later."[1] In 1841 settlement was pushed up the Trinity to a point near the site of the present city of Fort Worth, but this position proved untenable on account of the Indian and in the following spring it was abandoned.[2] At the same time settlements were being made around the site of the present city of Dallas, at McKinney, and to the north and east nearer Red River. "Beginning in 1842, it (this region) was rapidly settled chiefly by farmers, from Missouri, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee and other states."[3] In every case there were Indian

---

[1] Brown, Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas, 87.

[2] Ex-Governor J. W. Thochmorton, in Wooten, A Comprehensive History of Texas, 600-601.

[3] Brown, History of Texas, II, 282

depredations of the most violent character. Men were killed, property was stolen, houses were burned, and women and children murdered or carried into captivity.[1] This condition continued unchanged until the autumn of 1843, when a treaty was concluded at Bird's Fort on the Trinity, between the Republic of Texas and most of the tribes of Texas Indians.[2] The United States and Texas now entered upon a policy of cooperation in border Indian affairs[3] and, while depredations in Texas by no means ceased, they became less frequent. "At no period since the settlement of Texas did the frontier suffer so little from Indian depredations as during Jones' administration."[4]

Attempts to Control the Indian Situation in Texas

Having seen something of the character of Indian troubles in Texas it now becomes our purpose to briefly summarize the policies of Mexico and of Texas, respectively, to control the situation.

In Chapter I we gave a glimpse of the Spanish interest in the Indian of the southwest. To these interests Mexico had fallen heir, when she gained her independence. She found them

---

[1] Wooten, 602-603; Brown, Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas, 85-88.

[2] Secret Journals of the Senate, Republic of Texas, 1836-1845 in the First Beininal Report of the Texas Library and Historical commission, 288-293.

[3] Texan Diplomatic Correspondence, II, 109 et seq., Van Tandt to Jones, Jan. 20, 1843.

[4] Thrall, History of Texas, 136.

hard to control, and, for this reason, she was induced to allow Anglo-Americans to settle in Texas, hoping that they would prove a buffer against Indian aggression.[1] The Edward's revolt referred to above (p. 81) taught her to fear the Anglo-American and to hope for friendship with the Indian. Accordingly, she now began to use her troops "to overawe and control the Anglo-Americans,"[2] to check immigration from the United States,[3] and to use the Indian as a buffer against intrusion from that direction.[4] By 1830 the Anglo-Americans had become so objectionable that, on April 6 of that year, the Mexican government issued a decree prohibiting further immigration to Texas from the United States.[5] From this time forward there is little evidence, apparently, that Mexico made any effort to restrain the hostilities of the Texas Indian. In 1831 she entered into a treaty with the United States by which the two countries mutually agreed to cooperate in the control of the border Indians[6] and from which Mexico no doubt hoped to get more than she gave, but it does not appear that she

---

[1] Kennedy, I, p. 342; Texas Almanac, 1859, p. 101; Austin, An Address, in Mrs.Mary Austin Holley's Texas, p. 354.

[2] Kennedy, I, p. 364.

[3] Holley, Texas, p. 321.

[4] Marshall, A History of the Western Boundary of the Louisiana Purchase, 1819-1841, p. 134.

[5] Texas Almanac, 1859, p. 102.

[6] Malloy, I, pp. 1095-1096.

had at heart the welfare and protection of her Anglo-Texan settlers. In fact, she now began the more systematic development of the plan of alliance with the Indians[1] and, as the Anglo-Texans drew toward independence, one of their indictments against Mexico was that she had "incited the merciless savage, with the tomahark and scalping knife, to massacre the inhabitants of our defenceless frontiers".[2] The Indian policy of Mexico from this point forward has been sufficiently developed in the beginning of this chapter. It now becomes proper to briefly outline the Indian policy of the Republic of Texas.

There is no peculiarity in the fact that, so far as Texas formulated national policies and founded institutions, these were Anglo-American in character, modified by local conditions. The Indian policy was not an exception. The entire history of the Indian affairs of the republic is characterized by the traditional Anglo-American policy of carrying peace with friendship in the one hand and the sword in the other. At all times both hands were extended, but sometimes the left, sometimes the right, was the longer, depending always upon the attitude of the Indian. The Anglo-Texan was always willing to trade and treat with the Indian, but, on occasion, to fight also. The

---

[1] Texas Almanac, 1859, pp. 105, 107.

[2] The Declaration of Independence made by the Delegates of the People of Texas, in General Convention, March 2, 1836, in Kennedy, II, Appendix V, pp. 498-501.

more peaceful method characterized the policy to the autumn of 1838 and the period from January 1841 to annexation. During the interval between these two dates emphasis was placed, for practical reasons, upon the efficacy of the sword.

Contemporary with the gathering storm from Mexico a series of unprecedented Indian depredations burst upon Texas.[1] Committees of Safety were organized in a number of municipalities, whose original purpose was to offer protection against the savages, but it now began to appear desirable "to conciliate the emigrant Indians, the Cherokee, Shawnees, Kickapoos, and Caddoes".[2] A general consultation was held November 13, 1835. This body undertook to gain the friendship of the above tribes and their confederate bands by expressing confidence in the validity of the Mexican land grants to these Indians. It also resolved to send commissioners to treat with these Indians, establish their boundary lines, and "secure their confidence and friendship."[3] On the following February 23 the commission appointed under this declaration, with Sam Houston as chairman, concluded a treaty with the Cherokees, Shawnees, Delawares, Kickapoos, Quapaws, Choctaws, Boluxies, Iawonies, Alabamas,

---

[1] Texas Almanac, 1859, p. 113; Baker, A Texas Scrap Book, p.198

[2] Texas Almanac, 1859, pp. 113, 115.

[3] Yoakum, II, p. 63.

Cochatties, Caddos of the Neches, Tahoocattakes, and Unataquous Since this treaty contains the germ of the peace policy as later developed considerable space is given it.[1]

After entering into the customary "firm and lasting peace forever," it was agreed that "the before named Tribes, or Bands shall have and possess the lands within the following bounds, towit:" etc. Having set forth the boundaries between whites and Indians, it was provided that "the usual Bands or Tribes named in this Treaty, shall all remove within the limits or bounds as before described"; that "the commissioners on behalf of the Government of Texas bind themselves, to prevent in future all persons from intruding within the said bounds"; that "no individual person, member of the tribes before named, shall have power to sell or lease land to any person or persons, not a member or members of this community of Indians, nor shall any citizen of Texas be allowed to lease or buy land from any Indian or Indians"; that "the Government of Texas shall have power to regulate Trade and intercourse, but no Tax shall be levied on the Trade of the Indians"; that "the parties to this Treaty agree that one or more agencies, shall be created and at least one agent shall reside, specially, within the Cherokee Villages, whose duty it shall be to see that no injustice is done them, or

---

[1] For the full treaty see Report 1, 1909-10, of the Texas Library and Historical Commission, pp. 36 et seq.

other members of the community of Indians"; that "all the Lands and improvements now occupied by any of the before named Bands or Tribes, not lying within the limits before described shall belong to the Government of Texas and subject to its disposal"; that "all the Bands or Tribes ---- shall remove within the before described limits, within eight months from the date of this Treaty."[1]

While this treaty was an emergency agreement and was eventually rejected by the Senate it is significant in the following respects. First, it sought the friendship of the Indian and was willing to pay for it. Second, it recognized the principle of segregation and hence made double provision for the removal of these tribes to definite territories. Third, it embodied the idea of maintaining trading relations with these Indians and to that end provided for the sending of agents among them.

As to whether or not this treaty was accepted in good faith by the Indians with whom it was negotiated little evidence has been found. If it had any effect in allaying the danger of Indian aggression and reducing the likelihood of the violation of neutrality, the United States paid no attention to it, for at that very time she was mobilizing on her southwestern boundary and the process went on uninterrupted. When Burnett became

---

[1] For the treaty itself the reader is referred to Report 1, 1909-10, of the Texas Library and Historical Commission, pp. 36 et seq.

President, the Indians, no doubt, were even more inclined to be hostile than before, knowing his traditional attitude toward them. At any rate, hostilities grew apace and in June, 1836 Burnet wrote Gaines that an Indian incursion just at that time would be disastrous; that the commanding influence of the General and the government of the United States would be sufficient to restrain the hostile disposition of the immigrant tribes; and that their withdrawal from the contest between Mexico and Texas "would be peculiarly gratifying," to those whom he represented.[1] General Gaines remained on the eastern border of Texas until the Mexican crisis had passed, but not until the danger of the violation of neutrality by the Indian was over.[2]

Meanwhile, a body of Rangers was organized as a protection against Indian hostilities, and now did yoemen's service in neutralizing the work of Mexican agents among the Texas Indians.[3]

In October 1836 Houston became President of the new Republic and began in earnest a peace policy. In his inaugural address he said: "Treaties of peace and annuity, and the maintenance of good faith with the Indians, seems to me the most rational means for winning their friendship. Let us abstain from aggression, establish commerce, supply their necessary wants, maintain even-

---

[1] Texas, Almanac, 1860, p. 46, footnote.

[2] The army of the United States was withdrawn from Nacogdoches in the winter of 1836-7.

[3] Garrison, Texas, p. 233.

handed justice with them, and natural reason will teach them the utility of our friendship."[1] Accordingly a number of treaties were formed during 1837,[2] and regulations adopted looking to the establishment of agencies among the Indians.

Meanwhile, Indian atrocities, as we have seen in an earlier part of this chapter, were almost daily increasing. A number of circumstances were shaping to force the abandonment of the incipient policy. It is only necessary here to mention these circumstances, for each of them has been discussed in its appropriate place in an earlier part of this study. First was the circumstance of the westwood movement, which had been dammed up at the western boundaries of Missouri and Arkansas in 1830 by the passage of the Indian Territory act, and was now using Texas as a spill-way. Second was the removal policy of the United States which was now at its height and, which, as we have seen in Chapter II of this study, caused an Indian "spill-over" into Texas. Third was the maturing of the Mexican plot, which had been in process of development for a number of years.

In the face of such forces something had to be done. Smoking peace pipes and giving presents did not suffice. Accordingly the first act of the Congress that assembled in November 1838, and which was approved by President Houston on the 7th of that month, set aside twenty thousand dollars for fitting out militia,

---

[1] Linn, Reminiscences of Fifty Years in Texas, p. 279.

[2] Secret Journals of the Senate, pp. 76, 79, 80.

twenty thousand for obtaining arms, ammunitions, provisions and clothing for the troops on the northern frontier, and authorized General Rusk to draw immediately upon the Custom House officers for ten thousand. The next two acts were likewise Joint Resolutions dealing with the same subject - frontier protection, and that Congress appropriated a total of $170,000 for the army, most of which was intended for use against the Indians.[1] In view of these facts and the terrible atrocities of the period it appears that circumstances were rapidly driving the young Republic into a policy of "War to the knife and the knife to the hilt."[2]

The incoming administration seized the nettle without gloves. On December 21, 1838, in his first message to Congress, President Lamar made known his views on this absorbing topic. "He had not been informed of the origin and character of the disturbances in Eastern Texas; but he maintained that the Indians,

---

[1] Laws of the Republic of Texas, 3d Cong., 1st sess., pp.1-2.

