Marshall University
Marshall Digital Scholar

Theses, Dissertations and Capstones

1999

To educate the Heathen: a comparison of the treatment of the native peoples of the United States, Australia, Canada and New Zealand

Howard R. Nolen

Follow this and additional works at: https://mds.marshall.edu/etd

Part of the Canadian History Commons, and the United States History Commons

To Educate The Heathen: A Comparison Of The Treatment Of The Native Peoples Of The United States, Australia, Canada And New Zealand

---

Thesis submitted to
The Graduate School of
Marshall University

In partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts In History

By

Howard R. Nolen

Marshall University

Huntington, West Virginia

August 9, 1999

This thesis was accepted on August 3, 1999 as meeting the research requirements for the master's degree.

Advisor Robert D. Sawrey

Dr. Robert D. Sawrey
Department of History

Leonard J. Deutsch

Dr. Leonard J. Deutsch
Dean of the Graduate School

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Introduction	1
Chapter One - European Attitudes and Actions	7
Chapter Two - Missionary Works	22
Chapter Three - Education to Citizenship	37
Chapter Four - Native Response	66
Chapter Five - Personal Accomplishments	85
Chapter Six - When Assimilation Was Not Enough	103
Conclusion	123
Endnotes	127
Bibliography	142

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank MaryAnn Daugherty for arraigning my schedule at work so I could attend classes. Without your cooperation I would never have made it to this point.

Next, I would like to say thank you to everyone at Marshall University who helped me reach this point. Special thank yous go to the following people. Dr. Frances Hensley for her encouraging words to a self-doubting beginning graduate student. Dr. David Woodward who directed me through most of my undergraduate work and awarded me with my first "A" in history as a grad student. Dr. Charles Cox, I thank you for allowing yourself to be drafted onto my thesis committee. Thank you goes to Dr. Robert Maddox whose words of encouragement and direction, both as a thesis committee member and graduate advisor, were appreciated. A special thank you goes to Dr. Robert Sawrey for your guidance as my thesis advisor, your help and direction made my work possible.

For their support (financial, emotional, and technical), I want to thank my in-laws, Clem and Marilyn Pemberton, and brother-in-laws Mark Pemberton and Jay Pemberton and his wife Alisa.

I want to thank my mother, Dolly Walls, for all the support she has given me throughout my life.

Special thanks goes to my wife, Lisa, for her support, her caring, and her love all of which has helped me get through this ordeal. And finally I want to acknowledge my daughter, Elizabeth Kay, born on May 2, 1999. A bundle of joy for her proud parents.

Introduction

This thesis focuses on the treatment of Native Americans in the United States, with comparisons being made with the treatment of the native peoples of Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The treatment of these four countries will not be equal in each chapter due in part to the resources available and because this work's core focus is on the United States. The period covered in the United States begins with white, or European colonization and continues until the period of Franklin Roosevelt's administration. I use the period of colonization as my starting point for each country because the colonization of the four countries reviewed did not begin at the same time. I use Roosevelt's administration as the general cut off point for the United States because of John Collier, Roosevelt's Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and his "New Deal" for the Indians. This New Deal returned partial control for tribal affairs to tribal councils. Much of the tribes' self determination had previously been taken away by the U.S. government. For the other three countries the time frame ends when the native people receive citizenship in more than just title. In New Zealand, for example, the Maori obtained British citizenship with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in the early 1800's, but years passed along with two wars before they received the benefits of citizenship.

The reason this paper focuses on these four countries is because all four are former British colonies and unlike India and former British colonies in Africa the native peoples in all four countries have been pushed into the positions of being second class citizens in their own lands. According to the 1990 census, American Indians make up less than

one percent of the population in the United States[1], thus the countries have some similar qualities in their histories. I intend to look at the attempts of the European, in this case the British settlers/colonist, to assimilate the aboriginal peoples. A focus is on the role of the churches in these attempts, especially in the field of education.

In this thesis I attempt to establish the similarities of these countries, and the treatment of the aboriginal peoples. In all four countries that will be examined, the uses of treaties, warfare and better technology by the "colonist," as well as introduced diseases, forced the subjugation of the indigenous people to the will of the European. One reason for the second class citizenship for the native peoples stemmed from the European, in this case British, culture's belief in its own superiority to the cultures they met. The Christian European especially believed in the superiority of Christianity over all other religions. In 1492, the year Columbus "discovered" the Americas, Spain expelled her Jewish population and ordered the Muslims within her borders to embrace Christianity or die.[2]

In the mid to late 19th century white society's belief in its own superiority received a name. The belief became known as "Social Darwinism", and was based on Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. The theory of Social Darwinism put forth the idea of European society being better than less developed societies, which would eventually become extinct. The attitude of Social Darwinism and the resulting effect will be reviewed in the first chapter.

The attitude of the British in India goes hand in hand with the overall arrogance of the European in these former British colonies.

The British used the remote Indian village of Simla as a summer retreat for the British administration to escape the summer heat in the capital of New Delhi. The British did not permit the Indians, who carried the equipment that the administration needed to function, to step on the mall of the village. This ban did not get lifted until after the first World War, and then only if the Indians wore western style dress and not traditional Indian clothing.

While British rule in India is a perfect example of the arrogance of the European society, the administrators genuinely believed it to be their duty to help a backward country to profit economically. This conviction grew out of their belief in the supremacy of the white race to India's Hindu, Moslem, and Sikh population. This belief in helping the natives improve themselves became known as "the white man's burden"[3] In the United States, "manifest destiny" put the American Indian in the way of the Anglo-Americans's God given destiny of controlling the North American continent. In Australia the situation became known as "the Aboriginal problem."[4]

A belief of superiority could also be found in other cultures. The Chinese and the Japanese believed themselves to be superior to other cultures, so much so that they believed their emperors to be deities. Islam had spread east and west from the Middle East bringing the "true religion" to the infidels. Even Native American groups had superiority complexes. The name most native American tribes had given themselves would translate as "the people" or "the primary people." Even though other cultures believed in their superiority over their neighbors and the attitude is not unique to European society, the Anglo society view

of itself coupled with more advanced technology determined the results in the four countries studied.

While the first chapter examines British attitude, the second chapter concentrates on the work of missionaries to "save" native peoples. Pope Gregory XV in 1622 founded The Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, also known as the Propaganda. The Propaganda told missionaries not to worry about changing the cultures of the people they met. "`What could be more absurd,' the document asked, `than to transport France, Spain, Italy or some other European country to China? Do not introduce all of that to them, but only the faith.'"[5] Protestant missionaries saw no need to follow directives from the Pope, and upon seeing the "uncivilized" condition of the people they encountered Catholic missionaries could not help themselves but to try to change the native cultures as well. Again using New Zealand as an example, the Maori practiced head hunting and polygamy, both practices ran counter to the beliefs of Christianity.

Thus the job of the priest/missionary became to civilize the "savage" by teaching proper Christian morals and educating the "barbarian" in correct "civilized" behavior. When the native failed to learn the lessons properly it became the soldier's job to show the native people the results of not adhering to the lessons. The colonist believed that the native peoples had to become civilized to become functional in the new countries. One of the first things required of the native in order for him to become civilized was for the native to give up traditional ways, especially religion, and accept Christianity. Francis Paul Prucha has written that to the Western European to

"civilize meant to bring about a state of civility out of a state of rudeness and barbarism, to enlighten and refine... [T]o this was added instruction in reading, writing, arithmetic, and the truths of the Christian religion."[6] Once the "wild native" became educated, taught to farm and to be Christians, they then could be assimilated into the "civilized" society.

The missionaries, while trying to raise the native out of their barbarism, often ran into obstacles placed in their way by their governments. To compound the problem, the missionaries also had to compete with each other for converts. These problems are also analyzed in the second chapter.

The process of educating the native populations will be the focus of the third chapter. Both the teaching by missionaries and the contributions of the governments are examined. Also the two types of systems, the boarding school and the day school, and the resulting consequences on the native populations constitute part of the focus for this chapter.

To these attempts to educate them, native people generally responded in two ways. Native groups either accepted the effort or resisted it. Both of these ways make up the core of the fourth chapter. The last two chapters focus on the Native Americans in the United States. The results of acceptance by individual Native Americans is the fifth chapter.

Some of these people became successful by Euro-American standards, becoming doctors, lawyers, and politicians. They used their positions to try to aid their people. In their attempts, these Indians ran into

problems often stemming from the prejudices of white society and its view of native people. However, not all of the problems faced by the "successful" natives came from whites, some problems came from within their own society. As demonstrated in the fourth chapter, not only did individuals accept white ways, occasionally entire Indian nations saw the benefits of being like their white neighbors. The sixth chapter focuses on one such Indian nation, the Cherokee.

The Cherokee saw the likely benefit of becoming like their white neighbors and are the focus of the last chapter. Although they emulated white society they often found themselves at odds with their Anglo-American neighbors. The United States's policy of assimilation confused lawmakers when confronted with whole tribal nations willing to accept the policy. Although the Cherokee had established plantations and churches and wore Anglo-American clothing, President Andrew Jackson found them to be in the way of white America's destiny, and had them forcibly removed from the traditional Cherokee homeland. The pattern of the Cherokee being in the way of white society kept reoccurring. The U.S. made 349 treaties with only 54 of the more than 480 Indian nations through 1871 when Congress decreed no more treaties would be made. Eighteen of the treaties had been made with the Cherokee, none of which the United States fully upheld.[7] It is therefore the arrogance of European, specifically Anglo society, that is the underlying theme of this work. It is the topic which will be addressed next.

Chapter One - European Attitude and Actions

"It is on the British race . . . that rest the highest hopes of those . . . who seek to raise and better the patient masses of mankind." - V. G. Kiernan[1]

When the European came to the shores of the Americas, he brought with him his Christian values and the belief that any culture, other than his own, had to be inferior. This belief in his own superiority came with the European whether he came from France, Spain, England, or even Russia. The theory of European superiority became known as "the white man's burden," "manifest destiny" and "Social Darwinism." This attitude, and resulting behavior, will be examined in this chapter.

Charles Darwin, for whom Social Darwinism is named, wrote, "Wherever the European has trod, death seems to pursue the aboriginal. We may look to the wide extent of the Americas, Polynesia, the Cape of Good Hope, and Australia, and we find the same result. . . . The varieties of man seem to act on each other in the same way as different species of animals - the stronger always extirpating the weaker."[2] Darwin realized part of the cause for the disappearance of the native people. "This decrease," he acknowledged,"no doubt must be partly owing to the introduction of spirits, to European diseases, . . . and the gradual extinction of the wild animals."[3]

As Darwin pointed out, disease helped the Europeans' domination over the native populations. Because the aboriginal populations had no immunity to European diseases even simple childhood illnesses, like the measles, could ravage native populations. In 1819, in the American West, numerous plains Indians died from either smallpox or measles.

Missionaries explained to the survivors that the deaths had been the work of God who had cleared the way for his chosen people, the Christian.[4] The Mandan Indians of the central North American plains were so decimated by a small pox out break that by 1837 they numbered fewer than 130.[5]

According to Spanish mission records in California, the estimated mission Indian population decreased by more than 70 percent between 1779 and 1883 due primarily to diseases.[6] In some areas of California, disease ravaged the Indians to the point that whole tribes disappeared. Eight northern missions in California, recorded that they performed Catholic weddings for more than 10,000 Indian widows and widowers, between 1785 and 1810. The large number of Indian widows and widowers is proof of the high rate of death suffered by the Indians after contact with Europeans.[7] Disease also effected the native people elsewhere.

Many English settlers in Australia believed that the native peoples of Australia were doomed for extinction. In Victoria, the "invasion" by the British did not occur until 1834 but small pox had killed off half of the Aboriginal population in outbreaks as early as 1789 and 1829. The estimated native population of 15,000 in 1834 decreased by more than 80 percent in 1850 to only 2,000. Whites probably killed as many as 1,000 of those who died. The Aborigines faced a high death rate caused by killings, disease, alcoholism, malnutrition, and despair, and a low birth rate caused by venereal disease which caused sterility. The Aboriginals also chose, through abortions and abstinence, not to have as many children to be brought up in the harsh conditions the Aborigines faced.[8] Contact with the

Europeans also brought other problems for aboriginal people.

The native women in Australia, New Zealand, and North America always had something to offer the white male population. Many native races did not have a term for prostitution and saw women as trade goods. No matter how much the Europeans looked down on the native population, men had little objection to sexual activities with native women when no white women could be found. The sexual liaisons resulted in both illegitimate relations and marriages. The trafficking of women led to a high rate of abortions and infanticide. Spanish missionary Father Junipero Serra encouraged marriages, because the unions helped spread Hispanic civilization. Frequently, when European women became available, the whites would leave their native wives. In North America, traders often had an Indian family, where they traded, and a white family to whom they returned. Missionaries repeatedly pleaded with their governments to come up with ways to stop soldiers and other men from abusing, attacking, capturing, and raping native women. The missionaries could not teach the native proper Christian values when whites, who were Christians, engaged in these acts.[9] Mistrust over this and other issues led to armed conflict between native peoples and the Europeans.

When Captain James Cook attempted to make his first landing in Australia, two Aborigine men, standing on the shore, attempted to warn him away. Cook had his men fire a volley of musket shot over the head of the two men. Responding to the volley, one of the men threw a rock at Cook's boat. Cook then ordered a round of bird shot be fired at the men with some of the shot hitting one of the men. The man and his

companion began to throw spears at Cook's party. After a third volley, the two natives fled the scene. Thus, a violent relationship between the Aborigines, as a whole, and the English settlers who went to Australia had begun.[10]

Like Aboriginal society throughout Australia, the Aborigines on Tasmania relied on sharing and trade. In contrast to the Aboriginals, European society believed in personal ownership. As the English took the land on which the Aboriginals relied, the natives expected something in return from the new people. When the Aboriginals became more insistent the Europeans labeled them beggars and thieves. Since the Aboriginals did not have permanent dwellings, did not grow crops or have domesticated animals, the British settlers believed that no one had claims to the land. This view was backed by British law which said the native population had no claim on the land.[11] In Tasmania, like the rest of Australia, bloodshed result from such differences in cultures.

The British established their first settlement on Tasmania in 1803. The first massacre of Aborigines occurred within the first year when British troops fired on a group that included women and children. By 1806, skirmishes between settlers and natives became common place. The Aborigines killed livestock and herders; the Europeans shot Aborigines or gave them poisoned flour, abducted children for forced labor, and raped and tortured women.[12]

In accordance with Darwin's writings many whites came to believe that native peoples could not adapt themselves to "civilization and would eventually die out." Europeans found it a small step to quickening the departure of native races from this world. This is the

case of the Aborigines of Van Dieman's Land (Tasmania). On November 1, 1828, the governor declared martial law in the colony. Martial law gave troops authorization to shoot any native found in the settled districts (the central and south-eastern areas of the island). In 1830, five thousand men gathered under the direction of the governor. The men formed a picket line, known as the "Black Line." The line stretched across the settled part of the island in an effort to drive the natives from the colony. Because of large gaps in the line and the natives ability to hide, the line only managed the capture of two Aborigines: one old man and a boy, after a month of operation. Disease killed many of the natives of Tasmania in the next few years. In 1835, The government rounded up and transported 210 Tasmanian Aboriginals to an islet. The census of 1858 counted only fourteen aborigines on the islet.[13] A like pattern of removal and conflict also occurred all across Australia.

The governments of New South Wales and Queensland established native police forces to hunt down and apprehend aborigines. These native police forces, led by white officers, showed little restraint in their pursuit of justice. When an Aborigine servant assisted other Aborigines in the murder of a woman, seven of her eight children, and six other people, the native police killed sixty natives. Then in 1861, native police, supported by settlers, killed as many as 120 blacks in response to the killings of nineteen whites.[14]

In western Australia, an armed engagement occurred between settlers, troops, and native police against a group of Aborigines. The engagement resulted in approximately 20 blacks being killed. A settler

among the white force wrote that the Battle of Pinjarra, as the conflict became known, resulted the most humane treatment that could be given the Aborigines. The official governmental doctrine was to use British troops as protection against attacks rather than let the colonist handle strikes against the native population. The governors knew a policy of using regular troops would lead to less bloodshed. Although this became policy, settlers still killed more natives than the government. Some whites killed Aborigines for the simple sport of the hunt, like hunting kangaroos and dingoes. Of the likely extinction of the aborigines, one colonist remarked that to complain about the vanishing of the Aborigines would "`hardly [be] more reasonable than it would be to complain of the drainage of marshes or the disappearance of wild animals.'"[15] This attitude permitted many crimes against natives to go unpunished.