[2] It has been commonly taught that the change in Indian policy in Texas came with the change in the Executive and was due to the different character and policies of Houston and Lamar. As a matter of fact, the peace policy was being abandoned in the later days of Houston's administration because of the combination of circumstances recited above. Houston was indisposed both to make and to acknowledge the change, but it is practically certain that he could not have averted impending conflict had he remained President. Lamar struggled with a situation that he inherited rather than created and paved the way for the reinauguration of the peace policy in the early '40s.

whether native or intrusive had no just cause of complaint. The emigrant tribes had no legal or equitable claim to any portion of the territory: they came as intruders, were positively forbidden to make any permanent abidance, and had continued against the public wish, and at the sacrifice of public tranquility. The offer made to bordering Indians in the colonization law of Coahuila and Texas carried with it precedent conditions which had in no instance been complied with by any of the tribes. To the Mexican authorities of that state they were objects of disquietude and terror, and if they, in any instance, promised lands to their chiefs, they were either stimulated by fear, or induced by a design to array the tomahawk and scalping knife against the Anglo-Americans of Texas, upon whom such promises (if ever made) imposed no moral obligations. With respect to the pledge of the Consulation in 1835, and the consequent treaty, the latter had, never been ratified by a competent authority, and, if it had, still there was a reciprocity of obligation to which the Indians had not adhered by rendering allegiance to the Republic. ... His solicitude for due protection to the frontier had partially overruled his habitual repugnance to standing armies. In the disturbed state of their foreign and Indian relations, the proper security of the country at large especially the peace and safety of the border settlements, seemed to require the organization of a regular, permanent, and effective force."

---

[1] Kennedy, Texas, vol.II, pp. 329-330.

On the very day that this message was submitted Congress passed and the President approved "An act to provide for the protection of the Northern and Western Frontier." This act greatly increased the size of the army, gave it a thorough organization, and provided for its division into eight detachments, stationed at regular intervals from Red River to the Nueces. The act also provided that "a military road shall be laid off from, at, or near, the mouth of the Kiamishua Red River to the river Nueces, at the intersection of the road from Bexar to the presidio del Rio Grande; for which purpose an engineer of experience shall be appointed by the President, whose duty it shall be, in conjunction with the Colonel of that regiment thus created to examine and mark and stake out said road, over such ground and to be run in such manner as the Colonel and Engineer may deem most judicious; which road is hereby declared to be a public highway, and shall be sufficiently cleared and bridged to admit the passage of wagons": "That it shall be the duty of the Colonel to select such positions on the road as will be best calculated for the erection of forts, except the post on Red River, which post shall be at or near the upper settlement on said river, and for the defence and protection of the country subject at all times to such instructions as they may receive from the President": "that ... it shall be the duty of the Colonel to cause three leagues square of land to be laid off around each station" parts of which were reserved to the Government, "for purposes of fortification, farming, etc." It

was further provided that the men or parts of them should traverse "the space between each station twice a day"; that trading posts should be established at or near the posts; that "ardent spirits, arms or munitions of war should not be sold at or within ten miles of such trading houses"; and finally "That for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this Act, the sum of three hundred thousand dollars be, and the same is hereby appropriated."[1] The act contains twenty-five sections and conveys throughout the very distinct impression of throughness and maturity of purpose, as well as a distinct change in the general attitude of the government toward the Indian problem.

There followed a series of similar and supplementary acts, enlarging the militia and making appropriations for protection against the Indians.[2] This congress closed its labors by appointing, on January 26, a commission "to take charge of the property of those engaged in the late rebellion in the country of Nacogdoches"[3] It had appropriated for use among and against the Indians the sum of $1,430,000.

The Fourth Congress was scarcely less thorough-going in its methods. The appropriation bill carried the following items, which reveal something as to the Indian policy: "For expenses

---

[1] Laws of the Republic of Texas, 3d Cong., 1st sess., p. 12.

[2] Ibid., pp. 12-16; ibid., 245; ibid., p. 26; ibid., p. 41; ibid., p. 70.

[3] Ibid., p. 131.

removing the Shawnee Indians, fifteen thousand dollars; for compensation of Indian Agents of the Coshattee and Alabama Indians, including back pay, and for the present year, eighteen hundred dollars; . . . . . for pay to officers and men of the first regiment of infantry one hundred and seventy-eight thousand and fifty-six dollars; for subsistence of officers and men of the first regiment of infantry, eleven hundred and fifty-two dollars; for clothing for servants of officers of the first regiment of infantry one thousand five hundred and thirty dollars." The cavalry was provided for in similar fashion. Thirty-five thousand two hundred and eighty dollars were set aside for the recruiting service twenty-two thousand five hundred and twenty dollars for bounty to soldiers; one hundred and forty-three thousand five hundred and twenty dollars for expenses in the Quarter-Master-General's Department, besides a contingent expense for same to the amount of thirty-one thousand dollars; sixty thousand four hundred and seventy dollars and fifty-four cents for clothing, knapsacks, haversacks, etc.; ten thousand dollars for one hundred mules for twenty-five wagons; "for horses for twelve companies, sixty-seven thousand two hundred dollars," and for pork or bacon, beef, flour, corn-meal, soap, salt, vinegar, peas or beans, rice, coffee, and sugar two hundred and thirteen thousand one hundred and fifty dollars and forty-seven cents. Besides these there were many other items, bringing the total for that year to

$1,042,811.01[1]

On January 14 President Lamar approved an act providing "That the President be and he is hereby authorized and required, at as early a period as practicable, to have surveyed two leagues of land, including the village of the Coshattee Indians, also two other leagues of land including the fenced in village of the Alabama tribe of Indians for the entire and exclusive use and benefit of said tribes of Indians until otherwise provided for by the law; " ... "That the President be and he is hereby authorized and required to have surveyed on the vacant lands of this Republic, thirty miles square, at some proper point on the frontier, on which all the friendly Indians, within the Republic shall be placed as soon as circumstances will permit." "That the Government shall at all times, exercise exclusive jurisdiction over the soil included in the surveys contemplated by this act, and also criminal jurisdiction over the aforesaid tribes of Indians." "That the President be and he is hereby authorized and required to appoint an Indian Agent for the Coshattee and Alabama tribes

---

[1] Yoakum, vol.II, p. 282, gives as a total "of the appropriations made by Texas on account of the Indians" in 1840, $1,027,319. His figures are compiled from a speech made in the United States Senate in 1854 by Senator Rusk who based his own calculations upon "a statement from under the hand of James B. Shaw, controller of Texas, dated March 20th of that year, showing the expenses incurred by the republic of Texas in maintaining peace with and protecting her frontier from the incursions of Indians removed thither and belonging to the United States." It will be seen from this statement that there is not necessarily any conflict between these statistics. Also, Laws of the Republic of Texas, Fourth Congress, p. 207.

of Indians with such instructions and powers as may be necessary to accomplish the object contemplated by this act. ... "That whenever it shall be deemed expedient to remove said tribes of Indians, and they are actually removed off of said reserved lands, the same shall be held subject to the future disposition of Congress."[1]

It appears, then, from the Congressional Record of the Republic of the year 1840 that Texas was relying largely at this time upon the use of her strong right arm in dealing with the Indians and that as far as the hostile tribes were concerned, she had clearly adopted the policy of both expulsion and extermination. But toward the more peaceful and friendly Indians she was willing to be merciful: She sent agents among them to cultivate peaceful relations: She granted money for their support in times of hardship: She gave them tracts of land in compact bodies to be theirs, at least until Texas should decide again to remove them. In this last named fact is evidence that she realized that the separation of the two races was necessary to the happiness of at least the whites.

But as the year drew to a close it became more and more evident that such an elaborate military program was too expensive for the struggling republic. The national credit, already low when Lamar's administration was inaugurated, continued to decline,

---

[1] Laws of the Republic of Texas, Fourt Congress, pp. 197-198.

so that by 1841 the red backs, as Texas currency was called,[1] was worth only about ten or fifteen cents on the dollar.[2] Moreover, the credit of the nation was in no better condition. Attempts at borrowing failed[3] and the government was essentially without bread and butter.[4] Manifestly something had to be done; and one thing worth while would be the reduction of expenses. Accordingly, on January 18, 1841, Acting President Burnet approved a measure providing for the abolition of a number of officers. This act affected the military organization by eliminating the offices of Colonel of Ordinance, Quarter-Master-General, Commissary General of Subsistence, Surgeon General, and adjutant and Inspector General. Moreover, it further enacted "That the President be, and he is hereby required to reduce the number of officers in the Regular Army, to a number proportioned to the number of privates and that all further recruiting be discontinued until a further action of congress."[5] But this policy of retrenchment in the matter of national defense had more in its favor than

---

[1] Thrall, History of Texas, p. 125.

[2] Gouge, Fiscal History of Texas, p. 118.

[3] Ibid., Chap.XVI.

[4] It may be of significance in this connection that President Lamar, who had inspired and executed such a vigorous program against the Indians, became ill in the autumn of 1840 and was granted a leave of absence in December of that year. Vice President Burnet, therefore, was at the helm during the session of the Fifth Congress.

[5] Laws of the Republic of Texas, Fifth Congress, p. 106.

financial embarassments. "During the year 1841 the Indians were less bold than for several years before. The terrible chastisements they had received had taught them caution, and their depredations were confined to small bands. A few expeditions against them were practically fruitless, as, on discovering parties penetrating their country, they fled beyond pursuit."[1] Thus it would seem that the necessity for such elaborate military organization and such vigorous Indian measures had, for the time at least, passed. Accordingly the appropriation bill, approved February 5, 1841, carried a total for the War Department, including salaries for the Secretary and his assistants and also five thousand dollars "for running the military road to Red River", of only ninety-seven thousand three hundred dollars.[2] This amount is less than one-tenth of the appropriation for the same purpose of each of the two preceding years of Lamar's administration (See above) and a little more than one-half of that of the last year of Houston's first term.

In spite, however, of all efforts at retrenchment the country seemed hopelessly involved, money was uncomfortably scarce, and, as usual under such circumstances, the administration had to carry the responsibility for all ills. Burnet became the administration candidate for the presidency, as Lamar's

---

[1] Brown, History of Texas, vol. II, p. 197.