At Myall Creek Station in northern New South Wales, in 1838, a group of 12 stockmen killed at least twenty-eight Aborigines, including women and children. During a whirlwind of opposition, the government hanged seven of the stockmen for the murders. The executions were the first time that whites received the death penalty for the murder of an aboriginal in Australia. The hangings had the support of the government in Great Britain. In Australia, however, Governor Gipps received many appeals for clemency on behalf of the stockmen.[16] This incident was an exception to the general practice since in most cases, violence against the Aborigine went unpunished.

A survey of the North Queensland circuit court for the period from 1882 to 1894, showed that the courts handed down guilty verdicts in only one quarter of the cases in which Euro-Australians allegedly had

committed crimes against aborigines, no executions resulted. Murder charges made up a large percentage of the cases. Whites sometimes poisoned aborigines water holes, and placed arsenic in flour, sugar and damper given to the natives. These practices continued, in some parts of Australia, until the middle of the Twentieth Century.[17]

One of the last massacres occurred at Coniston Station, Northern Territory in 1928. When a Warlpiri man killed a white dingo trapper, white settlers killed thirty-one aborigines. The trapper had been caught taking advantage of the man's wife when the Warlpiri killed him. An official inquiry found the police officer in charge of the force that carried out the massacre not guilty of any wrong doing. In 1898, Judge C. J. Dashwood told a Commission that the Aborigines were being "shot down like crows" by miners and herders.[18] Massacres did not happen only in Australia.

In United States history there are two massacres of western Indians that stand out. The first massacre occurred at Sand Creek, Colorado Territory on November 29, 1864. The second occurred at Wounded Knee Creek, South Dakota, on December 28, 1890. The situation surrounding the Sand Creek Massacre will be looked at next. The Wounded Knee Massacre will be looked at in another chapter as the slaughter resulted in part due to the Indians' response to the way whites in the Unites States dealt with the Indians.

While the eastern United States was involved in the Civil War, the Confederate threat to the south west ended in 1862. Consequently, the militias in the area of the western United States became involved in conflicts with the Indians who became increasingly aggressive with the

settlers, stage coaches, and others whose numbers grew during this time. Colorado Territory Governor John Evans and the Colorado district commander Colonel John M. Chivington expected trouble and established plans to combat the situation. The plans included Colonel Chivington leading the 1000 men of the Third Colorado Volunteers on a preempted strike against a group of unarmed peaceful Cheyenne. At dawn on November 28, 1864, the irregulars attacked a group of 500 sleeping Cheyenne. The Cheyenne, wanting peace and believing that a peace treaty existed, had turned in their weapons at Fort Lyon. White Antelope, one of the Cheyenne leaders, stood in front of his tent with his arms folded as a sign of non-hostility, and Black Kettle, the other leader, placed an American flag and a white flag in front of his lodge to show the camp's peaceful intentions. Chivington and his men killed and mutilated as many as 150 Cheyenne men, women, and children. When the Volunteers returned to Denver they received a hero's welcome from the citizens for their defeat of the unarmed Indians. The cheering crowds admired the scalps and genitals that the troopers displayed as souvenirs of their victory. Kit Carson called the men who committed the massacre "Cowards and Dogs!" although his regular troops, fighting in New Mexico against the Navajo and the Apache, occasionally played catch with the severed breasts of Navajo women. The massacre outraged whites in the East, but was seen as proper by those in the West. Later, a joint committee of Congress condemned Chivington for his actions but could (or would) not punish him because by that time he had left military service. Failure to punish Chivington may have stemmed from the fact that two years earlier, he had defeated a Confederate Army at Clovieta Pass, New

Mexico. His victory against the rebels, in 1862, had put an end to any serious threat of Confederate control of the Southwest.[19]

Taking a Social Darwinistic approach to the effect of contact between whites and Indians, an Indian agent wrote in 1882, "Vice and drunkenness have correspondingly increased among the whites and among the Indian who do not live on the Reservation. In this respect it has been a bad year for the Indians. They are surrounded and come in contact with the worst classes of our white population who ensure and debase them. . . . Vices kill off the worst ones and the survivors grow better."[20]

A very public display of Euro-American vanity came in 1876 when the United States held the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia. Nearly 10 million people, almost one fifth of the U.S. population, attended the celebration. The Exposition did not include all Americans in a favorable light. Construction crews for the exhibition halls excluded blacks, and African-Americans were almost completely absent from the displays. The exhibits presented the American Indians as a harmless, primitive contradiction to the life of whites. On June 25, this view of the Indians changed quickly with the Battle of Little Big Horn in Montana. It would not be until July 2, that the nation would learn of the battle in which Sioux warriors led by Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse wiped out the Seventh Calvary led by Colonel George A. Custer. The Sioux had fought to protect land that had been promised to them by a treaty in 1868.[21]

The Lakota Sioux, upset by the mistreatment of the Santee Sioux in Minnesota, the slaughter of the Cheyenne at Sand Creek, and the opening

of the Bozeman Trail which cut across their land and allowed gold miners access to the Black Hills, responded to encroachment with violence. The Army had built three forts along the Trail to protect those using the Bozeman Trail. However, the soldiers could never venture far from the forts for fear of Indian attacks. The December 1866 ambush and death of Lt. William Fetterman and his eighty troopers ultimately led to the treaty of 1868. In the treaty, the United States agreed to withdraw from the forts. Gold seekers' violation of their land, land which had been promised to the Sioux by this treaty, led to renewed fighting that eventually led to Custer's Last Stand.[22] Like their cousins in America, the British in Australia looked down on the Aborigines.

For several reasons the British looked down on the Aborigines of Australia more than the Maori of New Zealand. One reason stemmed from the Aborigines not having many items which they could barter in trade with the whites, thus they never acquired firearms to use against the English. The Maori on the other hand had dried heads which sailors and whalers visiting New Zealand found so much to their liking that they willingly traded weapons for the heads.[23] Thus, like the American Indian, the Maori acquired firearms and used them against the British. Being able to acquire firearms, along with the length at which the Maori held out against the British during the Maori Wars, made them seem a more adept "savage" than the often ill equipped Aborigines. The difference in the way the British looked at the Maoris and the Aborigines can be seen in the awarding of medals for valor.

The British government awarded the Victoria Cross to a young marine in Sydney in 1864. The new medal had been established by the

Queen in 1856 for individual heroism for ordinary soldiers and sailors. The marine received the medal for his actions against the Maoris in New Zealand. White Australians saw the decoration as a tribute to the valor of both the marine and the Maoris. The British military never issued the Victoria Cross for combat against the Aboriginals.[24] In 1852, an Anglo-Australian, expressing the popular view of the time, said of the Aborigines, "In appearance they are in many cases revolting - reminding the European of the link between himself and the baboon, whose cunning they emulate, without any of the higher attributes which distinguish even savages in other parts of the Southern Hemisphere. To a European a more disgusting sight can scarcely be encountered than these people."[25] Thus it can be seen that white society had little love for the native people of Australia.

Sixty years after Cook explored the coast of New Zealand, Charles Darwin wrote that he saw "`cunning and ferocity'" in the tattooed Maori. The only bright spot he saw in New Zealand was a mission that thrived on the work of freed Maori slaves who seemed to learn quickly from the missionaries. Upon seeing the Maoris at the mission, Darwin felt a "triumphant feeling [not] at seeing what Englishmen could effect; but rather the high hopes thus inspired for the future progress of this fine island." Darwin eventually came to recognize the poor condition in which he found the Maori, as a whole, came from the introduction of rum and diseases more than a decade before his arrival.[26]

Seven years after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand, the American Missionary Association (A.M.A.) saw it as a miracle how "civilized" the Maori had become. In the A.M.A.'s newspaper

the **American Missionary** the editors wrote:

> What human likelihood was there thirty, or even twenty years ago, that New Zealand -- savage, pagan, cannibal -- would in so short time be placed, at the desire of her own chiefs, under the protection of the British crown . . . The progress of the gospel in New Zealand has not only been rapid, but the extension has been so progressive as to indicate that it is not a momentary excitement, but of a permanent character -- the effect, under the blessing of God, of causes in constant operation and efficiency.[27]

Things did not look so bright for the Maoris a few years earlier according to the editors of the **Edinburgh Review**. Writing about New Zealand becoming a colony of Britain, the editors sadly wrote, "[T]he Colony of New Zealand is already planted with every prospect, we trust, of advantage to Great Britain - though, too probably, to the destruction of the finest of the aboriginal races that has yet been discovered."[28] The editors of the **Edinburgh Review** seemed to completely buy into Darwin's theory that native populations could not survive contact with English culture.

While reviewing a book on Australia, in 1890, the editors of **Edinburgh Review** wrote:

> The Australian natives are generally admitted to be almost wholly devoid of religious impressions. Missionaries seldom succeed in imparting to them more than the outward appearance of Christianity. There are but a few missionaries in Australia, and the natives come but little into contact with them. The efforts made, especially in the southern part of the continent, have met with poor success . . . the fact that missionaries see but little fruit from their labours does not allow us to draw the conclusion that the Australian race is quite insusceptible to religious influence. The future of the native blacks of Australia it is not difficult to foresee - the race is doomed.[29]

Twenty-one years later, in the Northern Territory, statistics seemed to offer proof that the Aborigines would soon be extinct. Whites believed that the ratio of 157 children, below the age of four years, for every

1,000 Aboriginal women of reproductive age, indicated a fertility level to low to sustain the native population.[30]

The editors of the **Edinburgh Review** prophesied the doom of the native peoples of Canada as well. Nearly seventy years previously, while reviewing a book about Canada, they said almost the same thing about the Indians of North America that they had said of the Aborigines. They wrote:

> From all that we learn of the state of the aborigines of this great continent from this volume, and from every other source of information, it is evident they are making no progress towards civilization. It is certainly a striking and mysterious fact, that a race of men should thus have continued for ages stationary in a state of the rudest barbarism. That tendency to improvement, a principle that has been thought more than perhaps any other to distinguish man from the lower animals, would seem totally wanting in them. . . . [I]t now seems certain that the North American Indians, like the bears and wolves, are destined to fly at the approach of civilized man, and to fall before his renovating hand, and disappear from the face of the earth.[31]

Not everyone saw the Indians in Canada as a creature that would "disappear from the face of the earth."

William Parker of the Canadian North West Mounted Police wrote about his experience with the Indians during his thirty-eight years with the force. One account goes:

> After being in camp about ten days the colonel received a dispatch from the American authorities that the Sioux Indians in Dakota, just across the boundary line, were on the rampage and killed the settlers. He had the assembly sounded and gave orders for the whole force to mount in full dress, fully armed with carbides and revolvers . . . [A]s there was no further dispatch from the Americans, we returned to camp. We were all disappointed in not being in a scrap with the Indians.[32]

Does not such an account show a dislike for the Indian by the Mountie? Not in the case of Parker. Parker's disappointment did not come from not being able to "scrap" with the Indians, but simply in not being able

to "scrap." As anyone who has ever had the adrenaline pumping for a contest, either athletic or combat, and then had the contest canceled at the last minute would know the type of disappointment Parker would have felt. In a letter home to his mother, in England, Parker showed that he actually liked the Indians. In his letter he wrote, ". . . You need not be alarmed at me being scalped by Indians or eaten by alligators, as the former are very friendly." Then, in a letter to his sister Parker answered her inquiry about if he had met a "young lady yet" by teasing her by telling her he had his "eye on a very pretty squaw." But he feared if he brought her home the family would feel "squeamish" around her.[33] As in Canada, not everyone in Australia saw the native people as simple things in the way of progress that had to be removed.

George Elphistone Dalrymple called for the humane treatment of the Aboriginals. His life could be compared to that of Daniel Boone or David Crockett in the United States. Born into a Scottish aristocratic family on May 6, 1826, he is considered by some historians to be a key figure in the expansion of the North Queensland frontier from 1859 to 1874. He established two towns along the coast, Bowen and Cardwell. Dalrymple also served two years in the Legislative Assembly.[34]

Dalrymple recommended that the government establish a white mounted police force to replace that of the native units. He believed such units would help with the relationship between the two races. He also believed that most of the bloodshed between the races resulted from the two peoples lacking the ability to communicate. Dalrymple saw the communication problem as being the whites using firearms in attempting to teach the Aboriginals "Thou shalt not steal," and "Thou shalt do no

murder." He used an interpreter when dealing with Aboriginals.[35]

Unfortunately for the native people of the United States not everyone had the enlightened view of Dalrymple. While explaining how the white man's burden would work as the white fulfilled his destiny and arguing for the General Allotment Act, or Dawes Act, Senator Pendleton of Ohio declared that the Indians had to change their way of life or they would die out. Arguing the typical Americans view, he said that no matter how much one's humanity may be bothered by the fact, Indian extinction would become reality. The Indians had to change or they would "`be exterminated.'" He went on to declare:

> We must stimulate within them to the very largest degree, the idea of home, of family, and of property. These are the very anchorages of civilization; the commencement of the dawning of these ideas in the mind is the commencement of civilization of any race, and these Indians are no exception.[36]

At the turn of the century, British Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain echoed the Senator's words by saying, "I believe in this race, the greatest governing race the world has ever seen; in this Anglo-Saxon race, so proud, tenacious, self-confident and determined, this race which neither climate nor charge can degenerate, which will infallibly be the predominant force of future history and universal civilisation."[37] Unfortunately for many native people most Europeans bought into the ideas and believed in "Social Darwinism", "Manifest Destiny" and "The White Man's Burden." For many of these people the step from waiting for the native people to go extinct towards helping them become extinct was a small one. However, a group of people did exist that believed in saving the resident population. Missionaries made up a large portion of this group.

Chapter Two - Missionary Works

"Thus it is with the Indians in general. Their affections for their offspring, lead them to do anything for them: but they know not what to do or how. . . . Our only hope is to conquer them in the good old way - by love." - Brother Spencer[1]

"At heart, the American Indian, as may be said of most primitive peoples, is essentially a devout person, . . ." - U.S. Office of Indian Affairs[2]

Missionaries often found themselves at odds with the natives, their own governments, and each other. No matter the odds against them, the missionaries, through their work, had good intentions for the aboriginal people they encountered. The missionaries worked to help the native assimilate into the white society that confronted them. As will be shown in this chapter the assimilation process presented many difficult situations for the missionary and the native.

When the Russians established a foothold in Alaska in the late 1700's, Czarina Catherine the Great declared the people of Alaska to be Russian citizens. The Russians subjugated these new subjects to the position of serfs. These new serfs owed taxes to the Czar and the Russians used the threat of military force to ensure payment. Russian tax collectors accompanied the fur hunting expeditions to Alaska. The traders seized the breeding grounds of the beavers, seals, and sea otters. The Russians exchanged gunpowder and vodka for the furs they received. Thus, alcohol and gunpowder fueled the flames when trade and highhandedness led to ill feelings and bloody clashes.[3]

Even though the Chief Manager of the Russian American Company, Aleksandr Baranov, married a native woman, the children of Russian men and native women became part of the work force. The Russians kept

socially separated from the native population, except for sexual relations, including marriages. The Russians forced native men from their villages to hunt for furs. With the men engaged in the fur trade, the families had no one to hunt for food, leaving many women and children to starve to death.[4]

In Alaska, the Russian Orthodox missionaries established churches and schools in a hope to "civilize" the indigenous people. The Russian missionaries baptized on a voluntary basis, and found many prospects among the subjugated people. In 1790-91, Priest Vasili Siutsov reported having baptized 93 men and 33 women, and conducted fourteen marriages. Another missionary leader, the Archimandrite Iosaf, reported in 1794 that his party baptized more than 7,000 natives and performed more than 2,000 weddings. The Russian clergy complained about the treatment of the native people and often found themselves at odds with the Russian American Company officials. After Russia sold Alaska to the United States, Orthodox priest continued to come to Alaska for missionary work. From their base in Alaska, the Russian Orthodox Church established churches and seminaries throughout Canada and the United States as well as a monastery in Pennsylvania. Some of the early missionaries to Alaska became Saints in the Russian Orthodox Church, including one from the Aleut people of Alaska, indicating the fervor in which some of the native people accepted white society's religion.[5]

Like the Russian missionaries in Alaska, missionaries in English speaking countries often stood as a bulwark between the European and the native. The missionaries did not present a harmonious front, however. Often the European attitude of superiority entered into the missionary's

work. Not only did the missionary's attitude of superiority spill into his work with the native population, but also in his work with other missionaries.

In the **Edinburgh Review**, the editor, while reviewing three books on the United States of the early 1820's, wrote that the U.S. had put England to shame when it came to religious tolerance. The editor asserted, "They have fairly and completely, and probably forever, extinguished that spirit of religious persecution which has been the employment and the curse of mankind for four or five centuries." This could not have been farther from the truth when it came to the fight between missionaries for recruiting converts among the Indians.[6]

The different Christian denominations had little love for each other. They fought for converts and for funding, and had few kind words for one another. The biggest amount of animosity existed between Protestants and Catholics. The name calling did not limit itself to just a Catholic-Protestant conflict. Disagreements could be found between Protestant groups and even within some Protestant denomination.

One example of this is when, firing a written shot in the religious conflict, in the 1830's, William Howitt wrote about the colonization of the new world by the Catholic Spanish. Of Cortes and Pizarro, Howitt wrote, "Their entrance, assault, and subduction of the kingdoms of Mexico and Peru were from first to last, . . . the acts of daring robbers, on flame with the thirst of gold." He goes on to say, "But to have expected anything of this kind [Christian benevolence] from the Spaniards, would be the height of folly." According to Howitt, the "subduction" by the Catholic Spanish resulted because the Catholic

explorers took their religious guidance from Rome, "They knew no more than what Rome chose to tell them. They were not distinguished by one Christian virtue, - for they had been instructed in none."[7]

In the 1880's, Reverend Myron Eells wrote to the American Missionary Association of his concerns about the consolidation of the agencies in his area of the Washington Territory. One of his concerns arose from his fear that his brother would lose his position of agent. Rev. Eells asked that Secretary Strieby use any influence that he might have to assist his brother. His anxiety also derived from his concern that the government would turn his agency over to the Catholic Church. He wrote, "But my main object in writing to see if any influence can be brought to bear to keep this Agency from going to the Catholics." Eells felt that it would be natural to combine two agencies together, both already had been assigned to the Methodist, although the Episcopal Church ran them. The other three agencies included his, one controlled by the Catholic Church and the other by Presbyterians. He dreaded that since the Catholic agency had the largest population, it would be given charge of the combined agency.

Rev. Eells stated that he opposed Catholic control of his agency for two reasons. He thought the Catholic missionary in charge of the present mission to be unsuitable for the job. He thought the man a drunk who had been jailed on complaints filed by the very Indians he supervised. Second, he believed "if the Catholics shall send a school-teacher here, to be in charge, as well as teach the children, & compel them to attend their services, we might as well give up, as it would so divide things as to render our work very small." He also mentioned that

the "past 7 or 8 years" which he had worked at the agency, and the $2,000 the Association, had spent would have been wasted.[8]

Likewise, Addison Merrill wrote to the A.M.A. about his concerns for the Miami Indians who the government had moved from Indiana to Indian Territory in 1847. Merrill worried that the Catholic Church would minister to the Miami and they would be lost to salvation. He called the Catholic leadership of the Miami nation "Papist" saying that they were members of "that false church." Merrill mentioned a Methodist minister had attempted to establish a school among the Miami prior to their removal, but had little success because of Catholic influence. He wrote, "If anything be done, it must be done before the Romanists occupy the field; - if indeed such a motive is worthy of mention when the souls of these Indians are so fast going into that world where the Gospel can never enter."[9] While the Protestants complained about the Catholics, the Catholics complained about the Protestants.

The Catholic newspapers responded to the demise of Custer and his men by blaming President Ulysses S. Grant and his Indian Policy. An article in the **Boston Pilot** declared:

> They [the Sioux] bitterly complained of the inroads and demoralization of the whites; and they asked for schools and a Catholic priest to teach them. Their request were ignored, and their refusal to sell did not save them from invasion . . . The Sioux have grimly defended their own.[10]

After the Battle of the Little Big Horn, and because the Catholic Church had been hindered from missionary work, the **Western Home Journal** said, "[T]he blackest blot on our civilization is the manner in which we treat the Indians. Canada and the Indians are at peace," because the Indians ". . . have been righteously dealt with."[11] The **Connecticut Catholic**

and the **Freeman's Journal**, both blamed the battle on the replacement of the Catholic missionaries with Protestant missionaries. The editor of the **Freeman's Journal**, James A. McMaster, proclaimed, "Then was inaugurated one of the greatest, if not the very greatest, of crimes of Grant's bad administration. . . . The Methodist plan, which they cunningly called the Quaker, was to apportion the Indians as `dumb, driven cattle,' among ever so many religious denominations." Later, McMaster wrote, "The practical result of the cruel massacre of Custer and his command, should be the revoking of the Grant-Methodist swindle."[12] While the Protestant and Catholics complained about each other, the Protestants bickered with one another.

One example of this can be found in a letter from John McCarthy, a missionary from the American Home Missionary Society. In his letter to the home office, McCarthy asked for prompt payment for land that had been granted to his mission by the Cherokee Nation, in Indian Territory. He complained that the other missionary groups in the area had cut into the resources that he could gather from the local population. Not only did he complain of the lack of funds for his own mission but he accused the other missionaries of underhandedness. McCarthy stated his group relied on the mercy of those around them. He wrote:

> The necessity of pushing building operations is an embarassment [sic] to us; it is not so easy to impress people with our need of the money; besides the denominational spirit has been aroused in behalf of the needy Methodist and Baptist enterprises here, the former the "college" and the latter a church, so that we find ourselves forestalled with those to whom we would naturally look for assistance . . . The Methodists take little or no pains to conceal their antagonism; the air is full of their manoeuvers [sic]; one of the later being the (talked-of) creation of a new building for which they have no use; they will merely get names on subscription books to afford persons the excuse for refusing us. WE are not

militant at all. Our Congressional work is an open boat surrounded by armed privateers ready to fire upon us when they dare.[13]

The missionaries in the United States did not have the only religious groups that could not get along with one another. In Upper Canada, Peter Jones became the first Indian to be converted in a Methodist camp meeting and the first ordained as a Methodist minister in 1833. Jones served as liaison between the government and his people. In the mid-1820's, Sir Peregrine Maitland, the governor of Upper Canada and a member of the Anglican Church, threatened to withhold assistance to the Indians if they did not stop attending Methodist church meetings. Anglican Church members considered the Methodists to be "uncultured, uncouth, uneducated, and uncontrolled." The Governor gave the Methodist Indians an ultimatum saying, "Either desist from attending Camp Meetings and retain the goodwill and aid of the Governor, or persist in going and lose his friendship and assistance."

Not only did the Methodist Indians face the Governor withholding government support, but the local merchants threatened to refuse trade with the Methodist Indians. By being Methodists, the Indians opposed the consumption of alcohol. This disrupted trade because the merchants could no longer use cheap liquor for trade nor could they get the Indians drunk and cheat them.

For two years, Jones acted in the position of liaison and called for his people to choose their own religion. During this time, his people saw no reason to answer the threat. Then, in 1829, Sir John Colborne replaced Maitland as Governor. Colborne saw no reason why the Indians should not remain Methodists as long as they made progress

towards their acculturation. At this time, the chiefs decided to exercise their freedom of religion and remain Methodist.[14] After this dispute with the Methodist, the Anglicans later found themselves in an internal dilemma springing from their attempts to minister to the Indians in Canada.

John Williams Tims, an Anglican missionary, began working among the Blackfoot in 1883. He believed that education went hand in hand with religion and started a day school. By 1891, Tims had three day schools, with 106 students, and a boarding school with 24 student in residence. He decided, in 1899, to turn all the schools into boarding schools because it had become "obvious that the influence of camp life undid all the good the children received during the few short hours they attended school." Also, "since the Government decided to give its grants to boarding schools on basis of attendance of the children." Tims' goal became to increase the number of children at the schools, "not only for the good of the children, but to increase the assets." Eventually, Tims' schools came under fire from both the Canadian government, for health reasons, and the missionary society for which he worked questioned his results.[15]

In 1907, Doctor P. H. Bryce, a Medical Officer of the Department of Indian Affairs, visited the schools. He noted that the water sources from all the wells tested "bad," rated the ventilation as "very defective," and found all but three of the children in attendance under doctor's care for tuberculosis. Nearly a quarter of the 1,537 students who had attended the schools had died, with the main cause of death being tuberculosis. During this time Samuel Hume Blake had been

appointed to the Indian Committee of the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.[16]

Blake published a pamphlet in May, 1908, entitled "Don't You Hear the Red Man Calling?" In his pamphlet, Blake questioned the methods by which the school acquired students, and the results of the schooling. He quoted a letter that said day schools would be better because when the children finished their current educations "the boys are thieves and the girls are prostitutes." Blake also complained the mission spent too much time on the schools and not enough on missionary work.[17]

Tims took up the defense with several pamphlets of his own. He said that if the mission did any less the Catholics would pick up the slack. He challenged Blake to "produce evidence that any of the girls educated" in one of the schools "is living the life of a prostitute." Tims said that only two of the girls had not gotten married and they lived with their parents and always attended church.[18] This squabble within the Anglican Church demonstrates three things.

The first thing shown is the type of bickering that went on in most church organizations. It demonstrates that anti-Catholic motives did not exist only in the United States, but in Canada as well. It also illustrates how disease constantly threatened the Indians. Although, Blake may not have been able to prove his accusations, a later study showed that he may not have been totally off base on the possible effects of the Indian boarding schools. The Blake-Tims debate also points out another problem. Should the native people be educated before becoming Christians, or should they become Christians first.

Reverend Cephas Washburn argued for the Indians to become

Christians first. Washburn worked for the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, a Presbyterian organization, in the part of the country that became Indian Territory and then Oklahoma. When Washburn went there, a group of Cherokee had just settled in the area. Washburn set up a mission school, known as the Dwight School, among the newly arrived Cherokee, in 1821. He devoted the next twenty years of his life to laboring for the school and doing his missionary work among the Cherokee. Washburn found the Cherokee very accepting of his teachings because they had a long history of dealing with the whites.

When he wrote about his missionary work among the Cherokee, Reverend Washburn said:

> It was also remembered that in all efforts, even to civilize and educate them, the gospel must bear the forefront of the battle; because it is the revealed purpose of Jehovah, that the despised gospel of His Son shall have the glory of taming and humanizing every nation and tribe of barbarians, or they shall waste away in their savage degradation. Hence we ever considered that our great object was to preach the gospel to and thus save the souls of the Cherokees.[19]

Years later he rebuked all missionary groups by writing:

> It appears to me that God is rebuking our Churches for the disproportionate interest they feel for the Indians, while so much of sympathy and zeal are enlisted in behalf of the heathen abroad. I have not the data at hand . . . but I will venture the statement that the aggregate of converts, at all our foreign stations, does not exceed the aggregate of the Indian converts, while at the same time, it is true that our foreign missionaries have had access to at least a hundred times as many souls as our Indian missionaries. Now, why is this? Because God holds American Christians under the special obligation to convert the Indians.[20]

Elkanah Beard, one of the first missionaries for the Executive Committee of Friends on Indian Affairs, echoed Washburn's sentiments. In a report to the committee, Beard wrote, "The question is not, Can the

Indian be Saved? but, can Friends be saved if they do not attempt to support at least one mission for the aborigines of our country?"[21]

One family of missionaries went beyond simply teaching their converts. The Riggs family made great strides in their works, but they did not believe that Christianity must come first. The Riggs started their missionary work for the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and later worked for the American Missionary Association. The family of missionaries proved to be one of the bright spots that allowed the individual Indians to demonstrate how far the Indian could go in the Anglo-American society. The A.M.A., in 1882, transferred its African missions to the American Board and in exchange took over the Board's missions in Nebraska and the Dakotas including the mission to the Sioux at Santee, Nebraska. The A.M.A. inherited the educational work of Reverend A. L. Riggs, D.D., the head of the Santee Normal Training School. The school had one hundred pupils of both sexes and of all ages. Rev. Thomas L. Riggs, D.D. conducted the evangelical work. Of the 2,500 Sioux at Oahe, Dakota, two hundred Sioux had been converted to Christianity and the Indians at Santee had an Indian pastor. Twenty-five families at Oahe had accepted the missionaries' work and became farmers.[22]

The Riggs family attempted to improve the position of the Indians in their care by sending promising students to Beliot College in Wisconsin. The native children received the same training as the Euro-American students and eventually became ministers and missionaries. Charles Alexander Eastman became one of the first students the Riggs sent to the College. He attended Dartmouth and the Boston University

School of Medicine earning his M.D. in 1890. Moreover, he published several books and articles and lectured on the condition of the Indians.

Many Indian students did well at Beliot, but after thirteen years, the government terminated the program in 1884. The government had determined that the college did not properly prepare the Indian students for the "industrial" education promoted by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The Commissioner claimed that if something in the education process of the Indians should be neglected it should be the "literary skills" and not the "manual labor skills." White intellectual society believed the Indians needed only to be schooled in the knowledge of how to become farmers or domestic laborers, not doctors and lawyers. The government thought that the Indians only needed the kind of education they could receive at the traditional boarding schools, like the Carlisle Indian School, for the Indian to become successful in American society.[23]

Rev. Stephen R. Riggs, when writing about the difference between the Euro-American culture and the Native American culture, said:

> To us they are barbarians. But what makes us to differ from them? Chiefly we are indebted to the Bible for our superior intelligence and more civilized habits. And yet, with all these advantages, the late [civil] war has shown the white race to be capable of systematic cruelties which throw the barbarities of Indian massacres into the shade.[24]

Dr. Riggs did not see the Indians as being civilized, but he saw that they were not evil either.

Rev. Riggs did not subscribe to the theory of Social Darwinism. He had hope that the Indians could become civilized people and he believed that he understood how the civilizing of the Indian should be brought about. He wrote:

> Belonging to the same human race, and being very much like other heathen, the Indians are capable of being civilized and Christianized. But give them a chance, and hold out proper inducements to them. Make it possible for them to become men, and help them to become such; not by feeding and clothing them, except for the present necessity, but by showing them that work is honorable and remunerative, and that the law of labor is one from which no people are exempted; and above all, by leading them through education and religion up to the knowledge and experience of a higher life.[25]

While some missionaries believed the Indian should become a Christian before being taught how to read and write English, Dr. Riggs surmised it necessary to educate the Indians before they could become Christians. He concluded education to be the most important part of bringing the Indian to civilization, "in accordance to the theory that the heathen should be civilized and educated before an attempt be made to Christianize them." He reasoned that "[i]n some missions among the Indians, the school is the first and almost the sole agency used . . ." As for the process of teaching the Dakotas he found teaching the lessons in the native language "to be the most productive" way of teaching. The Dakota "learned to read their own language easily; and that knowledge we found to be helpful in learning English."[26]

The concept of using native languages did not originate with the work carried out by the Riggs. Some of the first missionaries in North America and New Zealand translated the Bible into native languages. No matter how useful missionaries found the native languages in teaching, the people who believed in social Darwinism viewed using native languages as slowing down the assimilation process. These people believed that by teaching the native people in English they could avoid the step of teaching in the native languages.