[2] The same bill carried for all purposes for this year $547,980 Laws of the Republic of Texas, Fifth Session, pp. 107-111.

term would expire in December, 1841. Houston became the candidate of those who were dissatisfied with Lamar, and who believed always that "Old Sam" was equal to any emergency. The chief plank in his platform was an economic administration of the government and to this end the policy of treating and trading with the wild Indians should be restored. According to Brown,[1] "The west and frontier preferred Burnet", while "the eastern and central sections, much the most populous, supported General Houston." It would be indeed hazardous to assert that Houston's election was proof of the popularity of his Indian policy, for General Edward Burleson, a veteran Indian fighter, was at the same time chosen Vice-President. Moreover, as indicated above, there was already a decided change in that policy in the last year of Lamar's administration. The Indians across the border within the United States were becoming more settled, because the policy of removal was not pushed with vigor after 1840,[2] and the drubbing which the Cherokees and Comanches had received in Texas had sent the one back across the border into the United States[3] and the other to the Buffalo Plains

---

[1] History of Texas, vol. II, p. 197.

[2] Miss Lucy B. Textor, who has written a most scholarly monograph on the "Official Relations between the United States and the Sioux Indians," fixes the year 1838 as the date of the practical expiration of this policy. See above, p. 24.

[3] Reagan, Texas State Historical Association Quarterly, I, p.46

to recuperate or to try their fortune elsewhere. But since the old circumstances which had driven the government to the policy of extermination were passing away, it was a safe campaign issue and the new administration found it easy to carry on the work of retrenchment in the army that already had been begun in the previous administration and to renew the policy of treating and trading.

On December 20, in his first message to Congress, the new executive "recommended that trading posts be established along the frontier, that traders be permitted to traffic with the Indians at these posts, and that a force of some twenty-five men be stationed at each. He further recommended the making of treaties with the Indian tribes; declaring that when the latter found that Texas was disposed to treat them kindly, confidence would be restored, and the interests of trade would keep them quiet; that millions of dollars had been expended in the attempt to exterminate them, but it had served only to irritate, and war and theft were the result. With an amount less than one fourth of former appropriations he firmly believed he could procure and maintain peace with all the tribes on the Texas border."[1] Two days before this, the new Congress which was likewise retrenchant, had followed up the work of the presiding body by abolishing a number of offices, among them "the Commissory of Subsistence, and Quarter-Master of the Regular Army", as well as greatly reducing the salaries of those retained.[2] The appropriation bill of this

---

[1] Yoakum, History of Texas, vol.II, p. 337.

[2] Laws of the Republic of Texas, Sixth Congress, p. 13.

President shall cause to be laid before Congress, at each regular session, a report of the affairs and transactions of the Indian Bureau, with his views and recommendation in relation thereto -- That the President shall have power --- to appoint interpreters ... that the President shall have power to appoint as many agents, not exceeding four, as may be necessary for the preservation of peace among the border tribes. .... That all agents shall report at least twice a year to the Executive ... That the President shall cause to be established trading-houses or posts; which posts or trading-houses shall be established as follows, to wit: etc. .... That the traders shall be appointed and licensed by the President ... and at all times be subject to the instructions of the President." Succeeding sections define very carefully the limitations under which all agents were to operate and fix penalties for all violations of the law governing such matters. The act then proceeds to forbid introduction of ardent spirits, warlike stores, etc. among the Indians and prescribes "that the Indians shall not come below the line of this territory, without special permission of an agent, and then only when accompanied by one or more white men, appointed by the agent for that purpose"; and, "that no person ... shall, without special permission of the President, pass the line of trading-houses, and then only for friendly purposes"; that the President shall have power to make such arrangements and regulations with the several tribes of Indians as he may deem expedient for the establishment and preser-

vation of peace, and the promotion of the common welfare."[1]

From this time forward to the end of the Republic the peace policy was pursued without interruption. On September 29, 1843 a treaty was signed with practically all of the tribes except the Comanches at Bird's Fort some twenty miles west of the present city of Dallas. This treaty prescribed the conditions of traffic with the Indians, forbidding the introduction of liquor, arms, and ammunition, provided for the complete and permanent separation of the two races, and empowered the President of the Republic of Texas to send among the Indians blacksmiths, mechanics, school-masters, and missionaries. The government reserved the right of working all mines and agreed to give annuities. A line of demarcation was agreed upon, along which trading houses were to be established - a line far in advance of the line of white settlement.[2] The appropriation bill for this year carried the meager sum of ten thousand dollars for Indian purposes.[3]

In the autumn of the next year a treaty was concluded at Tahwaccano Creek which included most of the above tribes and the Comanches and provided for annual councils composed of "chiefs from both the whites and the Indians."[4]

---

[1] Laws of the Republic of Texas, Seventh Congress, pp. 19-21.

[2] Secret Journal of the Senate, Eighth Congress, pp. 288-293.

[3] Laws of the Republic of Texas, Eighth Congress, p. 108.

[4] Secret Journal of the Senate, Eighth Congress, p. 106 and p. 311.

In the latter part of 1842 Texas and the United States began to cooperate in matters of Indian control,[1] Mexican intrigue lost its efficacy, Texas was becoming more populous and strong and the policy of Indian removal by the United States had been practically abandoned. From this time forward, therefore, the Indian problem in Texas was much simplified. She had a fairly well-defined and stable policy and profited greatly by the cooperation of the United States, an unmixed blessing until disturbed by the fact of annexation.

---

[1] Texan Diplomatic Correspondence, II, 103, 109, 214, 315, 410, etc.

Chapter V.

THE EFFORTS OF THE UNITED STATES TO CONTROL THE INDIAN SITUATION IN THE SOUTHWEST

The Movement to Establish Civil Government among the Indians

Having noticed the factors involved in the Indian problem of the Southwest and some of the conditions that these factors produced, it now becomes our purpose to enquire into the plans and purposes of the United States for the control of the situation. Did the United States foresee the consequences of her removal policy? If so, what provision did she make to meet them? If not, why not, and did she make any attempt to retrieve her mistakes? These are some of the many questions that a normal curiosity would suggest and the answer to which will appear in this chapter.

The subject falls naturally into three parts: 1. The Movement to establish civil government in the Indian Territory. 2. Attempts to civilize the Indian. 3. Military Activity.

In discussing the first of these phases of Indian control - the movement to establish civil government among the Indians - little more is here attempted than to summarize Miss Abel's "Proposals for an Indian State, 1778-1878,"[1] though in places

---

[1] Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1907, vol. I, pp. 87-103.

I have given different interpretations to the facts.

Just as the removal idea had its roots imbeded in the early experience of the Republic and was nourished by the consciousness that there was natural and ineradicable incompatibility between the character and institutions of the red and the white races[1] so the idea of an Indian State found its beginnings soon after the Declaration of Independence in a treaty between the United States and the Delawares and was for a century kept alive by the humanitarian desire to civilize the Indian.[2] As the removal idea grew in favor humanitarians looked with increasing hope to the preservation and civilizing of the Indian and pressed the government for an opportunity to convert the Indian into a good citizen. One of the means to this end would be to give him exercise in the rights and duties of citizenship.

For awhile the prospects of success were by no means poor. In his annual message of December 7, 1824[3], and in a special message of January 27, 1825,[4] President Monroe suggested that civil organization might properly follow removal. At the same time, Calhoun, who was Secretary of War, recommended that to

---

[1] The Writings of Washington, vol.X, p. 305. Ford edition.

[2] Abel, Proposals for an Indian State, 1778-1878, in Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1907, I, p. 89.

[3] Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, II, p.261.

[4] Ibid., pp. 280-283.

the most solemn assurances of permanence in their new Homes "should be added a system by which the government, without destroying their independence, would gradually unite the several tribes under a simple but enlightened system of government."[1] From these and other evidences Miss Abel concludes that there was a general plan to form, in their new homes, "tribal districts with a civil administration in each and the union of the whole in prospect."[2] At any rate, Congress took these official recommendations under consideration and came within a few votes of establishing a regular Territory of the United States.[3] The matter went over to the Adam's administration and was considered favorably by the Cabinet.[4] A bill was introduced in the House providing for the establishment of an Indian Territory in the west with an administrative machinery.[5] This measure failed and the matter was revived by the twentieth Congress. According to Miss Abel it was defeated this time by southern men who were "too anxious for prompt removal to care to dillydally with the details of a governmental system."[6]

---

[1] Gales and Seaton's Register, I, Appendix, pp. 57-59. Quoted by Miss Abel.

[2] Abel, Proposals for an Indian State, 1778-1878, p. 91.

[3] Ibid., p. 92.

[4] Diary of J. Q. Adams, February 8, 1826.

[5] American State Papers, Indian Affairs, II, pp. 646-649.

[6] Proposals for an Indian State, 1778-1878, p. 93.

The Jackson administration early committed itself to the policy of removal, and accordingly approved the removal act on May 28, 1830.[1] This act contained no provision for the organization of civil administration among the removed tribes. Miss Abel thinks that the political status of the Indian ought to have been changed at this point and that civil government should have been gradually established in the Indian Territory. It is not mete here to debate that question, but it seems worth while to remark that Jackson's knowledge of Indian character and institutions was perhaps as much responsible for the failure of such a project as was the eagerness of southern statesmen to bring about removal without taking time to work out the details of civil organization. But whatever the cause of the omission of such provision from the measure, the idea of an Indian civil organization survived.

We have already seen (p. 52) that the removed Indians began early to create trouble in their new homes. This condition required investigation in 1832 and accordingly a commission was appointed by Congress in that year to look into the inter-tribal difficulties and to find out the attitude of the emigrant tribes toward the proposed Indian government.[2] This commission, in a

---

[1] United States Statutes at Large, pp. 411-412.

[2] Act of July 14, 1832; Abel, p. 95.

report to Congress, favored such a project as had been proposed theretofore.[1] Bills were introduced with this end in view in the twenty-third Congress, but all failed. Of these and succeeding bills Miss Abel says: "The chief arguments against them were, that they contemplated military rule for an indefinite period, left too much to the discretion of the President, and by holding out offices to principal men only catered to the prejudices of chiefs, who feared the abolition of tribal governments would mean a diminution of their power. Some southern men took issue on the color line, announced themselves as opposed on principles to a prospective Indian State, and declared a negro State would be just as proper and to them just as acceptable.

.... The motley crowd of Indians, predisposed, by reason of their being advanced each to a different stage of civilization, to quarrel among themselves, were a menace to the peace of the adjoining States. Many of them, being enraged at the grievous wrong that had been done them, were suspected of plotting revenge. Remember, these were the years when the Texas question was beginning to be agitated. Should war with Mexico come on this or any other pretext, the Indian might find his opportunity. Closer military sypervision, therefore, under pretense of giving training in Republican self-government, was deemed the wisest course. Strange

---

[1] Reports of Committees, 23d Cong., 1st sess., IV, no 474, pp. 78-103. Serial 263.

to say, certain army men, consilted as to ways of fortifying the frontier, declaimed against the organization of the Indian Territory on the ground that the tribes would realize the force of the old saying, 'In union there is strength.'"[1] These are interesting statements and present plausible views of the situation. It should be remembered, however, that there was always real danger in a combination of Indians on this frontier. The fear of union, however, which the military officers expressed, is not to be laughed at, or lightly ascribed to an unpatriotic selfishness that would have perpetuated anarchy without regard to the Indian's welfare or the government's safety. It is also positively known that some of the officials were of the opinion that before such an organization could be effected with success, the Indians "must be taught to work, read, and write, and be weaned from the chase,"[2] a view that would seem to have some justification in the laws of social evolution.