Samuel Marsden became the first missionary to arrive in New

Zealand. Working as a missionary in Australia, Marsden met some Maoris who had left New Zealand to be sailors on a European ship. He decided to start a mission in New Zealand where he could teach the natives better ways to do their work and how to be Christians. He arrived in New Zealand in 1814 and proposed to teach the Maori better farming techniques and other trades. To help teach these trades he brought with him a carpenter, a shoemaker and a teacher.[27]

Not until 1825 did the first Maori become baptized into the church. The Maori had not been interested in learning new ways, or the Gospel. Being warriors, they wanted weapons which the missionaries refused to provide. The missionaries taught that the chiefs could only have one wife and converts must give up their practice of cannibalism. In an effort to gain converts the missionaries established a written text for the Maori language and translated the Bible into Maori.

Marsden, and those with him, belonged to the Anglican Church. Soon missionaries from the Roman Catholic Church and the Wesleyan Church followed them to New Zealand. All the missionaries did educational work. Like elsewhere, they also fought for new converts. Also, the competing missionaries confused the Maori. The Maori found Christianity hard to accept to begin with and they found the differences between the various groups to be beyond comprehension.[28] Native people everywhere had difficulties understanding the differences between the Christian denominations. After confusing the native with different ideologies, complaining about one another and internally, and trying to educate the native, the missionaries did not refrain from bragging about their work.

Boasting about how the missionaries had helped improve the

American Indian, A.M.A. missionary Reverend Mary C. Collins wrote, "Our mission schools have sent out hundreds of young men and women to act as living, working, object-lessons among the people from every tribe. These Christian fathers and mothers, homemakers, and home keepers, teachers and ministers, doctors and lawyers, all owe their present honors and useful position in life to our good Christian schools."[29] Her statement could be seen as a pat on the back for herself, and for the missionary system as a whole.

As a whole, the missionaries were a key facet in the Europeans' effort to "civilize" the native people whom they met. Education became the most important tool the missionaries used to achieve this goal. However, the missionaries did not present a unified front in their efforts. They argued along denominational lines and with in denominations about how the work should be carried out. Although not unified in their efforts, the missionaries managed to transform many natives into copies of themselves. The next chapter will review how these "good Christian schools" and the government schools function.

Chapter Three - Education to Citizenship

". . . I was marched to the dining room, placed with my back to one of the posts, and my arms brought around it and tied; then I was left alone in this uncomfortable position, to repent." - Frances La Flesche[1]

"The old net is laid aside. The new net goes a-fishing." - Maori Proverb[2]

European settlers in the colonies saw the education of aboriginal peoples as an essential process for the natives to be saved from extinction. As previously seen, the transplanted Europeans debated about whether the native should become a Christian before being educated or if the education should come first. They debated how much education the native should receive and who should do the teaching. Also, they argued about when the educated native actually should become a citizen. The eventual policies became that the native must be educated enough to become a farmer before they could become a citizen. The Dawes Act became the main instrument for Indian citizenship in the United States. The Dawes Act called for all reservations to be allotted to the Indians and the extra would be sold to whites. The United States government would hold the title for the Allotted land in trust for the Indian for twenty-five years at which time the Indian would receive the land and become a citizen, provided the Indian had succeeded in the "habits of civilized life" which were never defined. This chapter will analyze the educational process and the arguments for citizenship for the native people.

In the United States after 1819 Congress began funding education for Indians in an effort to "civilize" the Indians, including those

educated by missionaries. By 1871 the government assumed total r esponsibility for Indian education by making an appropriation for educational purposes. By the end of the century almost half of the Indian children in the United States had attended school sometime.[3]

Even with government help, missionaries found establishing schools to be a difficult process. In a letter, Reverend Bernard wrote about the difficulties he faced, in 1846, when he, his wife and Brother D. Spencer established a mission at Red Cedar Lake, Minnesota. The men cut their lumber, cleared the land for the buildings, constructed the buildings and raised a crop of potatoes. Mrs. Bernard tried to organize a school as well as take care of the domestic needs of the mission. In his report of the activities at the school, Rev. Bernard rebuked those who had sent him west for failing to provide a teacher.

In his letter, published in the **American Missionary**, Rev. Bernard wrote:

> You wish to know particulars about our school, the progress of the Indians, &c. Sure you cannot expect to hear a very flattering account of schools where there is no teacher. Will heathen children come together and teach themselves? Do you ask if I am not a teacher? I answer I am already farmer, carpenter, sawyer, physician, lawyer, trader and preacher. But, say you, don't Brother Spencer teach? I answer he is my right hand man, my dearly beloved brother and fellow-laborer in my duties. But where is your wife, say you? sure she can find time to teach. Please step in and see her at her daily routine of duties, and you will find how much time she has to sit down from 5 in the morning till 7 in the evening. Besides, you say in your letter, `do not let your wife undertake too much.' Now, who shall teach? Yes our bleeding hearts cry out, who? Our disappointment was very great on learning from Bro. W., that no one could be found to come to our aid. . . . Had we sufficient help, a large and interesting school might be kept up the year round, except in the sugar and rice making seasons.[4]

The problems faced by Rev. Bernard occurred elsewhere too.

In relaying the problems faced by a mission in Canada Rev.

McDougall wrote:

> Upwards to 600 natives regard this as their home, and just let our friends remember that this mission is more than a thousand miles from any commercial centre, that the missionary has to bring his supplies across the great plain, cut his lumber for building purposes with a pit saw, procure labor were wages are enormously high, and then it will be seen that the work is really astonishing.[5]

McDougall cited two reasons for the high wages in the Canadian West. The Mounted Police paid the Metis ninety dollars a month to act as guides and interpreters. Second, herders collected one hundred fifty dollars a month.[6] However, despite the troubles the missionaries faced, they often received praise from other whites who visited their missions.

Lewis Henry Morgan travelled in the Kansas and Nebraska area of the United States in 1859 and kept a journal of his travels. In it he wrote about the places he visited as well as the people he met whether they be white or Indian. He told about the mission schools on the reservations. In describing the actions of the schools at the Pottawatam reservation on the banks of the Kansas River, he wrote:

> There are two missions here, one a Catholic Manual Labor School called St. Mary's Mission . . . and the Mission of the Southern Baptists . . . They are both manual labor schools. The children are brought to the mission, fed, clothed, and schooled at the expense of the missions under a contract with the government by which they secure about $75 per head for each one of taught during the year.

Also, he wrote that the children at the Baptist Mission ". . . are comfortably clad and fed and appear to be happy and contented."[7]

Too, Morgan praised the work of the Baptist Mission among the Delaware, in Kansas, "This is the true system of Indian education, beyond a doubt, and this school is by far in the best condition of any I

have seen. We see here New England cleanliness, system, and good management." He called the principal, Rev. John G. Pratt, a "well educated and superior man." At this time, Pratt had been a missionary to the Indians for 22 years. Based on rumors, Morgan had less favorable things to say about the Methodist working with the nearby Shawnee. Rev. Pratt had previously been the missionary to the Shawnee until the closing of his school, and it is possible that Pratt may have negatively influenced Morgan's writings about the Methodist missionaries.[8] While the missionaries worked to overcome the obstacles they faced, government controlled schools also ran into barriers.

In 1866, in Arizona, seven years before the federal government established the first reservation for the Papago, the Catholic Bishop of Santa Fe attempted to open a school for the Papago. The school lasted only a few months because of the lack of desire among the Papago to have their children educated in the ways of the whites.

The government installed the first school among the Pima, in Arizona, in 1871. Reverend C. H. Cook, a Presbyterian missionary, became the first teacher. Rev. Cook reportedly spent a short time learning the Pima language before starting his first class. The Papago got their government school in 1873. The government built the school and employed two nuns from the Sisters of St. Joseph's Academy as the teachers.

The government often had trouble recruiting and retaining teachers for the Indian schools, but solved part of the problem by hiring missionaries to fill the positions. Also, sporadic attendance hampered these new schools. The schools constantly closed for inclement weather, at planting and harvesting time, and on ceremonial occasions. Poor

attendance at Indian schools led Indian agents to ask for boarding schools where the influence of the parents would be less.[9]

Army Captain Richard Henry Pratt became an important figure in the U.S. government's starting boarding schools for Indian children. Pratt had taken seventy-two Cheyenne, Comanche and Arapaho men, who had been captured fighting with the Army, and established an educational program for them at Fort Marion in St. Augustine, Florida. Pratt thought if he took the men away from everything they knew, he could re-educate them and turn them into examples of Euro-Americans. Pratt often lacked tactfulness when dealing with the Indian Bureau, consequently, the Indian Bureau ignored many of his ideas on dealing with the Indians. The government, however, let Pratt attempt his experiment in Florida.

Pratt brought in teachers to instruct the Indians on how to read and write, he taught them military drill, and he gave them uniforms to wear. The men worked in St. Augustine as bakers, sailors, fishermen, and field hands. Some of them drew pictures of their experiences and sold them to tourists. After Mrs. J. Dorman Steele visited Fort Marion, she wrote an article which appeared in the August 1877 edition of **The National Teachers' Monthly**. The article supported the work Pratt had begun with the Indians. Mrs. Steele wrote:

> What if . . . the next generation should witness peace in every tribe, Indian youth in schools, Indians in the Army thoroughly and worthy of trust as guardians of the peace in the west, a war debt replaced by an educational or civilization fund, and an end forever to the spilling of our bravest American blood? In a word, that we have accepted as brothers our natives whom this recent experiment has proved to be susceptible of transformation and responsive to Christian teaching. Shall we recognize them as men and women, and for the sake of humanity and our country's welfare, offer them the same opportunities which we lavish on immigrants from all lands, or shall we continue to prolong the popular cry of extermination?

> The Creeks, the Cherokees and the Choctaws have proved that their civilization is not a failure. Why not give the same opportunity to the Comanches, the Kiowas, even the bloody Sioux?[10]

After the government decided to allow the Indians at Ft. Marion to return home, a few wished to stay in the East; one had become a deacon in the local Methodist church. Pratt managed to get those wishing to stay in the East admitted to the Hampton Industrial and Agricultural Institute, in Hampton, Virginia. In 1868 the Freedman's Bureau built Hampton Institute as a teacher's college for newly freed blacks, so they could become teachers among the freedmen, replacing the missionaries who had moved in after the war. The school began to accept Indians in 1879. The first Indians who arrived from the reservations wore their hair in braids and their clothing included moccasins and blankets. The blankets replaced the traditional buffalo robes the plains Indians had worn before the destruction of the great herds. The arrivals soon had their hair cut, their blankets replaced with uniforms, and their light moccasins exchanged for heavy leather shoes.[11]

A day at Hampton began at five o'clock every morning. Students attended classes in the mornings. The girls labored in the laundry or sewing room in the afternoon; the boys received training on farming. The co-ed classes put many Indian students in a strange environment. In Omaha society, a girl must never be left alone with a boy. Girls always had to be watched by an older female relative. But at Hampton, the Indian way no longer mattered. The boys received permission to visit the girls barracks for dinner on Saturdays and Sundays, and twice a month they could stay after dinner for games.[12] Upon seeing how successful the Indians had become at Hampton, Pratt visualized the need

to establish a permanent boarding school for Indian children. His vision led to the establishment of the Carlisle Indian School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, 1879.

In 1881, of Carlisle's success, Pratt wrote, "Old Dr. [Stephen R.] Riggs came here on his way to Washington to meet the Commissioner and then returned and spent Sunday with us. He was an enemy. Said we were `too far away,' `too far south,' etc., for the Sioux. Was sensitive about removal from Agencies. He was thoroughly captured before he left." Dr. Riggs, and his wife Mary, worked with the Sioux for the American Board for Foreign Missions and had dedicated his life to this work.[13]

Captain Pratt dreaded young educated Indians returning to the reservation and living as if they had not been given a "civilized education". Pratt referred to this as "going back to the blanket". Other people shared Pratt's concern with the young Indians returning to their previous lives. In 1893, the secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association wrote to the A.H.M.S. requesting that the Home Missionary Society take over the missionary work that the Y.M.C.A. had been doing with the Cheyenne and Arapaho in the Indian Territory. The letter said:

> They ["the educated boys and girls"] are brought under Christian influence and teaching. When they return what do they tell their people; do they not speak of what they have learned about the Saviour, and what they know about Jesus. The fact is they return feeling strong and desirous of doing much for their people; but the influence of their old associations is too great and they soon give way and go back to camp life and Indian ways.[14]

The letter writer deemed the A.H.M.S. to be able to give a more stable environment for the returning youths than the Young Men's Christian Association since missionary work was not the goal of the Y.M.C.A.

After the successes of the programs at Hampton and Carlisle, the government built the first boarding school in Arizona for the Mohaves and Chemehuevis on the Colorado River Reservation in 1879. The next year, the government founded a boarding school for the Apaches, at San Carlos. The San Carlos School closed in 1882 because the agent there believed the Apaches "were too wild for the classroom." The school did not reopen until 1887. The Pimas obtained a boarding school in 1881, and the Navajos in 1884.[15] In 1887 the government built a boarding school for the Hopi at Kearns Canyon. Despite the school's location on the Hopi reservation, because of the larger nearby Navajo population, the school housed more Navajo children than Hopi children.

The push for boarding schools led to a series of off-reservation schools. The Training School at Tucson, built in 1888, became Arizona's first off-reservation boarding school. The Home Mission Board operated the school, which had been built with government funds. In 1890, the Indian Bureau built and operated a school at Fort Mohave. The Phoenix Indian School, built in 1891, became the largest off-reservation boarding school in Arizona.[16] The trend in off-reservation boarding schools did not last long.

The trend toward the construction of boarding schools changed in the 1890's when the Bureau began building day schools for children who lived near villages. The agent at the Gila River Reservation urged the building of day schools as early as 1884 when he wrote :

> It has cost $6000 to carry on this boarding school the past year. If that amount was expended for five or six day schools, paying the teachers a good salary, I think the Indians would receive more benefit, while the girls would be under the care of their mothers at night.[17]

Nonetheless, the renewed trend toward day schools did not end the use of boarding or mission schools. The off-reservation schools remained the most widely used type of schools. The boarding schools removed the child from the influence of his native culture, in an attempt to assimilate him into white culture as quick as possible. The off-reservation schools fit this aim perfectly.[18] In 1906, of the nearly 25,000 Indian children enrolled in government schools, 37 percent of the children attended classes in one of twenty-five off-reservation boarding schools.[19]

Being too far away, the Carlisle Indian school had little direct influence on the Indians of Arizona. The government tended to send children to a school near their home in order to save on the cost of transportation. However, all the off-reservation schools followed the same strict military regimen initiated at Carlisle, including corporal punishment. The schools did not permit students to return home during the semester and discouraged visits from parents and friends from the reservation. Along with assimilation, the purpose of the education the children received was to help them function in white society.

When Native Americans replaced white workers on the Skokomish Reservation in Washington the agent, Edwin Eells, wrote about how successful the boarding school system had become. He wrote to the American Missionary Association that:

> . . . all the working men employed at the Agency for the last fifteen or twenty years were dismissed by order of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and their places were filled by Indians, - young men who had grown up with us, attended our schools, worked in our shops as apprentice and were thus prepared to take the white men's places at the Agency. This indicates the advance which these Indians have made in the past ten or twelve years.[20]

He called the "experiment" of using the Indians to replace the white workers a success. The only problem he saw came from the young Indians not having the experience the whites had previously had and thus required more supervision. In spite of this problem he saw the lack of experience as only a temporary condition. Eells had been one of the first missionaries sent out by the A.M.A.[21]

Very proud of the education being provided for Indian children, a bulletin from the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs claimed, "The existing day and boarding school system [in the U.S.] has demonstrated very effectively its value and adaptation to the needs of Indian boys and girls. Its results are now unmistakable and the best argument for its continuance through some years to come. It has enabled the Indian to make greater progress than any other pagan race in a like period of which there is any written record."[22] Some Indians would disagree with the Indian Bureau view of itself.