Bills similar to that of 1832 were introduced in 1834, 1836, 1837, and 1838,[3] each succeeding measure seeming to command a weaker following. The Secretaries of War repeatedly recommended such an organization, but the plan seemed to grow gradually

---

[1] Abel, pp. 96-97.

[2] Executive Documents, 25th Cong., 2d sess., VIII, no.276. Serial 328.

[3] Abel, p. 95, footnote.

less popular throughout the period which constitutes the subject of this study. It seems probable that the declining interest in the matter was due in no small degree to a growing realization that the Indian was yet incapable of self-government - a conviction which was gradually augmented by the disorders which we have described in the foregoing chapters. If Indian autonomy and civil organization was debatable before removal, there was scarcely more than one side to the question after removal. We come, therefore, to the inevitable conclusion that the government rejected this plan for the control of the Indian because the Indian had already demonstrated and continued to demonstrate its futility. There was, no doubt, an unworthy influence at work at various times in the consideration of this proposal, just as there has always been in the handling of big governmental problems, but we can see no adequate reason for ascribing its failure to the selfishness of interested, military officials or to the political chicanery of southern statesmen. The measure failed because it did not, as yet, deserve to succeed.

Attempts to Civilize the Indian

Coordinate with the movement to establish civil government among the Indians and drawing its inspiration from the same source was a policy which the government gave greater favor - the policy of attempting to civilize the Indian. In this matter, however, there was nothing novel. The methods adopted and the

means employed were those that the government had been following with some consistency from the beginning, viz: - the policy of sending among the Indians teachers, missionaries, blacksmiths, and other civilizing agencies. The only difference between this policy on the southwestern frontier and that previously pursued in other quarters was a difference in thoroughness of execution. It will therefore not be necessary to dwell at length on this phase of the problem. A few illustrations will be given to show at once both the character of this policy and the gradually increasing interest of the United States in its successful administration.

It may be said in the beginning that it had never been the purpose of the government, in adopting the removal policy, to rid itself of a serious and difficult responsibility to the Indian. Of course, it is true that the whites wanted the lands which the Indian occupied on the east side of the Mississippi, but there was reason in the supposition, which was frequently voiced, that the Indian himself would be served by his withdrawal from too close contact with the white man. It was thought that he would be saved from vicious influences of disreputable white men and would continue to enjoy the benefits of civilizing agencies.[1]

---

[1] Messages of the President, December 7, 1824, in Niles' Register, XXVII, pp. 236, 237, 238.

Accordingly, humanitarian plans were not omitted in inaugurating the removal policy. In the various treaties formed provision was made for "civilization funds" and the government consciously entered upon the policy of encouraging philanthropists, teachers, and churches to undertake the work of enlightening and improving the removed tribes.

A few illustrations will suffice. Take the subject of education, as an example. By the Treaty of May 6, 1828 with the Cherokees, west, the United States agreed to pay annually into the education fund of that tribe $2,000 to be expended for schools in the nation.[1] By the treaty of September 27, 1830 with the Choctaws $2,500 were set aside for schools in the nation and $12,000 for a Choctaw Academy.[2] The Creeks, west, received by the treaty of March 24, 1830, $3,000[3] The Chicksaws, treaty of May 24, 1834, received $3,000. Other tribes were provided for similarly, so that by 1837 the government was making an annual contribution to the education fund to the amount of $60,720.[4] Besides this, Congress regularly made special appropriations to this cause, amounting to several thousand dollars annually.[5] This money was expended in part by the government

---

[1] Report of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, November 28,1840, in House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 2d sess., I, no. 2, p. 309. Serial 382.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., pp. 298, 299.

direct to the Indian schools, but more often through the Mission Boards of the various churches. Practically all of the leading denominations apparently shared in the expenditure of these funds. The most active, however, seem to have been Methodist, Baptist, Catholic, Protestant Episcopal, and Presbyterian.[1]

The denomination seems to have used largely its own methods, though the government made recommendations as to courses of study, etc. The instruction covered usually the ordinary elementary branches and in addition thereto religious instruction.[2] Occasionally a school departed from the beaten path. The following excerpt from the official report of a manual-labor school under the superintendency of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in the Fort Leavenworth agency illustrates this point. "Out of the school room the boys were taught to split rails, plough, mow, etc. When the workshop now in progress is completed, it is intended to teach them the carpenter's blacksmith's, and other mechanical trades; .....

As I happened to call on the day set apart for washing, the girls' school was not in operation. They are taught the same branches, but in a separate room. Besides ordinary household duties, they learn spinning, weaving, etc.; and it is expected that they will ultimately, make most of the clothing used in the establishment.

---

[1] Report of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, November 28,1840, in House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.2, p.431; ibid., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.2, p. 431. Serial 363.

[2] Any of the annual reports of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs after 1836 will indicate something as to the character of the course of study.

Two three-story brick buildings (one for the farmer, the other for the boys' school and lodging) have been erected, and are scarcely finished. A third, for the girls, is under way. There is, also, a frame building occupied by the principal, Mr. Browning; another for the blacksmith's residence; a blacksmith shop, barn, stables, etc.

Between five and six hundred acres are fenced and under cultivation, ..."[1]

Of a different character was the report of the Delaware Baptist Mission School, September 25, 1843. "The branches taught are reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, astronomy, and natural philosophy. Some attention has also been given to drawing and vocal music. ... All are boarded, and clothed at the expense of the institution. In addition to our day-school, we have a Sabbath School at the station every Lord's day. ..... Three more recently joined our church by baptism, upon profession of their faith in Christ."[2]

The report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for 1839 showed that there were ten Choctaw schools, three Creek schools, and several among the Cherokees. There were also schools for the

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.2, pp. 387-388. Serial 382.

[2] House Ex. Docs., 28th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.2, pp. 321-322. Serial 439.

Shawnee, Kickapoos, Pottowatomies, Ottoes, and others.[1]

Most of the reports touching the subject of education are quite flattering, but, granting that they are not overdrawn (a rather liberal concession), they do not indicate any very great success for this part of the government's policy, for no report shows an attendance at Indian schools for any one year, in the whole United States, in excess of 2,000 pupils. Apparently, then, this feature of the attempt to control the Indian in the southwest may be regarded as a failure. The Indian did not want to go to school and there was no way of compelling him to do so.

Along with the school usually went other agencies. The government often sent smiths of different kinds, distributed farming implements, seeds, and, in some cases, teams, gave medicines, salt, corn, tobacco, and other presents, and distributed annuities among them regularly.[2] The purpose of all these measures was to encourage them to settle down to agricultural pursuits and become self-supporting, the government protecting them, in the meantime, in some degree from hunger, sickness, and other hardships incident to removal. As seen in another connection, these means often and constantly proved horribly inadequate, but they nevertheless demonstrated the attitude and the policy of the government.

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.2, p. 432. Serial 363.

[2] House Ex. Docs., 25th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.3, p.626 et seq.

Besides these positive measures for the improvement of the Indian, there was also the purpose to shield him from the evil influences of selfish and designing men. In a previous chapter we have discussed the evil effect of the introduction of liquor into the Western Territory. According to both official and unofficial information this traffic was exceedingly persistent and unscrupulous, and not only degraded the Indian, but also hindered the plans and purposes of national administration.

The government was neither blind nor indifferent to this fact. The act approved July 9, 1832, by which the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs was created, made it unlawful to introduce, under any pretense, liquor into the Indian country.[1] This act proved inadequate and Congress took up the matter again. By act approved June 30, 1834 "to regulate trade and intercourse with Indian tribes, and to preserve peace on the frontier" Congress made it unlawful for any person to "sell, exchange or give, barter or dispose of, any apirituous liquor or wine to an Indian, or attempt to "introduce, any spirituous liquor or wine into the Indian country, except such supplies as shall be necessary for the officers of the United States and troops of the service, under the direction of the War Department,"

---

[1] Dunlop, Laws of the United States, 1789-1856, pp.817-818.

and prescribed a penalty therefor. It further enacted that "if any superintendent of Indian affairs, Indian agent, sub-agent, or commanding officer of a military post, has reason to suspect or is informed, that any white person or Indian is about to introduce, or has introduced, any spirituous liquor or wine into the Indian country, ... , it shall be lawful for such superintendent, Indian agent, or sub-agent, or military officer, ... , to cause the boats, stores, packages, and places of deposite of such persons to be searched, and, if any such spirituous liquor or wine is found, the goods, boats, packages, and peltries of such person shall be seized and delivered to the proper officer, and shall be proceeded against by libel in the proper court, and forfeited, one-half to the use of the informer, and the other half to the use of the United States.[1] This act, however, did not stop the evil. Officials continued to complain of the disregard for the law and the disastrous consequences thereof.[2] For some reason, however, the government hesitated or procrastinated for a number of years, seeking, perhaps, a more vigorous execution of the existing law, depending, it may be, upon state and territorial legislation,[3] or perchance, fearing for political reasons to tamper further with

---

[1] House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, p. 652. Serial 321.

[2] See pp. 38-45.

[3] Missouri, Iowa, and Arkansas all enacted laws regulating whiskey traffic with the Indian. House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.2, pp. 241-242. Serial 382.

so powerful an organization. It was not, at any rate, until March 3, 1847 that the government passed an amendatory measure whereby the violation of the act of 1834 was punished by imprisonment.[1] The efficacy of this last measure is a subject which lies beyond the limits of this paper. It is only desired here to call attention to the fact that, whatever its virtue, it came too late to relieve the disaster that the traffic wrought in the days of removal and immediately thereafter. As in its policy of educating the Indian, the government's efforts at warding off the evil consequences of the liquor traffic failed in large measure. The failure was not due to a lack of policy, but to a lack of vigorous execution of the policy adopted.

Milirary Activity as a means of controlling the Indian on the Southwestern Frontier

As the process of removal went forward it became increasingly evident that theorizing about the establishment of civil government among the emigrant tribes and attempting to civilize them through the agency of schools, missions, and blacksmithshops would prove entirely inadequate for all practical purposes The ministry of the humanitarian must be supported and supplemented by the power of the soldier. Accordingly, the War Department

[1] Dunlop, Laws of the United States, 1789-1856, p. 1154.

became an important, indeed the chief, instrument for the control of the situation.