In his book **Land of the Spotted Eagle**, Luther Standing Bear related his experiences while attending Carlisle Indian School. When asked in 1879 to attend the school, he "could think of no reason why white people wanted Indian boys and girls except to kill them, and not having the remotest idea of what school was," he thought that he would be killed once he reached the East. Standing Bear wrote that on the train ride to the school, he saw more white people than he ever thought could have existed. Every time the train stopped, white people would surround the train to look at the "little Indian `savages.'" The train ride took place only three years after Custer's defeat at the Little Big Horn. When the children exited the train for meals, they found

themselves under heavy protection by men in uniforms. About his journey to Carlisle, Standing Bear wrote:

> . . . I often recall that scene - eighty-odd blanketed boys and girls marching down the street surrounded by a jeering, unsympathetic people whose only emotions were those of hate and fear; the conquerors looking upon the conquered. And no more understanding us than if we had suddenly been dropped from the moon.[23]

At first, Carlisle did not prove to be a pleasant experience for Standing Bear. The "`civilizing' process began" with new clothes. He thought the worse parts of the new clothes to be the painful leather shoes and the trousers, which the children thought kept them from "breathing well." The Lakota thought that a person breathed through the skin and thus the pants covering the legs restrained their breathing. The teachers told the children that they could not go barefoot because the dew on the grass would give them colds. The teachers warnings came as a surprise to the children. Their mothers had never warned them about colds. Luther could "remember as a child coming into the tipi with moccasins full of snow", and not having any ill side effects.

The teachers required the children to pick English names instead of translating their names into English. The teachers gave a pointer to a child and told the child to pick a name from several written on the blackboard. Standing Bear did not know one name from the other when he picked Luther. The school officials prohibited the children to speak their native language. In his book Standing Bear wrote, "This rule is uncalled for, and today is not only robbing the Indian, but America of a rich heritage. The language of a people is part of their history."

The worse part of the experience at Carlisle for the children, according to Standing Bear, turned out to be the change in diet. The

meals at the schools introduced the children for the first time to white bread, coffee and sugar. The change of diet, clothing, housing and the confinement along with loneliness overwhelmed some children. "[I]n three years nearly one half of the children from the Plains were dead and through with all earthly schools. In the graveyard at Carlisle most of the graves are those of little ones."[24] Of the first 112 Apache children sent to Carlisle, starting in 1886, 30 had died from diseases by the end of 1889. Of the remaining Apache children, twelve more became so sick that the school sent them home to recover.[25]

After graduating from Carlisle, Luther returned to the Lakota reservation and immersed himself into his culture while retaining the image of what he had learned at Carlisle. Upon returning in 1882, Standing Bear taught school, ran his father's store, and married. Although he became successful upon returning home, he watched with a heavy heart as students returned from boarding schools and could not speak their native language, or worse, because of shame, refused. "They had become ashamed and this led them into deception and trickery."[26]

Many of the same problems that Luther Standing Bear discussed in his book are echoed nearly a century later in Charles W. Hobart's study of the schools in Canada. Hobart's results transcend time and could have been found on any continent. When compared with Standing Bear's story, the universality of Hobart's investigation was apparent. Hobart, by covering a four month period in 1963 and 1964, reviewed a situation in the western Canadian Arctic that is typical of the residential school process. He reported on the Canadian attempt to rapidly integrate the Eskimo population, through educating the children.[27]

The study Hobart conducted included 818 Eskimo children between the ages of 6 and 18. The government of Canada, through the Education Branch of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, controlled the schools. The school system he observed consisted of ten day schools for 465 children and boarding schools where 353 students lived.[28]

The lives of children attending the day schools did not differ much from those of white children in the Canadian provinces. A child grew up with his classmates where the surroundings outside the windows remained familiar. His school buildings differed little from the ones that could be found in rural areas throughout Canada.[29] However, students at the boarding schools faced a different dilemma.

The largest boarding school, Sir Alexander MacKenzie School in Inuvik, housed about three hundred students. Some of the children, as young as six years old, had been flown as far as 800 miles to attend the school. Before arriving at the school, most of the children understood no English, had never seen running water, and ate a diet that consisted mostly of raw meat. The school kept the dormitory rooms comfortably warm by white standards, but too warm by Eskimo standards. The meals, good by white middle class norms, made no allowances for Eskimos' taste.

Describing the teachers and the curriculum, Hobart reported that the teachers signed a two year contract and often returned to the south at the end of this obligation. Although certified teachers, they normally had no specialized training in dealing with "culturally deprived" or non-English speaking children. The curriculum, the Alberta curriculum, had been designed for white students "and has a pronounced

middle-class bias." The government allowed no modifications to the program had the teachers desired to modify what they taught.[30]

Hobart listed four consequences of Eskimo children attending boarding schools. The students faced a change in their physical physiological makeup, first. The students adjusted to the diet and warmer rooms at the school but had problems upon returning home.

"Social psychological" changes ensued from the differences the children faced when moving from the home to the school and then back. The children faced an initial shock upon moving to the school and then a feeling of being deprived of the facilities provided at the school when at home. These problems also arose when students returned home became disobedient and disrespectful to their parents. Hobart said this stemmed from a lack of respect for their own culture they learned from the curriculum taught at the school. The problem increased the longer the child stayed away from their native culture.[31]

Another related effect of the children being away from their native culture could be seen when the children returned home and had a reported change in morality. The problems included lying, stealing, smoking, drinking, and premarital pregnancy. Traditional Eskimo society considered lying and stealing to be morally wrong. Hobart believed lying increased because the children learned one thing at school and when they returned home they could not apply what they had learned, thus they lied about what they did.[32] This result is similar to the one Samuel Blake pointed out, in his pamphlet, sixty years earlier.

The fourth consequence Hobart labeled "playing two different games." The children learned to live in two different worlds, one: the

traditional Eskimo home, the other: the white world of the school. At home they did not apply the knowledge they acquired at school, and no one at the school encouraged them to apply what they knew from home.

Hobart's study focused on the Eskimos of Canada in the middle 1960's, but comparable consequences can be found in Luther Standing Bears writings thus showing a pattern in the attempts to educate native children in a wholly European way with no thought given to traditional values.

About the United States' endeavor to remake the Indian into a white man, Luther Standing Bear wrote:

> The matter is not the making-over of the external Indian into the likeness of the white race - a process detrimental to both races. Who can say that the white man's way is better for the Indian? Where resides the human judgement with the competence to weigh and value Indian ideals and spiritual concepts; or substitute for them other values?
>
> Then, has the white man's social order been so harmonious and ideal as to merit the respect of the Indian, and for that matter the thinking class of the white race? Is it wise to urge upon the Indian a Foreign social form? Let none but the Indian answer.[33]

In Australia, the government took a different tactic than the United States to integrate native children into white society. The state governments deemed children of mixed blood to have a redeemable quality because of their European bloodline. Hence, the state governments took these children away from their Aboriginal parents, often by force, and placed them in the foster care of white families. The governments removed the children in an attempt to deny them any knowledge of their Aboriginal roots and to completely immerse them in Anglo-Australian culture. In the Northern Territory, the Aboriginals Ordinance of 1918 enforced the removal of "Half-caste" children from

their parents whom the government deemed to have no legal rights to the children. The state placed the children in institutions and foster homes. The establishments included the Bungalow in Alice Springs, the Kahlin Compound, the Retta Dixon Boys Home in Darwin, and missions like Croker Island and Garden Point on Melville Island.[34] Other Australian states had similar methods.

In 1909, the government of New South Wales passed the New South Wales Aborigines Protection Act, which gave the Aborigines Protection Board, established in June 1883, nearly complete control over all aspects of Aboriginal life in New South Wales. Amendments in 1915 and 1918 allowed the Board to remove children from parents for training. Paralleling Indian education in the United States, the girls received domestic labor training and the boys learned to do farm work. Unlike the United States, however, they received little in the way of a formal education.[35] New Zealand appears to have had a more enlightened record for attempting to assimilate the native population through education than the other three countries.

New Zealand created a provision, in 1867, for the establishment of separate education for the Maori. The provision did not go into effect until 1879 when the new Department of Education got control of the local village schools. The government authorized two hundred scholarships for Maori education in 1880. The children received the scholarships to help them attend church run secondary schools designed for Maori education. As in the United States, the New Zealand government sent married couples to rural Maori schools hoping they would serve as models of "civilized" ways and promote Maori acculturation. Until 1931, official policy said

for the schools to assimilate the Maori to Euro-New Zealand ways as quickly as possible. By 1938, 8,811 Maori children attended Native schools while another 11,456 attended public schools.[36] While New Zealand made progress in educating the Maori, Canada had run into its own dilemmas.

In talking about the "taming" of the Canadian West, Reverend George McDougall, Superintendent of Missionary Work for the Wesleyan Methodist Church, credited the Mounted Police. Rev. McDougall wrote, "These representatives of our young nation having suppressed the liquor trade . . ." have brought about law and order. "The poor natives, who for years have been plundered and murdered, are now relieved from what some call frontier justice." Speaking of the Indians, he points out that disease had "reduced their number one half, thus humbling the proud man of the plains." He gives credit to the "rowdy with his murderous six shooter" for having taught the Indian "the power of the white man," and disposing "them to welcome the red coat as his deliverer." McDougall also recognized the missionary who, he says, preceded the Mounties, "and taught the Indians principles of loyalty" to the Canadian government. Another reason Canada had less trouble with the Indians than the United States, the authorities in Canada had less qualms about punishing whites for transgressions against the Indians.[37] The Indians of Canada saw that one law existed for both the native and white, unlike the United States or Australia where a double standards existed.

Also, the Canadian government left the disbursement of annual annuities to the Mounted Police, instead of the Indian Agent. Of one such disbursement, Colonel James Parker wrote:

> . . . [T]he main band of the Crees were a superior lot and were always thankful for what was being done for them. They always wanted to be assisted and advised as to planting and working their gardens, as the buffalo herds had then disappeared and they were compelled to change their mode of living . . . I was always careful to give them everything that they called for and sometimes a little more and it was the little more that pleased them most.[38]

About the Mounties trip to the Canadian West, Col. Walker said that they had been ordered to stay about forty miles north of the U.S.-Canadian border, "so not to get into any mix-up with the American Indians, as they were constantly on the war path in those days."[39] One reason the American Indians "were constantly on the war path" stemmed from the United States's failure to fulfill the promises made in treaties including the payment of annual annuities. The government's failure to make these payments led to starvation on the reservations. Rather than starve, the Indians would leave the reservations to hunt for food. When the Indians left the reservations, the Army would be sent to force them back with armed conflicts ensuing. The Sioux Indians saw, firsthand, the difference in how the two governments treated the their native populations.

For nearly a year after the battle of the Little Big Horn, Sitting Bull and his followers roamed the plains of the United States. Colonel Nelson Miles called for a conference hoping to talk Sitting Bull into surrendering. Sitting Bull refused to give up, and when he left the soldiers' camp the soldiers fired on the Sioux. Col. Miles, using artillery, chased the Indians for 42 miles, but still Sitting Bull refused to surrender. In May of 1877, following the example of the Sioux who fled Minnesota in 1862, Sitting Bull and his followers entered Canada. Beside the attack from Col. Miles, the killing of Sioux chief

Crazy Horse may be one factor that led to Sitting Bull leaving the U.S. In the Spring of 1877, Crazy Horse had been bayoneted to death when he refused to be placed in the guardhouse at Ft. Robinson.[40]

Upon entering Canada, the Sioux moved to the Prince Albert area. Col. Walker met with the Sioux and told them, that as refugees in his country, they "would have to keep the peace and work for a living" because the Canadian government could not feed them and buffalo no longer existed in that part of Canada. The Sioux promised to behave and went to work for the settlers in the area. The women did domestic work and the men cut wood and worked for the Hudson's Bay Company.[41]

The United States, in October 1877, sent a commission to Canada to sway Sitting Bull and the Sioux to return to the reservation that had been set aside for them. Sitting Bull's reply to the delegation clearly showed his contempt for them and his approval of his treatment in Canada. He told the Commission:

> For Sixty-four years you have persecuted my people. I ask you what we have done to cause us to depart our own country? I will tell you. We had no place to go, so we took refuge here. It was on this side of the boundary I first learned to shoot and be a man. For that reason I have come back. I was kept ever on the move until I was compelled to forsake my own lands and come here. I was raised close to, and today shake hands with these people. [He then shook hands with the Canadian delegation]
>
> That is the way I came to know these people, and that is the way I propose to live. We did not give you our country, you took it from us. Look how I stand with these people. Look at me. You think I am a fool, but you are a greater fool than I am. This house, the home of the English, is a medicine house and you come here to tell us lies. We do not want to hear them. Now I have said enough you can go back. Say no more. Take your lies with you. I will stay here with these people. The country we came from belonged to us; you took it from us; we will live here.[42]

The disappearance of the buffalo is often given as a reason why

the plains Indians often fought with the U.S. Calvary. It was more likely a case of broken promises, of being forced from their homes, being forced to change their way of life and having a foreign way of life forced upon them. As long as the Indians fought with the army they were seen as being uncivilized and thus not ready for citizenship. The Omaha relied heavily on the hunting of buffalo, but with the leadership of Chief Joseph La Flesche, they managed to switch from reliance on the buffalo to a settled farming community, and never took up arms against the U.S. Government.

It could be argued that the Omaha had already been semi-nomadic and thus already relied on agriculture, or that their principal chief being half white would be more likely to go with white ways. However, the importance of the annual buffalo hunts can be seen in the procedures the Omaha followed. They selected men as "police" for each hunt. These men ensured everyone followed the orders of the hunt leader. If anyone attempted to hunt the buffalo on his own, the person ran the risk of scaring the herd and the rest of the tribe would be without meat. Thus, the police imposed strict penalties on the offender. The penalties entailed flogging, and taking all of the person's property. If the offender accepted the punishment his property would be returned. If he fought the punishment his property would be destroyed. This shows the importance of the buffalo to the Omaha. As for La Flesche being half white, the Omaha continued to hunt buffalo until the herds vanished.[43] Many whites felt that as long as the Indians hunted the buffaloes and traveled nomadically, and not become farmers they were not ready for citizenship.

When the Indians of the Canadian plains are compared with the plains Indians of the United States many similarities can be found, one being their mutual reliance on the buffalo. The Indians of western Canada lived as nomadically as those in the United States. However, the Indians of Canada never took up arms like those in the United States. In Canada the Indians who depended on the buffalo (the Crees, Blackfoot, Assiniboins, and the Bloods) did not go to war over the loss of the buffalo. Thus, it would be improper to blame the loss of the buffalo as the only cause of conflict in the United States. On the loss of the buffalo to the Canadian Indians, Rev. McDougall wrote, "Unfortunate people! nothing but their abandonment of paganism and conversion to Christianity can save them."[44] On Native American and Anglo-Canadian relations in western Canada, McDougall wrote:

> I found the Red man very reasonable in his demands . . . If the Indians of this great country had the same feeling of animosity towards us as they have towards the Americans, there would not be a white man alive in less than a month. I have sometimes heard the Mounted Police swagger about what they would do with the natives in case of insurrection, but my opinion is that if the good Lord had not predisposed the red man to look upon these troops as friends, very few of them would have gone back to tell the tale of their adventures in the North West.[45]

Anglo settlement of the Canadian west did not happen completely without bloodshed. However, the only major Indian "wars" in Canadian history are referred to by Canada, as rebellions. These rebellions have the overtones of a religious struggle with the Catholic Metis against the Protestant government in Ontario. The Metis attempted in 1870, and then again in 1885, to install an independent semi-Indian state in western Canada.[46] The Metis are a mixed race people, originally the product of French-Canadian trappers and Cree Indian mothers.

Communities grew as the children grew and intermarried. They became hunters engaging in the fur trade, and feared for their livelihood when the British government turned western Canada over to the Canadian government. The rebellions also had the implications of a civil war caused when the government dictated changes in the way of life for a segment of people who did not want to change and did not trust the government. However, the Canadian government did not see the Metis as citizens because of their mixed blood.

Col. Walker wrote about the rebellions saying, the "disturbing element . . . was the French halfbreeds". Gabriel Dumont and Louis Riel led the Metis, and according to Walker "claimed to have several grievances against the Canadian Government".[47]

The Government of Canada did not recognize the Metis as either whites or Indians, thus they received no protection under law or treaty. Accordingly, the Metis had no legal basis to claim the land on which they lived. Metis farms followed the French method of narrow strips leading away from a river and continuing into the foothills. Despite local practice, when the Canadian Government surveyed the area in 1869 they imposed the British style of dividing the land into grids. This method forced families to lose resources that once had been available to all the families. The Metis felt armed insurrection to be their only recourse when the government refused to listen to their complaints. To lead them the Metis selected Louis Riel whose father had been a leader among the Metis community.[48]

Riel began his formal education at the age of seven years old. He attended a school in St. Boniface run by the Grey Sisters. The school,

primarily for girls, accepted young boys. Catholic Bishop Tache eventually established a school for the boys in his home where Riel continued his education.