The importance of keeping a division of the army in the far west had gradually increased as the frontier had moved in that direction. When the Santa Fe trade was opened in 1821-1822 the danger to the caravans from the wild tribes made necessary the sending of military escort and emphasized the need of military protection to that part of the country. By the time the process of removal was well under way a number of forts had been established along the frontier from the upper waters of the Mississippi along the west line of Missouri and Arkansas and thence southeastward to the Gulf of Mexico at New Orleans, as follows: Fort Snelling on the upper Mississippi, Fort Crawford at Prairie du Chien, M. T., Fort Armstrong at Rock Island, Illinois Fort Leavenworth on the right bank of the Missouri near the Little Platte, Jefferson Barracks near St.Louis, Missouri, Fort Gibson on the left bank of the Arkansas at the mouth of the Neosho River, Fort Coffee on the opposite bank of the Arkansas a few miles below the mouth of the Canadian, Fort Jesup near Natchitoches, Louisiana, Fort Towson on the left bank of Red river near the mouth of the Kiamichi, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, New Orleans and the surrounding forts of Pike, Wood, and Jackson. Of these, Snelling, Crawford, Armstrong, New Orleans, Wood, Pike, and Jackson were only indirect supports to the others named on

this border. At the forts which directly protected the southwestern frontier there were a total of seven hundred and twenty-two soldiers, a little more than half of all the soldiers along the line above described and about one-tenth of the whole army of the United States at this time.[1] The forts on this frontier were repaired and strengthened about 1833-1834 and a number of roads built in the west. The Quartermaster General reported on November 22, 1834 that instructions had been given for the repair of the military road from Memphis to Little Rock, and to survey and open a road from Helena to the mouth of the Cache river, a road from Jackson, Lawrence county, by way of Liberty and Fayetteville to Fort Smith, a road from Strong's (a point on the Memphis-Little Rock military road) by way of the Litchfield to Batesville, and a road from Columbia to Little Rock. A road had already been opened from Fort Towson to the False Washita; also one from Fort Gibson to the Little Red river of Arkansas and thence to the mouth of the False Washita; also one direct from Fort Gibson to the point where the last named road crossed the north fork of the Canadian.[2] At the same time the Chief Engineer reported progress in the construction of a road from Memphis to St.Francis, a point twentyfive miles westward. He also reported that the channel of the Arkansas river had been cleared as far

---

[1] Report of the Secretary of War and accompanying Documents November 27, 1834, in House Docs., 23d Cong., 2d sess., I, no.2 pp. 33-309. Serial 271

[2] Ibid., p. 95.

up as Little Rock, and that further operations on this and Red river had been prevented for lack of funds. The latter stream had been cleared for seventy-five miles as far up as the Caddo agency.[1]

It will be seen from these reports that some preparation was being made to handle the situation in the southwest. The government was not entirely oblivious to the dangers in that quarter. But at the same time it was apparent to military officials in that region that these preparations were wholly inadequate. Some of them were wise enough to see that an Indian problem of no small proportions was taking form on a rapidly growing frontier. On February 8, 1832 Lewis Cass, Secretary of War, complying with a resolution of the Senate requesting information about the inland trade of Mexico, said "It is quite time that the United States should interpose, efficaciously, to put a stop as well to the depredations of the Indians against our own citizens, as to their hostilities among themselves. If this be not soon done, the evil will increase, and it will be more and more felt as the Indians east of the Mississippi migrate to the country west of that river. We shall be bound by every principle of duty to protect them; and as they will be placed in juxtaposition with the savage tribes of the plains, unless

---

[1] Report of the Secretary of War and accompanying Documents November 27, 1834, in House Docs., 23d Cong., 2d sess., I, no.2 pp. 109, 154.

we restrain the latter, a perpetual border warfare will be the consequence."[1]

Similar consequences must have been foreseen at the same time by other officials, for from the superintendency of Indian affairs at St.Louis came the prediction that unless some effectual mode should be speedily adopted to hold in check the Comanches, Kyawas, etc., the injury to hundreds of our own citizens would be severely felt; "to say nothing of the effect produced on the Indians within our own borders, (not yet half civilized) who witness the unchecked hostility of their roving neighbors, and who can scarcely refrain from an open expression of their contempt for a Government which could permit a few bands of half-starved, naked savages to prey upon as many of its citizens, to strip them of everything they possess, and even to shed their blood with impunity."[2]

Three years later these conditions must have been seen as inevitable results, which had already begun to take place. Mr. Cass then said that it was well known, that some of the Western tribes of Indians, roaming through the extensive prairies west of Arkansas and Missouri, particularly the Comanches and Kiowas, had, for some years, interrupted the peace of that quarter, by predatory attacks upon citizens, and upon the indigenous and

---

[1] Senate Docs., 32d Cong., 1st sess., II, no.90, 4. Serial 213

[2] Ibid., p. 8.

emigrant Indians, whom the United States was under obligations to protect. Their war parties had annoyed our citizens, in their intercourse with the Mexican States, and had rendered the communication difficult and hazardous. It had become necessary to put a stop to this state of things, either by amicable representations or by force.[1] Further on in this same report Mr. Cass said: "The system of removal has changed essentially by the prospects of the emigrants, and has imposed new obligations on the United States. A vast tract of country, containing much more than one hundred million of acres, has been set apart for the permanent residence of these Indians, and already about thirty thousand have been removed to it. ..... . This extensive district, embracing a great variety of soil and climate has been divided among the several tribes, and definite boundaries assigned to each. They will there be brought into juxtaposition with one another, and also into contact, and possibly into collision with the native tribes of that country; and it seems highly desirable that some plan should be adopted for the regulation of the intercourse among these divided communities, and for the exercise of a general power of supervision over them, so far as these objects can be effected consistently with the power of Congress, and with the various treaty stipulations existing with them. It is difficult,

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 23d Cong., 2d sess., I, no.2, 33. Serial 271.

indeed, to conceive how peace can be preserved, and the guarantee of protection held out to the Eastern Indians, fulfilled, without some legislative provision upon this subject."[1]

Congress was slow to take action in the direction indicated by these reports. But in February 1836 the Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in the Senate requested the Department of War to submit its views as to the best method for the protection of the frontiers exposed to the hostile incursions of the Indians. In reply the Quartermaster General, said, among other things, that the Indians north of Red river, if united, might bring into the field perhaps twenty thousand warriors, and their numbers were daily increasing by the emigrating tribes from Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida. Many of the emigrants occupied, he said, their new positions under the influence of hostile feelings, the result of real or imaginary wrongs; and for the purposes of vengeance would readily united with the native tribes, who naturally viewed with jealousy the steady progress of population westward, in any measures against the United States which should promise even temporary success; and even were the mass of them inclined to preserve peace, danger was to be apprehended from the collisions among themselves, and their misunderstandings with frontier settlers. The better, and indeed the only way, to preserve peace

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 23d Cong., 2d sess., I, no.2, p. 40.

among them and to pretect them,and the white settlers, was to establish a strong cordon of posts along the whole line, with one or more advanced posts on the Missouri; and if found necessary, on the Arkansas and Red rivers also, with good roads communicating between them, and from them to the interior. The posts should be fortified, and the garrisons should be sufficiently strong and well supplied to resist any sudden attack, and hold out if besiged; and there should be a mounted force constantly patrolling the road, and whenever circumstances should render such a measure advisable, strong detachments of dragoons or mounted riflemen should make excursions even into the remotest Indian country.[1] In these opinions and arguments the Secretary of War concurred most heartily repeating with emphasis most of what the Quarter Master General had said and adding with reference to the emigrated tribes that "We must expect that they will return in some measure to many of their former habits. They will, in a great degree, be strangers to one another, and to the primitive tribes occupying that region. They will form little quasi-independent communities, and will, of course, be liable to all those accidents and excitements which, even in more advanced societies, are calculated to lead to collisions. These will be increased by the peculiar views and feelings of the Indians.

---

[1] Reports of Committees, 24th Cong., 1st sess., II, no.401, 9. Serial 294.

Their institutions have a tendency to war. No warrior arriving at manhood can enjoy any estimation until he has been present where the blood of an enemy has been shed. From that period he dates his distinction, and his fame is after that proportioned to his success in war. Their civil polity is feeble, seldom providing punishments for offences, unless through the medium of the injured party. This, of course, leads to all those acts of revenge and retaliation, which disturb barbarous communities.

It is obvious, from these remarks as well as from our own experience, that we must anticipate, after the removal of the Indians, that causes of difficulties, both among themselves, and between them and our citizens, will arise, and be in continual operation."[1] There follows a plan of military preparedness very similar to that outlined by the Quarter-Master General.

In accordance with these recommendations the Committee on Military Affairs made a report on March 3, 1836 in which they declared that the nation's greatest exposure to sudden incursions was the inland frontier and that it had been too little regarded; that the savage tribes bordering upon the white settlements were more dangerous to the lives and property of the citizens than was the whole civilized world; that more effectual protection should be provided against these "creatures of passion and

---

[1] Reports of Committees, 24th Cong., 1st sess., II, no. 401, pp. 4-5. Serial 294.

momentary impulse"; that a military force should be stationed within their observation "to prevent the miseries which would result from funds among themselves, as well as the depredations which they might be tempted to commit against our own citizens"; and finally that the most economical and effectual plan to accomplish this end was that suggested by the War Department and therefore in conformity with these views the committee would report a bill."[1]

The report of the Committee was accepted by Congress and on July 2, 1836 an act was passed "to provide for the better protection of the western frontier." This law authorized the President to cause to be opened a military road from some point upon the right bank of the Mississippi, between the mouth of the St.Peter's and the mouth of the Desmoines, to Red river. It also contemplated the establishment of military posts at such points on this road as, in the judgment of the President, might seem most proper.[2]

On the following October 4 Cass was appointed Minister to France and B. T. Butler became Secretary of War ad interim. While recognizing the importance of the work already begun Butler thought that the line of posts contemplated, though probably sufficient, if well garrisoned, to protect the frontier

---

[1] Reports of Committees, 24th Cong., 1st sess., II, no. 401, pp. 1-2.

[2] Senate Docs., 24th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.125, p. 1. Serial 297.

would not be in every way adequate. He said that in order to exercise the necessary supervision over the emigrated Indians, to preserve peace among the different tribes, and to protect them from their savage neighbors, posts must necessarily be established at convenient positions in the interior of their country.

It will be seen at once that this contemplated a greater reliance upon the military arm of the government. This view may have been occasioned by a clearer vision of the probable difficulties arising out of removal, for in the same communication we find these words: "To my view, nothing is clearer than the ultimate failure of the great experiment we have commenced with the emigrated Indians, unless we secure to them, by military protection, the place and the time for the fair trial of that experiment. If we leave them unprotected, they will fade away as other tribes have faded; and the process, as in their cases, will be diversified by the same sanguinary events. The only difference will be, that, as the Indians on our Western frontier are concentrated in greater force than has ever before been known in the history of the race, their inroads, if not more frequent, will probably be more terrible and disastrous than any which have yet occurred."[1]

---

[1] Senate Docs., 24th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.1, p. 124. Serial 397.