Finding Louis to be an outstanding student, Bishop Tache recommended Riel attend school in Quebec. The Bishop had made plans with several colleges to accept any scholars he saw fit to send them. Riel, at the age of thirteen, went to the College of Montreal where he proved to be a good student, and an arrogant one. His education at the College lasted eight years and included Latin, Greek, French, English, science and philosophy.[49]

After the first unsuccessful attempt, in 1870, to get guarantees of citizenship and rights for the Metis from the Canadian Government, Canada exiled Riel from the country. The banishment did not stop Riel's effort to help the Metis. Riel became an American citizen and attempted to get the United States to help the Metis. He believed that if the Metis received farming equipment and land in the United States they could live happily. In exchange for help from the U.S., the Metis would help the government with the plains Indians. Riel felt that the Indians would listen to the Metis better than a white representative from Washington. But the government decided that it had no land to spare for the Metis.

Riel then turned to the Catholic Church for help. The Church, eager to help the Metis, hoped Riel would be able to convince them to settle at mission settlements. In an effort to help, Riel accepted a teaching position at a mission school.[50] However, in 1885, Metis discontent with the government again led to armed rebellion. Riel again

found himself at the front of the movement. He provided the political leadership while Dumont provided the military leadership. Bands of disgruntled Indians joined the Metis during each of the uprisings. The Indians who joined the Metis did not like the changes imposed by the Canadian government on their lives, such as young men looking to make their name as warriors. Thus the lack of the Metis being granted citizenship can be seen as a major reason for Canada's "Indian wars."

While ignoring the Metis, the conservative Canadian government of 1885 gave the Indians of Eastern Canada the rights of citizenship only to have the right taken away by a Liberal Parliament in 1898. On July 4, 1885, Parliament passed the Electoral Franchise Act which gave the right to vote to all male British subjects, by birth or naturalization, with certain property requirements relaxed enough to include those who rented property. This suffrage right included Indians, except those in the western Canada. Demonstrating the European's racial bias, the law also excluded Chinese from voting.

Liberal members of Parliament fought against giving the suffrage to the eastern Indians. Prime Minister Sir John A. MacDonald introduced the Franchise Bill on March 19, 1885. Four days later, the Metis began their second rebellion. The Liberals feared that the right to vote would soon be given to the "unruly" Indians in the west who had rebelled against the Government. By 1898, the Liberals managed to take the vote away from the Eastern Indians. It would be 1960 before the Indians living on reservations would be given the franchise again, although earning the right much sooner.[51] However, according to an article in **The Times**, the Indians of Canada could be proud of their service during

the First World War. Although not allowed to vote, more than 4,000 Canadian Indians joined the Canadian Expeditionary Force during World War I. Those who volunteered for military service represented more than one third of the entire Indian male population of Canada.[52] In the previous century citizenship for the Indians in the United States had been considered by President Thomas Jefferson.

President Jefferson saw assimilation and citizenship into American culture as the best thing for the Indians. Jefferson wrote:

> In truth, the ultimate point of rest and happiness for them is to let our settlements and theirs meet and blend together, to intermix, and become one people. Incorporating themselves with us as citizens of the United States, this is what the natural progress of things will of course bring on, and it will be better to promote than retard it. Surely it will be better for them to be identified with us, and preserved in the occupation of their lands, than be exposed to the many casualties which may endanger them while a separate people.[53]

One can safely assume had the Indians been given the option of either being forced from their land or becoming American citizens, many Indians would have accepted the rights afforded them as citizens.

The Cherokee, for example, would most likely have become citizens rather than face the loss of their homes and suffer the deaths they faced on the Trail of Tears when forced to move from their traditional homeland. In his Eighth Annual Presidential Message, Jefferson stated, ". . . One of the two great divisions of the Cherokee Nation have now under consideration to solicit the citizenship of the United States, and to be identified with us in laws and government in such a progressive manner as we shall think best."[54] Unfortunately for the Indian, removal, either by force or voluntarily, became the only option offered by the Euro-Americans. After removal became the policy of the United

States in dealing with the Indian population, some people still called for them to be given the right of citizenship decades later.

Arguing for the Indian in the United States to be given the right of citizenship, Col. Pratt wrote:

> If enforced, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, as they read, amply provide the complete and economical cure for our every Indian trouble. It is self-evident that the greatest glory to government and the highest beneficence to the Indian was to be achieved in at once transforming him into a capable, coordinated citizen, able as such to live and thrive among us without special control over him and his property.[55]

Pratt continued on this theme saying:

> Going from the Declaration to the Constitution, I read "Article XIV, section I. All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and the State in which they reside . . . ." . . . . I presumed that this also meant just what it said, and that because it was part of the Constitution it was the highest law in the land. All our Indians were "born in the United States," and the facts showed that, most imperiously, the Indian, both in person and property, was under "United States jurisdiction.[56]

While the Indians in Canada and the United States could not become citizens, the Maori in New Zealand had a different problem.

The Maori, upon signing the Treaty of Waitangi, had been promised the rights of British citizenship in 1840. The third article of the Treaty reads, "In consideration thereof Her Majesty the Queen of England extends to the Natives of New Zealand Her royal protection and imparts to them all the Rights and Privileges of British Subjects." According to the Treaty, the Maori had the exclusive right to keep their land and sell it, when they wished, to the Queen's representative. Missionaries played a key role in the Maori's acceptance of the treaty.

On advise from missionary Henry Williams, over forty chiefs placed

their mark on the treaty at the first meeting held on February 6, 1840. Williams, along with his son, had translated the document from English to Maori for the chiefs. At nearly fifty meetings over the next seven months, missionaries and government representatives gained a total of 500 signatures on the Maori version of the treaty. Thirty-nine chiefs chose not to sign. A Maori chief summed up the Maori's grasp of the treaty as being that they retained the land while the Queen got the shadow. Although technically British subjects, not until the Maori Representation Act of 1876 did the Maori receive the chance to elect four representatives to the New Zealand Parliament.

In the mean time, an increase in European immigration caused the white population to grow, and a desire for more land for the settlers. The establishment of a Settler Government, under the Constitution Act of 1852, brought a slacking in the influence of the treaty on the whites. The situation led to warfare on New Zealand's South Island (1843-48) and on the North Island (1860-70). By 1877, the New Zealand Chief Justice declared the Treaty of Waitangi "`a simple nullity.'" Nearly a century passed before the New Zealand Parliament passed legislature to look at Maori land claims based on the Treaty of Waitangi.[57] Toleration of the native population took a long time in Australia as well.

Captain Phillips, first Governor of New South Wales and founder of Port Jackson (Sydney), captured an Aboriginal named Bennelong. Phillips attempted to make resemble the British settlers. Phillips hoped to make Bennelong an example for the Native Australians to follow. However, the Aboriginals rejected Bennelong seeing him as a collaborator. The same label applied to the Aborigines who joined the Native Police Force. In

1814, Governor MacQuarie organized the first reserves in N.S.W. The government of New South Wales instituted over 130 reserves and missions by 1900. Once a year, the government passed out blankets to Aboriginal communities. Ergo, the Aboriginal became a "blanket Aborigine" like the "blanket Indian" in the United States.[58]

The Australian Commonwealth government took over the assimilation policy in 1951, and as late as 1968 the Commonwealth continued to establish reservations. In a 1967 referendum, 90% of Australians voted for the Commonwealth government to make the Aborigines citizens and include them in censuses. Self determination finally became Australian policy in 1972, and the Government began looking into land claims.[59] Although the native people have become citizens, their education is still not what it might be.

As recently as the mid-1990's the Indian schools in the United States, run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, did not meet even minimal building standards. According to an article by the Associated Press, "the 187 BIA-funded schools" had "an estimated backlog of $650 million to $800 million in needed repairs." In the same article, the Director of the BIA's Office of Indian Education Programs is quoted to have said, ". . . In some cases we are probably putting some kids in danger, in unsafe conditions." The government had agreed, in treaties, to pay for the education of the Indian children, but once again the U.S. Congress has failed to live up to the expectations of their promises. The law requires BIA schools to be funded on an equal basis with that of the public schools in the state in which the school is located. In South Dakota, BIA funding per student reached only about 60 percent of what it

should have been.[60]

In the attempt to assimilate their native populations the Anglo societies of the four countries reviewed in this work saw education as an important part of the process to civilize the savage so that the native would become a citizen. White society did not limit its educational attempts to reading and writing but saw religious instruction and vocational training as also being required. The general thought of white society dictated that the indigenous people become at least grade school educated Christians who were generally farmers before they could become citizens. While the Anglo-European governments tried to educate the natives and assimilate them into the white society, the native populations took two approaches to the move. Some of the native people accepted the move while others fought what happened around them.

Chapter Four - Native Response

> "All Indian parents are exceedingly fond of their children. One instance I observed myself." - William Parker[1]

> "During the early period, when Indian children were forced to undergo exposure to Christian doctrine as a part of the formal education process, native religious leaders were strongly opposed to schools and encouraged Indians not to send their children." - James E. Officer[2]

Some native peoples accepted the Europeans' attempt to educate their children. Some of these children grew up and attempted to help their people by using what they learned to stand up for them in the white man's world. Other native people saw no use in the teachings being offered or the religion that the missionaries brought with them. The Europeans' insistence on assimilation or extinction left little opportunity to choose a middle ground. In this chapter both views of the native people will be examined.

In 1676, a Gaspesian/Micmac chief from the American northeast, got tired of the French attitude of superiority. The French called the Americas a "little hell" compared to France. The French equated the Indians to the beast of the forests because they did not have bread, or wine. Also the French assumed the Indians had no religion, no honor, nor any social order the French could ascertain. The Micmac chief told the French the time had come for the French to learn what his people thought of the French. He told the French:

> It is true that we have not always had the use of bread and of wine which your France produces; but, in fact, before the arrival of the French in these parts did not the Gaspesians live longer than now? . . . Learn now, my brother once for all, because I must open to thee my heart: there is no Indian who does not consider himself infinitely more happy and more powerful than the French.[3]

Likewise, upon concluding a treaty with the Iroquois Confederation in June, 1744, commissioners from Maryland and Virginia invited the Iroquois to send some boys to attend William and Mary College. The Indians declined saying they had previously sent some boys to be "brought up at the colleges of the Northern Provinces: they were instructed in all your sciences; but when they came back to us, they were bad runners; ignorant of every means of living in the woods . . . neither fit for hunters, warriors, nor counsellors, they were totally good for nothing." However, to show their appreciation for the Commissioners' offer, the Indians made a counter proposal by offering them, ". . . if the Gentlemen from Virginia will send us a dozen of their sons, we will take care of their education, instruct them in all we know, and make Men of them."[4]

At a peace treaty conference in 1785, a Cherokee chief named Corn Tassel, tried to get a committee from the recently established United States to see that the Cherokee government wanted peace, but they also wanted to be left alone to live as they saw fit. Echoing those that came before, Corn Tassel told the commission:

> [M]uch has been advanced on the want of what you term civilization among the Indians; and many proposals have been made to us to adopt your laws, your religion, your manners and your customs. But we confess that we do not see the propriety, or practicability of such a reformation, and should be better pleased with beholding the good effect of these doctrines in your own practices than with hearing you talk about them, or reading your papers to us upon such subjects.
>
> You say: Why do not the Indians till the ground and live as we do? May we not, with equal propriety, ask, Why the white people do not hunt and live as we do?[5]

Red Jacket, a Seneca chief of the Iroquois Confederation, had no desire to learn anything of the white man's religion. In 1805, the

Evangelical Missionary Society of Massachusetts sent a young missionary, named Cram, to the Iroquois. Informing Cram that the Seneca did not need him, Red Jacket said, "We only know what you tell us about it [Christianity]. How shall we know when to believe, being so often deceived by the white people? . . . You say there is but one way to worship and serve the Great Spirit. If there is but one religion, why do you white people differ so much about it? Why do you not agree, as you can read the book? Brother, we do not wish to destroy your religion or take it from you; we only want to enjoy our own." Reportedly at the end of the meeting, when Red Jacket offered his hand to Cram, the missionary refused to accept it saying that God and the devil could never be friends. Red Jacket smiled, shook his head and left the meeting.

When asked why he did not like missionaries, Red Jacket said that the missionaries did not do any good. He explained, "If they are not useful to the white people and do them no good, why do they send them among the Indians? If they are useful to the white people and do them good, why do they not keep them at home? They [the whites] are surely bad enough that they need the labor of everyone who can make them better." Red Jacket pointed out that each missionary told the Indians something different. Red Jacket surmised that the missionaries twisted Bible stories to suit their own plans. Elaborating on the problems brought about by the different denominations' views, he said, "The red man knew nothing of trouble until it came from the white men; as soon as they crossed the great waters they wanted our country, and in return have always been ready to teach us to quarrel about their religion. Red Jacket can never be the friend of such men."[6]

Religious rivalries between Christian groups led to the massacre of several American missionaries in the Oregon Territory in 1847. The Indians attacked the Whitman mission among the Cayuse and killed twelve people at the mission. Two explanations can be found for the attack on the mission. The first reason was revenge for a measle epidemic which had killed over 200 Cayuses in only a few weeks. The second reason can be blamed on the rivalry among the Protestant and Catholic missionaries in the area having caused the Indians to have arguments, grudges, and "high feelings" to the point that bloodshed finally resulted.[7]

Not facing religious rivalries, some Indian groups requested white teachers. When General Oliver Otis Howard traveled to Alaska, in 1875, "sub-chief" Kalemste of the Wrangel Indians asked Howard to send them a teacher. Some of the soldiers at the local fort had been teaching the Wrangels, but Kalemste wanted a real teacher for his people because the soldiers had other duties and could not provide a permanent school. The general promised he would send the teacher.[8]

Although accepting white civilization, some native people did not fully accept the method of teaching. While teaching at a school among the Caddo Indians, Lawrie Tatum had his teaching ability questioned by the chief, George Washington. The chief knew some English and decided to test the children to see if they had actually learned anything, or if Tatum had "`medicine'" and had bewitched the children to do as he told them. Washington had spent the day in front of the schoolhouse listening to the lessons being taught inside. When Tatum dismissed the children for the evening, Chief Washington entered the building and had the children return to the classroom. He began going over the lessons

he heard being taught. Washington kept the children until midnight, when convinced that the children had actually been learning and had not fallen under a spell from Tatum.[9] While some accepted the teachings of white society, this proved to be the exception on most occasions.

Thirteen years before General Howard's visit with the Indians of Washington and fourteen years before Custer's death at the Little Big Horn, the Sioux had made war on the white citizens of Minnesota. Too much alcohol, frustration with white encroachment, deception by white traders, and failure to be paid for land that they had sold to the United States caused a group of Sioux to kill six whites. Knowing they would either have to flee or fight, the Dakotas, led by Little Crow, decided to fight rather than leave the land they considered to be their own. During the winter and spring, before the decision to fight had been made, 1,500 Sioux had died from exposure while waiting on promised supplies. Making the decision to fight easier, many of the soldiers in the area had been pulled away to fight in the American Civil War, along with reports of the Federal's Army's defeats in the first battle's of the war. Over 1,000 warriors attacked white settlements killing 737 men, women and children, in 1862.

After Federal troops established control over the area, the army captured between four and five hundred warriors. A military commission tried four hundred men in one month. The commission acquitted fifty men, sentenced twenty to prison, and sentenced over 300 more to be hanged. President Abraham Lincoln ordered that only the men who could be proven guilty of individual murders or of having raped white women be executed. With these guidelines, the Army hanged thirty-eight of the

prisoners, the largest mass execution in U.S. history. Understanding the white man's need for revenge, one of the Indians involved in the uprising said, "`A great many white people have been killed, it is right that some Dakota should suffer.'"[10] The harsh treatment which the Minnesota Sioux received from the settlers, before and after the rebellion, led the Sioux in the Dakotas and other plains Indians to become more hostile to Euro-American advances into their territory.[11]

Some of the Sioux fled Minnesota and entered Canada. The Hudson Bay Company permitted the Indians to remain as long as they promised to behave. That winter, the Sioux became so hungry they went from door to door at Fort Garry begging for food. Some of the Sioux became so desperate they sold their children at the same price that would have been paid for a young ox. Authorities, fearing the Sioux would starve to death without help, provided them with food clothing and ammunition for them to hunt. The Sioux responded to the kindness shown them by refusing to take part in the Metis rebellions.[12]

The refugee Sioux eventually received reserves like those of the native Canadian Indians. On these reserves, the Sioux put the skills they had learned working as farmhands for the white settlers to good use. This worked well with the Canadian plan, like the American plan, to turn the Indians into independent farmers. In 1890, the year that saw the murder of Sitting Bull in the U.S., Canadian authorities marvelled at the Sioux's ability to do so well on their reserves without the direct supervision of a white farmer. As part of the Canadian plan to assimilate the Indians into Euro-Canadian culture, the government encouraged church groups to establish schools on the Sioux's reserves.

Most met with little success due to poor attendance by the Sioux. By World War I, the Canadian Sioux had become as self-supporting as the local white farmers. Thus, they showed what the Sioux could do with a little understanding. Also, the fact that, in 1904, the Canadian government listed half the Sioux as pagans, shows they faced less persecution of their native religion than their American kinsman.[13] The success of the Sioux in Canada stems from the Canadian government's willingness to allow the Indians to control most of their own affairs, and the Sioux believing that they were living in Canada as guess.

Some Native Americans did not limit themselves to accepting the education offered by the whites, many accepted the new religion. It would not be uncommon, by the end of the Nineteenth Century, to see Native American preachers leading Indian congregations. In September 1877, Edward Morris, a minister from the Massachusetts Home Missionary Society, wrote to Rev. M. E. Strieby of the American Missionary Association to gain monetary support for a full blood Choctaw who had been helping Morris. Morris had recently had the man ordained through the Red River Association in Texas. He believed that the newly ordained Indian minister would be a good missionary among the full-blood Choctaw, if the A.M.A. could offer financial support.[14]

While working at the Sandy Lake Mission, Reverend John Johnson, a Methodist minister and an Ojibwa Indian, wrote to a friend telling the friend about two principal chiefs and a number of warriors who asked him to teach the children of their band. They reportedly told him, "`We Indians are getting poorer and poorer. We begin to see that by following the Fire Water [alcohol] we are following death. We wish you to come

down among us and teach our children.'" In his letter, Johnson asked, "[C]an these poor miserable heathen be helped? . . . They are calling our names as Christians, for help. . . . I think something ought to be done for them before the Papists establish among them."[15] Johnson, an Indian, had completely accepted the Protestant, white way of thinking. Not only did he accept Christianity, but he became a minister in the white man's religion, and he referred to the non-Christian Indians as "heathen." As a Protestant, he shows the existing prejudice of the time at the time against those of the Catholic Church. However, not all Indians in this later period embraced white education or white religion.

A division about the Europeans' religion and education existed in many of the Indians Nations. Upon hearing of the "power" the Canadians had gained from being able to read the Bible, the Nez Perce of Idaho and Oregon sent four men to St. Louis, Missouri to ask missionaries to come and teach them.[16] One of the missionary groups founded a large school among the Nez Perce. For a short time, their students included the son of one of the Nez Perce bands' chiefs. The boy would grow up to be known by his English name: Chief Joseph. The Nez Perce had helped William Clark and Meriwether Lewis on their exploration to the west coast and they assisted travelers using the Oregon Trail.

Roughly half of the Nez Perce people accepted the teachings of the missionaries and became Christians. The Christian group signed a treaty ceding all the land of the Nez Perce to the U.S. government.[17] Chief Joseph, along with the other non-Christian Nez Perce, refused to accept the terms of the agreement. Chief Joseph questioned how he could be held to an agreement made by others who had no authority to act on his

behalf. He compared the treaty to a man's neighbor selling the man's horses without the man's consent.

In April, 1877, General O. O. Howard met with Chief Joseph and the other Nez Perce chiefs in order to get them to move their bands onto the Lapawai Reservation. Chief Joseph asked General Howard, "If we come and live here what will you give us? -schools, teachers, houses, churches, and gardens?" When Howard answered in the affirmative, Joseph replied, "Well! those are just the things that we do not want . . . We want to hunt buffalo and fish for salmon, not plow and use the hoe."[18]

After some debate, the General refused to allow the chief more than thirty days to move their people and effects onto the reservation. Chief Joseph and five other chiefs attempted to lead their people to Canada to escape Howard and the reservation. The group consisted of 250 warriors and 450 women, children and old men. Chief Joseph hoped to find sanctuary in Canada like Sitting Bull and the Sioux had done a year earlier. The Nez Perce and the U.S. Army then fought a running battle towards the border. The fighting resulted in the first time the Nez Perce had ever taken up arms against whites. Four major skirmishes ensued. General Nelson A. Miles finally cut off Chief Joseph's advance towards the Canadian border at Bear Paw Mountain in Montana. After having travelled over 1000 miles, Joseph's band had made it to within approximately 30 miles of the Canadian-U.S. border. The journey lasted from the middle of July until the end of September. One band, led by Chief White Bird, managed to make it into Canada where they received assistance from Sitting Bull and the refugee Sioux.[19]

After the attempt to reach Canada, the government sent the Nez

Perce into exile in the Indian Territory where they remained until 1884, when the government sent them to three separate reservations in Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. Many of the group refused to farm or live in the houses that had been built for them. Still refusing to accept white ways, Chief Joseph died in 1904 while living in the same tipi he had lived in since the exile to Indian Territory.[20] Ironically, some soldiers grasped the Indians' defiance to white culture, one being George Armstrong Custer.

Just before his death, Custer had praised the Indian. A few months before the Battle of the Little Big Horn, he had written:

> I often think that if I were an Indian I would greatly prefer to cast my lot among those of my people who adhered to the free open plains rather than submit to the confined limits of a reservation, there to be the recipient of the blessed benefits of civilization, with its vices thrown in without stint or measure.[21]

The man who became a symbol for the need to ensure that the Indians be kept on reservations and "civilized", had understood the reason so many Indians resisted the encroachment of the European. Likewise, another Army man who saw the plight of the Indian on the reservation, General William T. Sherman, described the reservations as, "a parcel of land set aside for Indians, surrounded by thieves."[22] Even the Indians tried to tell the government how they wanted to be treated.

Writing of the treatment of the Indians, Chief Joseph wrote:

> The white people have too many chiefs. They do not understand each other. They do not talk alike. . . .I can not understand how the Government sends a man out to fight us, as it did General Miles, and then breaks his word. Such a government has something wrong with it. I can not understand why so many chiefs are allowed to talk so many different ways, and promise so many different things. . . .I have heard talk and talk, but nothing is done. Good words do not last long unless they amount to something. Words can not pay for my dead people. . . . It

makes my heart sick when I remember all the good words and all the broken promises. There has been much talking by men who had no right to talk.[23]

Sitting Bull spoke similar words while in Canada when a Commission from the U.S. tried to talk him and his Sioux into coming back to the United States and living on the reservation that had been created for them.

For improving U.S.-Indian relations Chief Joseph made the following recommendations:

> If the white man wants to live in peace with the Indian he can live in peace. There need be no trouble, treat all men alike. Give them all the same law. Give them all an even chance to live and grow. All men were made by the same Great Spirit Chief. They are all brothers. . . . You might as well expect the rivers to run backward as that any man who was born a free man should be contented when penned up and denied liberty to go as he pleases. . . . I asked some of the great white chiefs where they get their authority to say to the Indian that he shall stay in one place, while he sees white men going where they please. They can not tell me.
>
> I know that my race must change. We can not hold our own with the white men as we are. We only ask an even chance to live as other men live. We ask to be recognized as men. We ask that the same law shall work alike on all men. If the Indian breaks the law, punish him by the law. If the white man breaks the law, punish him also.
>
> Let me be a free man - free to travel, free to stop, free to work, free to trade where I choose, free to choose my own teachers, free to follow the religion of my fathers, free to think and talk and act for myself - and I will obey every law, or submit to the penalty.
>
> Whenever the white man treats the Indian as they treat each other, then we will have no more wars. We shall all be alike - brothers of one father and one mother, with one sky above us and one country around us, and one government for all. Then the Great Spirit Chief who rules above will smile upon this land, and send rain to wash out the bloody spots made by brothers' hands from the face of the earth. For this time the Indian race are waiting and praying.[24]

It took more than a half a century before the U.S. Government would finally act upon these recommendations.

Other native people called for equal treatment under the law as well. Edith Jones wrote, in 1938, about the Aborigines in a letter sent to the **Times** of London. She wrote that it was interesting to note:

> That on `Australia Day' a number of educated aborigines have called a conference in Sydney of representatives having aboriginal blood to frame and forward to the Government a resolution protesting against the treatment of aborigines during the 150 years of white occupation, and appealing for ` a new policy' which shall provide education for natives and raise them to `full citizen' status and equality within the community.

and "That the aborigines during the last 150 years have not lost the proud spirit they showed when Captain Cook first landed" on the shores of Australia.[25]

A month later in the same manner a writer using the pseudonym John N Q'Land bragged about how with the proper white handling the Aborigine could be saved. He told about the Yarrabah Mission in Queensland that had been functioning for over 45 years at the time of his letter. He proposed that the mission be used as an example of the way to solve the Aborigine "problem."

The Queensland government had several missions set up for the Aborigines and had "English, Roman and Baptist chaplains" working among the people. Run by a missionary, the Yarrabah Reservation received financial support from the Queensland government as well as through the Australian Board of Missions. John N Q'Land's article also said that the Aborigines ". . . accept Christianity - undiluted. They have a long way to go, but they are quite in earnest . . . They learn the art of agriculture . . . They do not in their depressed state, form an insanitary slum in the bush; but under white guidance take pride in their homes and villages, keep themselves and their children clean and

are very fairly industrious." John N Q'Land also called for a partnership between the government and missionaries to build on what had been done for the Aborigines at the Yarrabah Mission.[26] The success of the Yarrabah Mission not only can be seen as an example of what the Aborigines could do under "white guidance" but also as an example of Aborigines accepting Euro-Australian culture. Not all native people accepted "white guidance" so easily.

In Canada, the Indians of the Pacific Coast viewed some Canadian laws with contempt, especially one that forbade a ceremony known as the potlatch. The potlatch ceremony confirmed the social status of the person who gave the ceremony. The holder of the potlatch gave gifts to all guests present. The cost of the gift depended on the rank of the receiver. Potlatch ceremonies could take years to plan, with the giver calling in assistance from other family and clan members. One potlatch might have hundreds of guest and last for more than a week.

Missionaries who witnessed the ceremonies thought the large amount of food prepared to be very wasteful. Also, because some of the potlatches contained plays that incurred feigned acts of cannibalism which the missionaries assumed the tribes actually practiced cannibalism and wanted the pagan ceremonies ended. In Canada the missionaries managed to have Parliament ban potlatch ceremonies in 1840. The ban lasted until 1951 when the Indians ceased to perform the ceremony. The missionaries in the U.S. also had enough clout to have a similar ban imposed on the Indians of the United States by the end of the 19th century.

Many Indians of the Indians in the Pacific Northwest refused to

obey the ban. Some tribes continued with the custom, but called the ceremony a party instead of a potlatch. Some tribes held potlatches and then fought the merits of the law on technicalities in court. Other groups held the ceremony in secret. The Indians saw the potlatch as a religious and social ceremony and held the celebration in conjunction with marriages, births and deaths. The governments telling the Indians that they could not conduct potlatches would be the equivalent of telling a Catholic he could not attend mass, or telling a Jew he could not go to the synagogue.[27] While the Indians in Canada fought with white society in court, the Indians in the United States fought white society on the battlefield.

American newspapers called the "Battle" at Wounded Knee the last great battle of the Indian Wars. The battle, actually a massacre, stemmed from a distrust and a misunderstanding between two cultures. When people feel that they are at a helpless point in their lives, they turn to some form of religion for help. The Indians of the western United States during the 1880's found themselves in such a position. The establishment and spread of a ceremony named the "Ghost Dance" religion resulted from the Indians' feeling of despair. The Indians who performed the Ghost Dance believed, if properly performed, the ceremony would return the buffalo along with family members who had been killed by the whites and the white invaders would be washed from the land. As the Ghost Dance religion spread across the west, the white settlers became nervous believing that the dance to be a war dance, and thus the Indians to be preparing for war. The whites did not understand that the Indians believed the ceremony would remove them by magic. Instead, they

viewed the ghost dance as a war dance. Calls went out to Washington for assistance in stopping the Ghost Dance and the presumed threat.

The Army identified Sioux Chief Big Foot to be a leader of the Ghost Dance movement and labeled him a potential troublemaker. The Army ordered Chief Big Foot and his more than 300 followers to report to Fort Cheyenne. At first, Big Foot agreed to comply but upon hearing that a second group of troops had been sent to escort them, the Sioux, fearing an attack, fled toward the Badlands, North Dakota. General Nelson Miles ordered the fugitives be captured. On December 28, 1890, 470 calvary men, including units of the Seventh Calvary, Custer's old command, surrounded the Sioux and demanded they turn over all their weapons. The soldiers completely surrounded the camp at Wounded Knee Creek, South Dakota and placed artillery on the hills above the Sioux.

The Army ordered the Sioux, in groups of twenty, to go to their lodges and retrieve their weapons. When the first twenty men gave up only two weapons the troopers began searching the tipis. A medicine man began blowing on a whistle and urging the young men to resist. Sick in bed with pneumonia, Big Foot found himself in poor shape to stop what came next. After a few moments, a young Sioux man drew a concealed weapon and fired a shot into the air. The soldiers believing that they had been fired upon began shooting into the Indian camp, including the artillery. By the time the shooting ended, the soldiers had killed more than 150 Indians including forty-four women and fourteen children. The soldiers lost twenty-five killed and thirty-nine wounded, most from what today would be called friendly fire.

Because of a blizzard, the soldiers left the dead Indians lying in

the field until New Year's Day 1891. The burial party of white civilians, guarded by soldiers for fear of a Sioux counterattack to revenge the massacre, found four infants still alive wrapped in their mother's clothing. The men of the burial party received two dollars per body. They buried the frozen corpses in a mass grave. White society felt that the Seventh Calvary had finally revenged the Battle of the Little Big Horn.[28] Because the North West Mounted Police proceeded the settlers, the miners and the ranchers it is generally believed that Canada managed avoid such massacres because the Mounties stop problems before they could escalate.[29]

A few days after the Massacre at Wounded Knee, a young Lakota man named Plenty Horse shot and killed Army Lieutenant Edward W. Casey. Plenty Horse had returned from Carlisle Indian School five years earlier and had fallen into the difficulty of not being able to fit into the Indian life on the reservation or into the white man's world. After the shooting, the government put Plenty Horse on trial for murder. At his trial, Plenty Horse said that he felt that by committing the murder he had finally found a place for himself among his people as a warrior. His lawyer argued that the shooting had taken place during a period of warfare among the Sioux and the Army, thus the shooting could not be murder but an act of war. The Army admitted that a state of war had existed on the reservation at the time. If the Army had not agreed with Plenty Horse's defense, the Army could not explain why the "battle" had occurred. This admission by the Army led the judge to dismiss the charge against Plenty Horse.[30]

Just prior to the Wounded Knee Massacre, Chief Sitting Bull had

also been accused by local merchants of being a leader of the Ghost Dance movement. At first Sitting Bull had refused to join in the ceremonies, but he eventually "converted" to the religion. By this time, Sitting Bull had returned to the United States and had been part of Buffalo Bill Cody's Wild West Show. With the show, he had travelled to England and met Queen Victoria whom he praised. Although Sitting Bull remained on the reservation when the Sioux fled for the Badlands the government still ordered his arrest.