When VanBuren became President on March 4, 1837 Joel R. Poinsett became Secretary of War. In his first annual report, December 2, 1837, we find no reference to the proposed posts and military road. He recommended the formation of a suitable Territorial Government, and the Indians' admission to such a supervisory care in the general legislation as is granted by the laws of other Territories of the United States, and for the exercise of which they appear to be sufficiently prepared. He further recommended that appropriation be made to defray the expenses of an expedition to the Comanches who had "committed outrages upon our citizens, and carried off some women."[1] On the 30th of the same month in transmitting "various reports in relation to the protection of the western frontier" in answer to a resolution of the House of Representatives, he said: "In presenting these documents, ... , I might have considered my duty fully discharged, had not other plans been previously recommended, which I regard as entirely inefficient, but which have received, in some measure, the sanction of Congress." He stated that some movements were being made toward the survey of the proposed road and the establishment of the posts, but that it had been his opinion, from the time he first considered the subject, "that such a chain of posts, strung along the best road that can be

---

[1] House Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.3, 196-197. Serial 321.

constructed, furnished with all the means to operate, and with competent garrisons to occupy them" was not calculated to afford that protection which the border states had a right to expect from the Government, nor to redeem the pledge to protect the emigrant tribes from the savage and warlike people that surrounded them. He advocated the establishment of posts within the Indian country as well as a back line within the white settlements, the latter to be used as rally points in time of special danger and pending the concentration of troops. He thought the road proposed might prove a disadvantage,and recommended the organization of an efficient frontier force, to be raised in each of the frontier states. His concluding remarks appear significant, though they throw no further light upon his plan. "I venture to hope, if these measures are adopted by Congress, and carried into effect at an early day, so as to anticipate any hostile movement of the Indians, peace will be preserved on our Western borders; but, if they should, unfortunately, be delayed until the discontent which exists among many of the tribes breaks out into open hostility, and the first movements of that wild and warlike people prove successful, as they infallibly would do in our present unprepared state, it might require double the force, and quadruple the means, I have here indicated, to restore and preserve peace along that extended frontier."[1]

[1] House Ex. Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., II, no.59, pp. 1-3. Serial 322.

These views and recommendations were supported by the reports of the subordinate officers. The Quarter-Master General advised that the lines of communication should be diverging or perpendicular to the frontier, not parallel with it, and that approximately five sevenths of the army on the Western frontier be stationed in the neighborhood of the emigrated tribes.[1] From the Engineer Department came at the same time the following significant paragraph: "Texas is in the occupancy of a people with whom the United States entertain the closest relations of friendship, which, it is believed, can never be interrupted; and, but for the peculiarity of her position, in reference to another neighbor, and the fact that the northern frontier of her territory is but sparsely settled, and consequently unable to resist or prevent the passage of an Indian war-party on its way to strike at our people, the presence of a military force near her eastern frontier, ... , would hardly be needed. Circumstanced as she is, however, both as regards her political relations, and having a large numerical force of Indians to the north, whose disposition to aggression is well understood, the occupancy of some convenient posstions, within striking distance of the lines of communication to and from her northern frontier, is rendered of prime necessity." He though the force should be only large

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., II, no. 59, pp. 9-16. Serial 322.

enough to maintain the neutrality on one side, and on the other restrain the rising disposition of the Indian hordes farther north from breaking out onto open hostilities. He then recommended a careful topographical survey of the country on both sides of Red river, the freeing of the navigable streams tributary to the Mississippi from all obstructions to the head of navigation, the renovation of the posts at Jesup and Towson, and the working of the roads leading from the interior of Louisiana to the crossings of the Sabine. Along the line north from Towson to a point on the Missouri near but north of the Great Platte he saw especial danger. There were more than twenty-five thousand warriors in this vicinity and "should they be induced to unite for purposes offensive and defensive" they would probably "give vent to their long-suppressed desire to revenge past wrongs, which is restrained, they openly and freely declare, by fear alone. That such a union will be formed at no distant day, we have every reason to believe; and the period may be accelerated by their growing wants, and the policy of Mexico to annoy Texas, and raise an impenetrabel barrier in the direction of her frontier." Believing that these people could be restrained only by a strong military force, he proceeded to outline a preparedness program of some dimensions.[1]

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 25th Cong., 2d sess., II, no. 59, pp. 3-9. Serial 322.

Some of these recommendations seem to have met with favor, while others went unheeded. The report of the Quarter Master General, November 29, 1839 stated that the survey of the military road from Red river to the Mississippi at Fort Snelling had been made and one hundred and forty miles of the southern section, from the Red to the Arkansas had been completed, contracts had been let for eighty-six miles out of Fort Leavenworth south and there yet remained one hundred and twenty-eight north of the Arkansas incomplete. Barracks were in the course of erection at Fort Smith and Fort leavenworth, though the work was being hindered by the lack of material, funds, and laborers. Measures had been taken to construct barracks on the Illinois river, sixty miles north of Fort Smith. This officer recommended that additional barracks and other improvements be made at Fort Gibson and that auxiliaries be stationed at Spring river and at Marais de Cygne. He thought that the frontier from the Missouri to Red river, a distance of four hundred miles, was an immediate danger and that a union of the removed tribes under capable leadership, such as he thought they possessed, would be able to lay waste the whole frontier in a single month. Knowing that these Indians entertained no friendly feelings for the whites he urged the hasty completion of the improvements suggested.[1]

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.2, pp. 113-114. Serial 363.

At the same time the Engineer Department reported progress in clearing the Missouri of snags, sand bars, etc. and similar work on the Arkansas. The great raft on Red river, which had been an obstacle to shipping for so long and which the government had been trying to get rid of since 1833, had been removed but no sooner done than a great rise had replaced it. It was again removed by funds derived from people in the vicinity. So important was the navigation of this stream becoming that superintendent Shreve asked for an appropriation for $85,000 for the year 1840.[1] The course was urged not only, however, for the purpose of Indian control, but for commercial purposes as well, as were all of the plans for clearing the navigable streams.

The Major General of the Army reported this year that regiments were maintained at Leavenworth, Gibson, Smith, Wayne, Towson, and Jesup to the amount of 2,062 men, which was four-fifths of the soldiers between Fort Snelling and Fort Jackson and one-sixth of all the army of the United States. He also reported that a regiment of dragoons had been usefully employed in suppressing a spirit of hostility among the Missouri Indians, another had quieted the apprehension of difficulties among the Otoe and Pottawatomies, another had furnished escort to a caravan of Santa Fé traders, and an account of some internal diffi-

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1st seee., I, no.2, pp. 202-209. Serial 363.

culties among the Cherokees and the consequent uneasiness along the frontier settlements, he had sent five companies from Fort Leavenworth toward Fort Gibson and two companies from Fort Jesup to Fort Gibson, where the whole 4th regiment was already stationed.[1]

It will be noticed from these reports that since the report of 1834 there had been quite a bit of military activity on the southwestern frontier. And yet, those in a position to know thought that part of the country was ill-protected. The Secretary of War, who transmitted the above reports, with apparent impatience recommended that the chain of posts be immediately completed. He said that in addition to the reasons which he had previously given were now to be added the dangers arising from the presence of the Seminoles and Cherokees who had but lately emigrated under circumstances not calculated to render them friendly to the whites; that the outbreak among the latter tribe had made thoroughness of preparation the handmaid of eternal vigilance; that the government ought to take steps to prevent the recurrence of such troubles; and that the fear of punishment would perhaps most certainly restrain them.[2]

On the following February 24, 1840, the House called upon the Secretary of War to communicate "the plan adopted, or pro-

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.2, p. 56.

[2] Ibid., 41-53.

posed to be adopted, by him, for the defence of the western frontiers, commencing on the Gulf of Mexico, and extending to the southwest corner of Missouri"; also what forts had been erected, where erected, the distribution of troops in that region, what roads connecting with the frontier of Arkansas were available, what roads were needed, what tribes of Indians, with their number, immediately west of Missouri and Arkansas, and what would be the cost of the improvement deemed material to carry into effect the said plan of defence.[1]

Answering this resolution Poinsett said that the navigable streams were in a condition to admit of the approach to the posts, "whether by means of steamboats or other light transports"; and with reference to communications by land, he said that he believed that ample preparation could be made without the opening of many new roads and that, in most cases, the repair of those already established would be quite sufficient. He described in some detail the existing roads and posts, but made no reference to his former recommendation relative to interior posts and supply depots.[2] Accompanying this letter, however, was the report of a board of officers within the department acting under orders of the Senate of March 2, 1839. Its recommendations covered the western frontier from Sabine Bay to Lake Superior. It

---

[1] Senate Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., VI, no.379, p. 1. Serial 359.

[2] Ibid., 1-5.

stated that that part of the border which lay south of the Red river had little or nothing to apprehend from Indian aggression because "the progress of the Texas settlements will tend to push them (the Comanches) farther from our border"; that the most dangerous region extended from Red river to the Missouri and that "We are bound by solemn treaty stipulations, to interpose force, if necessary, to prevent domestic strife among them, to preserve peace, between the several tribes, and to protect them against any disturbances at their new homes by the wild Indians who inhabit the country beyond"; that these obligations could be fulfilled only by maintaining advanced positions in the Indian country, with an adequate restraining military force. This board then recommended locations for these posts within the Indian country, and a secondary line, intended for the protection of the border settlements, as well, also, as small but effective reserve forces posted within sustaining deistance of the several sections of the frontier.[1]

All of these various and varying recommendations were tardily and imperfectly considered during the next three years[2] and Indian depredations and other troubles as outlined hereinbefore went on apace. Significant as indicating the failure of the government to maintain order in this region is an act of the legislature of Arkansas January 18, 1843 as follows:

---

[1] Senate Docs., 26th Cong., 1st sess., VI, no.379, pp.6-8 Serial 359.

[2] See Annual Reports of the Secretary of War for 1840-1843.

"Whereas the State of Arkansas is constantly exposed to the dangers of a savage war upon the frontier, by hordes of reckless and savage Indians; and whereas, the General Government has left us without sufficient force for protection, or garrison for the security of the troops or protection of citizens; and whereas, the department at Washington had disregarded the application for an increased force, either from a want of knowledge of our situation, or some other cause equally fatal to our security; Therefore,

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, that the Executive be, and he is hereby, requested to open a correspondence with the proper department at Washington, and urge the necessity and propriety of an increased force on the frontier, from the northwest corner of Missouri to the Sabine river, and to procure, if possible, the creation of a post of defence near the site of the old Fort Wayne, ... , and one at or near Beattie's Prairie, and, also, at a point between Fort Smith and Fort Towson.

And be it further resolved, that if the application to the heads of the War Department should be ineffective or denied us, then the executive is requested to make known our exposed condition to Congress, and request their interposition to afford us that protection our exposed condition requires and which we, as a sovereign State, have a right to demand; and that the executive be further requested to procure the opening of a military road

on a line from Fort Smith to Fort Leavenworth, and that our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to procure a sufficient appropriation to complete the road, and to build the posts of defence here referred to, and they are requested to aid the Executive in his application at the War Department for the purposes above specified."[1]

Meantime there was likewise failure in maintaining neutrality and keeping the peace long Red river. On August 25, 1842, the agent for the Chickasaws complained rather earnestly about relations with Texas. The Texans undersold the Indians in the market of farm products, a fact which conduced to habits of carelessness and indifference among the Indians. He also stated that it required a great deal of attention and remonstrance to prevent the Chickasaws from crossing over into Texas, where at numerous points whiskey shops were kept open and where distilleries were then in process of erection; that both Choctaws and Chickasaws were induced, "by the presence of these dens and sinks of iniquity upon their border, to cross over," where they were generally made drunk, frequently robbed, and sometimes murdered.[2] This condition and the threatening appearances among some of the wild tribes at the Southwest caused the Department of War to place an observation corps on the Southwestern boundary line in

---

[1] Senate Docs., 27th Cong., 3d sess., III, no.127. Serial 415.

[2] Executive Docs., 27th Cong., 3d sess., I, no.2, 452. Serial 418.

the autumn of 1842 and led the Secretary of War to recommend the employment of mounted men to range the entire western frontier.[1]

Whatever was done to comply with these recommendations failed in large part. We have seen the attitude of Arkansas; Missouri, and Louisiana also resolved and petitioned.[2] On January 27, 1844 the Committee on Military Affairs in the House, answering these resolutions and petitions, reported that in view of the fact that, by the policy of removal, the government had "subjected our western frontier to the same apprehensions, dangers, and depredations from these tribes, from which others have been relieved; in view of the fact,too, that attempts at civilizing these emigranted Indians have been attended with little success and in some cases had "proved entirely abortive"; and in view of the further fact that there were "many restless, roving, and ungovernable tribes of wild Indians" who "range in all the fierceness of their native character" across the western territory the Committee, after conference with "many experienced officers of the army," recommended a mounted force "so formed as to enable them to repair in speed to the scene of depredation, give a speedy chase to the enemy, overtake and punish him."[3] Congress accepted the report of the Committee and made provision

---

1 Executive Docs., 27th Cong., 3d sess., I, no.2, 177. Serial 418.

2 House Exec. Docs., 28th Cong., 1st sess., 3, no. 30, 1-2. Serial 441; Reports of Committees, 28th Cong., 1st sess., I, no. 77, 1. Serial 445.

3 Ibid., 1-3.

for compliance with its terms. In his annual report November 1844 the Secretary of War said that "by the judicious distribution and watchfulness of the troops", the Indian frontiers had enjoyed a remarkable tranquility. This had been brought about "by the exhibition of military force on and beyond our frontier" - detachments of dragoons having made "wide circuits in the Indian country of the west."[1] These statements must have been meant to apply chiefly to the Choctaws and Chickasaws, for accompanying the Secretary's report was the statement from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the effect that "the dissensions and ill feeling that have so long and so injuriously prevailed in the Cherokee nation, have not yet disappeared, and I fear have not subsided to any useful extent."[2] Moreover, according to the agent at Council Bluffs the Ottoes were at war with the Pottawatomies, the Pottawatomies were fighting the Omahas, the Osage and Kansas were involved with the Pawnees, the Pawnees south of the Platte were conspiring with chiefs on the other side for the murder of Lieutenant Fremont on his return from California, and all of the frontier in the northern part of the western Territory stood in constant dread of the Sioux at that very time.[3] Also accompanying the report of the Secretary of War was a communica-

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 28th Cong., 2d sess., I, no.2, 129. Serial 463.

[2] Ibid., 304.

[3] Ibid., 436-438.

tion from the St.Louis superintendency which said, among other things, that it had been learned upon good authority that the Comanche Indians had in their possession a considerable number of women and children, whom they treated as slaves. They were said to have been captured in the Texan country; "that the men were killed, and the women and children taken into the most abject slavery;" that these people were doubtless citizens of the United States before going to Texas; that the United States government would certainly take some steps to rescue these unfortunates; that several of them had been brought in by trading parties of Osages; and that "a few thousand dollars judiciously invested in suitable merchandise, and placed in the hands of a discreet agent, might be the means of restoring to liberty, friends, and usefulness, from one to two hundred women and childre

During the next year, however, attention was turned away from these terrors to other matters of far reaching consequence for the Indian problem of the southwest. Colonel Kearny in the summer of 1845 leaped across the great plains, held council with various Indian tribes, and took geographic notes on the far west, thus better clearing the way to the Oregon country, intimidating the wild tribes that infested the Santa Fé Trail, and filling the inaginations of young Americans with visions of western

---

[1] House Ex. Docs., 28th Cong., 2d sess., i, no.2, 434-435.

fortunes. The annexation of Texas was practically accomplished in the same year and in shifting the boundary line from the Sabine to the Rio Grande "manifest destiny" had paved the way for carrying the flag to San Francisco Bay. The significance of these facts in the matter of controlling the Southwestern Indian is at least hinted at in the report of the Secretary of War, November 29, 1845. He said that the ready acceptance on the part of Texas, of the terms of annexation had excited the illwill of Mexico and rendered necessary the transfer of more than half of the army of the United States to the south side of Red river and that so long as Mexico maintained the attitude she then held there was no prospect of reducing the military forces in that quarter. Besides the hostility of Mexico, annexation would bring the United States into proximity to various tribes of Indians, whose habits and character were unlike those of the tribes already within the United States. Their fierce and warlike disposition could only re restrained by a military force organized to act promptly and efficiently upon them. Moreover, the withdrawal of the troops from the western and southwestern frontier had so weakened the defences there, already insufficient, that apprehensions had been created in that quarter, and a general anxiety for the reoccupation of the posts vacated. To protect the increasing current of emigration to Oregon he recommended the establishment of a chain of military posts to the base of the Rocky Mountains; and, for the better protection and

administration of the increased interests of the United States in the west he urged that the army should be materially increased.[1]

This report as a whole is no doubt typical of the popular mind at this time. People were no longer looking to the western limits of Missouri and Arkansas as a line beyond which they could not hope for homes. The dam that had held back for a decade and a half the stream of westward migration was now broken and a flood of empire builders swept across the Indian Territory. The attempt to control the savage of the southwest through civil organization had failed to gain the approval of the government; and, had it succeeded in this, would have failed to accomplish its larger purpose. The persistent humanitarian agencies had arms all too short to reach their marks. The military policies were a little more successful, and but for too much slack in the system would have done a better service. As it was the southwestern Indian remained all but uncontrolled from 1830 to 1845, at which time, however, new forces had come upon the field which were destined to put a new face on the whole frontier problem.

---

[1] Senate Docs., 29th Cong., 1st sess., I, no.1, pp. 193-206. Serial 470.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

United States Government Publications

American State Papers

Foreign Relations. 6 vols. Washington, 1832 - 1834.

Indian Affairs. 2 vols. Washington, 1832 - 1834.

Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897. 10 vols. Washington, 1899. James D. Richardson, ed.

Congressional Globe. 28th Cong., 1st sess., XIII.

Department of the Interior - Census Office

Seventh Census of the United States, 1850. Progress of the United States Statistics, 1780-1850. Washington, 1851.

House Documents

22d Cong.,	1st	sess.,	III,	no.102.	Serial	218.
24th "	"	"	II, "	401.	"	294.
24th "	2d	"	I, "	2.	"	301.
24th "	"	"	II, "	35.	"	302.
25th "	1st	"	I, "	42.	"	311.
25th "	2d	"	I, "	3.	"	321.
25th "	"	"	II, "	57.	"	322.
25th "	"	"	II, "	59.	"	322
25th "	"	"	IV, "	351.	"	317.
25th "	"	"	VIII, "	278.	"	328.
25th "	"	"	IX,	311.	"	329.

House Documents

25th	Cong.,	2d	sess.,	XII,	no.	351.	Serial	332.
26th	" ,	1st	" .,	I.	"	2.	"	363.
26th	" ,	2d	" .,	I.	"	2.	"	382.
27th	" ,	2d	" .,	I.	"	2.	"	401.
27th	" ,	2d	" .,	IV.	"	237.	"	404.
27th	" ,	3d	" .,	I.	"	2.	"	418.
27th	" ,	3d	" .,	VIII.	"	219.	"	425.
28th	" ,	1st	" .,	I.	"	2.	"	439.
28th	" ,	1st	" .,	III.	"	30.	"	441.
28th	" ,	2d	" .,	I.	"	2.	"	463.

House Reports

21st	Cong.,	1st	sess.,	II,	no.	246.	"	200.
22d	" ,	1st	" .,	II,	"	321.	"	225
24th	" ,	1st	" .,		"	401.	"	294.
27th	" ,	2d	" .,	V,	"	1098.	"	411.
28th	" ,	1st	" .,	I,	"	77.	"	445.

Laws of the United States, 1789 - 1856.

Dunlop, compiler. Philadelphia, 1856.

Senate Documents

21st	Cong.,	1st	sess.,	II,	no.	59.	Serial	193
21st	" .,	1st	" .,	II,	"	61.	"	213
22d	" .,	1st	" .,	II,	"	90.	"	213
24th	" .,	1st	" .,	IV,	"	300.	"	282.
24th	" .,	2nd	" .,	I,	"	1.	"	297.
24th	" .,	2nd	" .,	I,	"	20.	"	297.

Senate Documents

24th	Cong.,	2d	sess.,	II,	no.	172.	Serial	281.
24th	"	, 1st	" .,	VI,	"	418.	"	284.
25th	"	, 2d	" .,	I,	"	16.	"	314.
25th	"	, 2d	" .,	IV,	"	276.	"	317.
26th	"	, 1st	" .,	I,	"	1.	"	354.
26th	"	, 1st	" .,	VI,	"	379.	"	359.
26th	"	, 2d	" .,	I,	"	1.	"	375.
27th	"	, 2d	" .,	I,	"	1.	"	395.
27th	"	, 2d	" .,	I,	"	269.	"	395.
27th	"	, 3d	" .,	I,	"	1.	"	431.
27th	"	, 3d	" .,	III,	"	127.	"	415.
28th	"	, 1st	" .,	V,	"	341.	"	435.
28th	"	, 2d	" .,	I,	"	2.	"	449.
29th	"	, 1st	" .,	I,	"	1.	"	470.
32d	"	, 2d	" .,III,		"	14.	"	660.

Senate Journal

27th Cong., 1st sess., Serial 389.

Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols, and Agreements between the United States and other Powers, 1776 - 1902. 2 vols. Washington, 1910.

William M. Malloy, compiler.

Other Materials

Abel, Annie Heloise

Proposals for an Indian State, 1778-1878; in Annual Reports of the American Historical Association, 1907, vol. 1, pp. 89-102. Washington, 1908.

The History of Events Resulting in Indian Consolidation West of the Mississippi, in Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1906. Washington, 1906

Adams, John Quincy

Memoirs of, 12 vols. Philadelphia, 1874 - 1877. (Charles Francis Adams, ed.)

American Historical Association Annual Reports, 1907, 1908.

Texas Diplomatic Correspondence. 3 vols. Washington, 1908, 1911. (George Pierce Garrison, ed.)

Anonymous

A Visit to Texas: being the journal of a traveler through those parts most interesting to American Settlers. New York, 1834.

Texas in 1840 by an Emigrant of the United States. New York, 1840.

Austin, Stephen F.

An Address, in Mrs. Mary Austin Holley's Texas. Baltimore, 1833.

Baker, D. W. C.

A Brief History of Texas from its Earliest Settlement. New York, 1873.

Baker, D. W. C.

A Texas Scrap Book. Chicago, 1875.

Bancroft, Hubert Howe

North Mexican States and Texas. 2 vols. San Francisco, 1889.

Benton, Thomas Hart, ed.

United States Congress (Debates)

Abridgment of the Debates of Congress from 1789 to 1856. 1857 - 1861.

Thirty Years' Views. 2 vols. Boston, 1854-6.

Bolton, Herbert Eugene

Anthanase de Mézières and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1768-1780. 2 vols. Cleveland, 1914.

Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century. Berkeley, 1915.

The Spanish Occupation of Texas, 1519-1690, in the Southwestern Historical Quarterly, XVI, 1-26.

Brown, John Henry

History of Texas from 1685-1892. 2 vols. St.Louis, 1893.

Life and times of Henry Smith, the first American Governor of Texas. Dallas, 1887.

Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas. Austin. (No date given).

Bruce, Henry

Life of General Houston. New York, 1891.

Channing, W. E.

A Letter to the Hon. Henry Clay, on the Annexation of Texas to the Unites States. London, 1837.

Chittenden, Hiram Martin

The American Fur Trade of the Far West. 3 vols. New York, 1902.

Clark, R. C.

The Beginnings of Texas, 1684-1718 (Bulletin of the University of Texas, no.98). Austin, 1908.

Columbus (Pseud)

The Origin and True Cause of the Texas Insurrection commenced in the year 1835. Philadelphia, 1836.

Comprehensive History of Texas, A

(Dudley G. Wooten, ed.) 2 vols. Dallas, 1898.

Cox, Isaac Joslin

General Wilkinson and his later Intrigues with the Spaniards, in The American Historical Review, XIX, 7949 812.

The Louisiana-Texas Frontier, in Texas State Historical Association Quarterly, X, 1-75.

The Louisiana-Texas Frontier, in The Southwestern Historical Quarterly, XVII, 1-42.

Crane, William Carey

Life and Select Literary Remains of Sam Houston of Texas. Philadelphia, 1885.

Davis, Mrs. M. E. M.

Texas Under Six Flags. Boston, 1897.

DeCordova, J(acob)

Texas; her resources and her Public Men. Philadelphia, 1858.

De.Shields, James

Cynthia Ann Parker. The Story of her capture at the Massacre of ... Parker's Fort ... and of her Recapture at the battle of Peace River by Captain L. S. Rose of the Texan Rangers. St.Louis, 1886.

Edwards, David B.

The History of Texas. Cincinnati, 1836.

Evarts, Jeremiah

Essays on the Present Crisis in the Condition of the American Indians. Boston, 1829.

Farnham, Thomas Jefferson

Travels, in Thwaites, Early Western Travels, vol. 28.

Folsom, George

Mexico in 1842. To which is added, an Account of Texas. New York, 1842.

Foote, Henry Stuart

Texas and the Texans. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1841.

Gannett, Henry

A Gazeteer of Texas. Washington. 1904.

Garrison, George Pierce

Texas, A Contest of Civilization. Boston, 1903.

Westward Estension. New York, 1906.

Gayarre, Charles E. A.

History of Louisiana. 4 vols. New Orleans, 1903.

Gouge, William M.

The Fiscal History of Texas. Philadelphia, 1852.

Gregg, Josiah

Commerce of the Prairies; or, the Journal of a Santa Fé Trader, During eight expeditions across the great western prairies, and a residence of nearly nine years in Northern Mexico. Philadelphia. 1850.

Gregg, Josiah

Scenes and Incidents in the Western Prairies: during eight expeditions, and including a residence of nearly nine years in Northern Mexico. Philadelphia, 1857

Hancock

Essays on Texas. New York, 1837.

Helm, Mrs. Mary S.

Scraps from Texas History. Austin, 1884.

Holley, Mrs. Mary Austin

Texas. Lexington, 1836.

Hodge, Frederick Webb, ed.

Handbook of American Indians north of Mexico, in Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 30. 2 vols. Washington, 1907 - 10.

Houck, Louis

A History of Missouri. 3 vols. Chicago, 1908.

Jones, Anson

The Republic of Texas. Private Memoirs, Memoranda, and Letters. (No date given.)

Kendall, G. W.

Narrative of the Texan Santa Fé Expedition. 2 vols. New York, 1850.

Kennedy, William

Texas: The Rise, Progress, and Prospects of the Republic of Texas. 2 vols. London, 1841.

Lester, C. Edwards

Houston and His Republic. New York, 1846.

Linn, John J.

Reminiscences of Fifty Years in Texas. New York, 1883.

Lubbock, Francis Richard

Six Decades in Texas, or Memoirs. Austin, 1900.

Millard, N. Doran

History of the Republic of Texas. London, 1842.

Marshall, Thomas Maitland

A History of the Western Boundary of the Louisiana Purchase 1819-1841. Berkeley, 1914.

McCaleb, Walter Flavius

The First Period of the Gutierrez-Magee Expedition, in Texas State Historical Association, Quarterly, IV, 218-229.

McMaster, John Bach

A History of the People of the United States, from the Revolution to the Civil War. 8 vols. New York, 1883-1913.

Morrell, Z. N.

Flowers and Fruits, or 46 Years in Texas. St.Louis, 1872.

Morphis, J. M.

A History of Texas. New York, 1874.

Newell, Rev. C.

History of the Revolution in Texas, etc., together with the latest Geographical Topographical, and Statistical Accounts of the Country. New York, 1838.

Niles, John M. and Pease, L. T.

History of South America and Mexico, to which is attached a Geographical and historical view of Texas. 2 vols. Hartford, 1844.

Niles Weekly Register.

North American Review

Vols. 24, 30, 31, 33, 47.

Olmsted, Frederick Law

A Journey Through Texas. New York, 1857.

Otis, E. S.

The Indian Question. New York, 1878.

Paddock, B. B.

A History of Central and Western Texas. Chicago, 1911.

Parker, Thomas Valentine

The Cherokee Indians, with special reference to their relation with the United States Government. New York, 1907.

Parton, James

Life of Andrew Jackson. 3 vols. Boston, 1866.

Paxson, Frederick Logan

The Last American Frontier. New York, 1900

Phillips, U. B.

Georgia and States Rights, in Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1901. Vol. II. Washington, 1901.

Pike, Zebulon Montgomery

Papers of Zebulon M. Pike, 1806-1807, in The American Historical Review, XII, 798-827. Herbert Eugene Bolton, ed.

The Expedition of Zebulon M. Pike to the Headwaters of the Mississippi River, through Louisiana Territory, and in New Spain, during the years 1805-6-7. 3 vols. New York, 1895. Elliott Coues, ed.

Probus (Pseud) See David Lee Child.

The Texan Revolution. Washington, 1843.

Reagan, John H.

Expulsion of the Cherokees from East Texas, in Texas State Historical Association, Quarterly, I, 38-46.

Reeves, J. S.

American Diplomacy Under Tyler and Polk. Baltimore, 1907.

Republic of Texas

Laws of the Republic of Texas: First to Ninth Congress. Houston, 1838-1845.

Laws of Texas, 1822-1897, Compiled and arranged by H. P. N. Gammel, Austin, 1898.

Secret Journals of the Senate ... 1836-1845. Ernest William Winkles, ed., in Texas Library and Historical Commission (Accompanying the) First Biennial Report, 1909 - 1910. Austin, 1911.

Journal of the Permanent Council (October 11-27, 1835), in Texas State Historical Association, Quarterly, VII, 250-278; IX, 287-288. Eugene Campbell Barker, ed.

Roberts, Oran M.

Message to the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of Texas, February, 10, 1879.

Rives, George Lockhart

The United States and Mexico, 1821-1848. 2 vols. New York, 1913.

Royce, C. C.

History of the Cherokee Nation.

Indian Land Cessions in the United States, in United States Bureau of American Ethnology. Eighteenth Annual Report ... 1896-97. Washington, 1899.

Santleben, August

A Texas Pioneer: Early Staging and overland freighting days on the frontier of Texas and Mexico. Washington 1910.

Schooloraft, Henry R.

Personal Memoirs of a Residence of Thirty Years with the Indian Tribes on the American Frontier. Philadelphia, 1851

Smith, Justin H.

The Annexation of Texas. New York, 1911.

Smithwick, Noah

The Evolution of a State. Austin, 1900.

Sowell, Andrew J.

Early Settlers and Indian Fighters of southwest Texas. Austin, 1900.

Stiff, Edwood

Texan Emigrant. Cincinnati, 1840.

Textor, Lucy E.

Official Relations between the United States and the Sioux Indians, in Leland Stanford Junior University Publications, History and Economics, no. 2. Stanford, 1896.

The Texas Almanac

Galveston, 1857, 1858, 1859, 1860, 1861, 1867, 1868.

Thrall, Rev. Homer S.

A History of Texas. New York, 1892.

Pictorial History of Texas. St.Louis, 1897.

Thwaites, Reuben Gold

Early Western Travels, vol. 28.

Triplett, Frank

Conquering the Wilderness. New York, 1883.

Walker, F. A.

The Indian Question. Boston, 1874.

Williams, Alfred Mason

San Houston and the War of Independence in Texas. Boston, 1893

Winkler, Ernest William

The Cherokee Indians in Texas, in Texas State Historical Association Quarterly, VII, 95-165.

Woodman, David

Guide to Texas Emigrants. Boston, 1835.

Yoakum, Henderson

History of Texas from its first Settlement to its Annexation to the United States in 1846. 2 vols. New York, 1856.