Indian Agent James McLaughlin, who reportedly did not like Sitting Bull, ordered the Sioux Indian Police to arrest Sitting Bull. In the middle of the night, forty Sioux police surrounded Sitting Bull's cabin and physically dragged him from his bed. At first Sitting Bull agreed to go with the police but upon exiting his cabin he began to protest. Some of his followers began to fire on the police. In response, one of the policemen shot Sitting Bull, point blank, in the back of the head. Others killed during the shooting included six of the Sioux police, and eight of Sitting Bull's defenders, including his seventeen year old son, Crowfoot.[31] Some of Sitting Bull's followers fled the area and ended up with the Sioux at Wounded Knee. The Sioux resisted the United States efforts to conform them. Other Indians attended the schools set up for them. Their memories of these schools are not wonderful.

Of his education at the Genoa Indian School, Nebraska, Sid Byrd said that he learned to "take care of number one, at the expense of others," and that he had learned to "perform tricks." Byrd went on to say that the white man wanted the Indians "to jump through hoops like a dog." According to him, the teachers punished runaways and openly

rebellious children by locking them in the guardhouse. Also, the teachers always berated all the children by telling them that they would never be anything more than Indians.[32]

On a similar note, Thompson Highway, a Native American playwright, said that girls had their heads shaved for minor infractions of the rules. If a girl wet the bed the girl would have to take part in "Pee Parades". The "parade" consisted of the girl wearing her urine soaked sheets over her head and march around the dorm while praying for forgiveness. Punishment, Highway said, consisted of physical, psychological, and sexual abuse.[33]

Basil Johnson tells about his life at a residential school in Canada. He said that a clergyman and a representative of the Indians Affairs Branch physically separated him from his parents and removed from his home to be assimilated and not to return to the reservation. Johnson's grandmother would only tell him she had cried when he had been removed. At the Catholic school he attended, he received a beige uniform and had his hair cut. He felt he had been given away and his parents did not want him. He said the teachers taught him about his worthlessness and his culture's, and "Punishment was good, strapping blows with fists on the head." Johnson also tells of sexual abuse.[34]

Many Indigenous People accepted the role imposed on them by white society. They accepted the white man's religion and became farmers. Some of those who could used the white man's teaching to improve the position of their people. They became clergymen doctors, and lawyers and fought for better treatment for their people in the capitals of the new nations they found themselves. The native people who wanted nothing

to do with the European way of doing things held on to their traditional ways. On occasion they fought white society with weapons instead of words. Few is the number of native people who completely forgot their heritage. A sample of the native people who fought in white society for their people will be looked at in the next chapter by looking at Native Americans in the United States.

> We called her Sarah Winnemucca, but her real name was Toc-me-to-ne, which means shell-flower . . . She did our government great service, and if I could tell you but a tenth part of all she willingly did to help the white settlers and her own people to live peaceably together I am sure you would think, as I do, that the name of Toc-me-to-ne should have a place beside the name Pocahontas in the history of our country. - Gen. Oliver Otis Howard[1]

Many aboriginal people were what the missionaries of the time would have called "success stories" of the European process to educate and "civilize" them. These people accepted what the Europeans offered and then tried to use what they learned to improve the lot of their people. These success stories will be the focus of this chapter. The first part of the chapter will highlight Indian women, in the United States, who used the education they received from white society to improve their people's condition. The latter part will center on Indian men who left their mark on U.S. society. It is important to note that although these people can be seen as being personal successful by white standards, generally they did not make great gains for the Indians of the United States because of the prejudice of white society.

In many of the tribes of North America women held important positions in the leadership of their people. The Iroquoian people, which includes the Cherokee, had a council of women that had great influence on the tribes' political operations. The Cherokee called this council the Women's Council of the Cherokee and its leader became known as the Beloved Woman of the Nation. The Beloved Woman had the power to decide the life or death of any captives.

Among the Sesquehanna, the Huron and the Iroquois the penalty for

killing one of the women of the tribe was twice that of killing a man. Authority flowed from the mother, or matron, of the longhouse, or clan, to the "sachems" of the clan. The sachem, male members of the clan, represented the clan at tribal council meetings. The sachems received their appointments to the council from the women and could be recalled by the matron of the clan.[2]

Among the Indians of the southwest United States, when a man took a wife he moved into the home of his in-laws. If the couple ended the marriage, the children and all acquired property stayed with the wife. The man returned to his clan. These groups traced their family through the clan-mother. These matrilineal and matrilocal people included the Navajo, the Apache and the pueblo dwelling Zuni and Hopi.

Sarah Winnemucca, a Paiute Indian from Nevada, will be the first woman examined this chapter. Sarah Winnemucca was born in 1844. In her early life Sarah feared whites. She had been told that the white men's beards made them look like owls. After the story of the Donner party's cannibalism reached the Paiute, they used the story to frighten the children telling them if they did not behave the "owl men" would eat them. She overcame this fear when she travelled with her grandfather, Captain Truckee, or Chief Winnemucca I, to California. Her grandfather led a small group of Paiute who hoped to gain employment from the white settlers in Stockton. Captain Truckee had friends among the settlers. Truckee had assisted John Fremont in the Mexican War. During the trip Sarah got a bad case of poison ivy around her eyes. The swelling around the girl's eyes became so bad that her eyes swelled closed. She lost her fear of whites after being nursed back to health, and saw that a

white woman had restored her sight.

Captain Truckee knew that the Europeans had moved into the area to stay and counseled his people to be at peace with the new arrivals. He did not change his counsel even after a group of white men killed one of his sons in 1850. While on his death bed he requested that his two granddaughters, Sarah and her sister - Elma, be sent to a school in California. Sarah's family sent the girls to the Sisters of Notre Dame School, run by Belgian nuns, in San Jose. The curriculum included grammar, history, geography, arithmetic, needlework, music, philosophy and mythology. After only a couple of weeks at Notre Dame, because the white parents threatened to withdraw their children and their support from the school if the nuns permitted the two Indians girls to remain, Sarah and her sister returned home. Sarah then went to live with a Mormon family, the Ormsbys, for a year.

Mrs. Ormsby taught Sarah how to cook and sew as well as helping her with her English. Sarah had a natural talent for languages. In 1860, a brief war between the settlers and the Paiute interrupted her education, again. The war resulted from two white brothers kidnapping two Paiute girls and holding the girls captive in the cellar of a barn. A group of Paiute men found the girls and killed the brothers during the rescue. The deaths of the brothers ignited the bloodshed that followed. One of those killed in the fighting was Major William Ormsby. Of the fighting, Sarah later wrote, "There were no Custers among the officers in Nevada. If the Indians were protected, as they call it, instead of the whites, there would be no Indian wars."[3]

After a second Paiute War in 1866, Sarah became an interpreter for

the Army, speaking five languages: English, Spanish, Paiute, Washone and Shoshone. She received sixty-five dollars a month for her services. For the next couple of years, the army saw that the Paiute received their rations and peace prevailed in the area. In 1869, President Grant established the Indian Commission which said that all Indians, including the Paiutes, should be placed on reservations. Sarah began writing letters to get help for her people, and her name became well known in official circles.[4]

Sarah married Lieutenant Edward Bartlett in 1871. The couple married in Salt Lake City, Utah, because Nevada had outlawed marriages between whites and Indians. The marriage did not last long because of Bartlett's drinking. This marriage became the first of Sarah's three marriages, all to white men. Her second marriage also ended because the man drank too much.

After writing letters to Washington to help her people, Sarah next attempted to help her people by going to San Francisco to ask the general in charge of the area for help. The general sent her back to Nevada to talk with a senator visiting the state. The senator made promises that he could not keep. Sarah returned to San Francisco where she gained a large amount of publicity in the press but no help.

Sarah wrote a letter to Washington complaining about the treatment of her people on the Malheur Reservation. When the agent in charge of the reservation, W. V. Rinehart, found out about the letter, he fired Sarah as his interpreter and banished her from the reservation. The Paiute accused Rinehart, a local merchant, of selling in his store, items meant for the Paiutes. In his reports to Washington, Rinehart

admitted to paying the Indians only half the wages they could earn from the local settlers. He also conceded that he shackled Paiute children for being disrespectful to him. He urged that the children be taken away from their parents so that the Indians could not influence the way the children grew up. The Paiute and the leaders of the Bannock Nation asked Sarah to go to Washington. Before she could go, Sarah learned that the Bannock had gone to war with the whites.[5] The Bannocks had taken some Paiutes as hostage to keep them from joining with the Army.

When war broke out between the whites and the Bannock, in 1878, Sarah again became an interpreter for the Army. Her duties included being a scout, marking springs, and caring for the wounded. As an interpreter for the Army, Sarah worked for her friend General Otis O. Howard. General Howard requested that Sarah talk the Bannocks into releasing Sarah's father and the other Paiutes they had taken prisoner. When they refused, Sarah led a rescue mission into the Bannock camp and freed her people using the cover of darkness. For her effort, the army promised to give Sarah $500, but years passed before Sarah received the money. At the end of the conflict, Sarah's father, Chief Winnemucca, called the Paiute together. He told them that since Sarah had fought while the rest of the Paiute had stayed out of the conflict she should be made chief. The Paiute had never before chosen a woman to be chief. The title of chief did not last long because those people who knew her continued to call her Sarah, while newspapers called her a "princess."[6]

When Sarah received her money from the Army, she planned to go to Washington to plead her people's case for better care from the government. Before going to Washington, Sarah stopped in San Francisco

where she rented a lecture hall and gave speeches about the plight of the Paiute. By this time, the Paiute had been moved by the government to a reservation which had been promised to the Bannocks who had always been enemies of the Paiute. Sarah drew large crowds to her lectures and caught the attention of Indian Affairs Special Agent J. M. Haworth.

Haworth promised to send Sarah, her father, and some other members of her family to Washington at government expense. He did this so the government could control Sarah's access to the press while in the East. While in Washington, Sarah and her party were introduced to President Hayes but he left the room before Sarah could discuss the Paiutes' dilemma with him. Her main contact in the government became Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurz. Secretary Schurz promised to deliver everything Sarah asked for her people. He even promised, in writing, that the Paiute would be removed from the reservation of their enemies. But when Sarah got back to her people, the agent refused to accept the written instructions. Sarah then moved to Fort Vancouver where she taught at a school for Idaho Indians and acted as an interpreter. Sarah stayed there for two years.[7]

After teaching at Fort Vancouver, Sarah moved to Montana to live with her sister. After being there a year, the Paiute again asked Sarah to go east. This time Sarah decided not to use official channels and, instead of going to Washington, she went to Boston. In Boston she began giving lectures as she had in San Francisco about the injustices the Paiute faced at the hands of corrupt officials. Her lectures once again drew large crowds. Sarah did not charge admission but accepted donations for the lectures, part of which she used to finance her

lectures. She gave her speeches without the aid of notes. When she went to a new city she always gave the first lecture to women only audiences. Sarah spoke throughout the East giving lectures in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New England. During this time, Sarah wrote a book about the Paiutes ordeal, Life **Among the Paiutes, Their Wrongs and Claims**. The book was the first written in English and published for a Native American.[8]

Upon seeing Sarah's successes with her lectures and fearing a petition she had begun, the Bureau of Indians Affairs began a slanderous press attack on Sarah's character calling her a drunkard, immoral, and untruthful. Sarah fought back in the press by printing letters from people who knew her, including General Howard. The publicity from the conflict brought more people to her lectures and helped her gain more signatures on her petition for better treatment for the Paiute. Congress passed a bill giving the Paiutes their own reservation and promised more support. Commissioner of Indian Affairs Hiram Price promised to give Sarah his full cooperation. Sarah headed west to help her people with the coming changes and to set up a school with the money she received from the speeches.[9]

Once again Sarah's efforts failed to bear fruit. On her return trip, she met with three disasters. Someone stole most of the money she had earned from the lectures. Second, when she returned, she had to pay off a debt her brother, Natchez, did not actually owe. Natchez would go to jail if the inferred debt did not get paid. The third disaster came when the agent turned her down for the teaching position at the Agency school. On top of that Secretary Schurz chose to ignore the

congressional bill that gave land to the Paiutes. Nevertheless, Sarah did have one friend in Washington who came to her aid.

Senator Leland Stanford, founder of Stanford University, gave Natchez, Sara's brother, 160 acres of land near Lovelock, Nevada. With this gift, Sarah organized a school where she could teach. She financed the school from the profits of lectures she made in California and Nevada, the profits from her book and from donations given by the friends she had made in the East. The Indian Bureau sent an agent to visit her. The agent told Sarah that if her brother did not turn over his land to the Indian Bureau she would not receive any federal funding for her school. Since the Indian Bureau had not assisted in starting the school, Sarah saw no need for its help now. In three years, illness and financial problems caused by local whites who did not like Indians owning land, caused her to close the school. Once again she went to visit Elma in Montana where she died at the age of forty-seven.[10]

In her book, Sarah Winnemucca wrote her opinion of White-Indian relations. She said:

> Oh for shame! You who are educated by a Christian government in the art of war; the practice of whose profession makes you natural enemies of the savages, so called by you. Yes you call yourselves the great civilization: You who have knelt upon Plymouth Rock, covenanting with God to make this the home of the free and the brave, Ah, then you rise from your bended knees and seizing the welcoming hands of those who are the owners of this land . . . and your so called civilization sweeps inland from the ocean wave; but oh my God! leaving in its pathway marked by crimson lines of blood and strewed by bones of two races, the inheritor and the invader.[11]

With the violent nature of white-native relations in New Zealand and Australia the same sentiment in these words could have as easily been expressed by the Aborigine or the Maori.

Many Indians wrote about their school experiences. One, Francis La Flesche, told about his encounters as a small boy attending the Presbyterian mission boarding school on the Omaha Reservation. On his first day at the school, he cried until an older boy came over to comfort him. The boy told him that he would be his friend, and not to worry because he would be permitted to go home on Saturdays.[12]

His group, the "Middle Five," and an associated group, would occasionally sneak a couple of the boys out a window at night to go into the nearby Omaha village and bring back native food to be shared. The boys would also speak amongst themselves in the Omaha language. All of this went against the rules of the school. When the teacher discovered their nocturnal escapades, the leaders of the two groups stated that they had forced the younger boy, who had been caught going out the window, and accepted all blame for the activity. As a result, the teacher whipped both boys with switches.[13]

Francis's father, Joseph La Flesche, principal chief of the Omaha, had a French father and an Indian mother. Francis's mother, Mary, had an Omaha mother and a U.S. Army doctor, John Gale, as her father. As a girl, Mary had attended school in St. Louis, Missouri. Having lived in white society, Joseph La Flesche, Iron Eyes, foresaw the need for the Omaha to become like the Euro-Americans. He knew that the Omaha way of life would quickly come to an end and the buffalo would soon be gone. Having lived in the white man's world, Iron Eyes knew the importance of education and required all of his children to attend school. He constantly supported the idea of his people receiving an Euro-American schooling. After losing one of his legs from infection caused when he

stepped on a nail, Joseph became very studious in learning as much as he could about Christianity.

Joseph refused to follow the Omaha custom and allow his daughters to be tattooed to show their status. The tattoo would have been placed on the girls' forehead and neck. He knew that his children would live in the world of the whites, and he did not wish the girls to be marked in a way that would be seen as a mark against them.[14] Had he lived to see the result of the education he required his children to obtain, Iron Eyes would not have been disappointed with the way his children turned out. Through the efforts of Joseph La Flesche, and his children, the Omaha acquired U.S. citizenship on February 7, 1887, long before all Indians would be given this status in 1924.[15]

Francis went on to distinguish himself among the whites with whom he worked. He began his education at the same missionary school that his younger sisters attended. Francis received an appointment to the position of clerk in the Office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1881, and earned his law degree from National University in 1893. He assisted Alice C. Fletcher with her studies of the Omaha, and in 1910 transferred to the Bureau of American Ethnology. In December 1929, he retired from government service.[16]

Joseph La Flesche's daughters did very well in the white's world as did his sons. His daughter, Susette La Flesche, began her education at the mission school on the Omaha reservation. When the school closed, she furthered her education at the Elizabeth Institute for Young Ladies in New Jersey. Susette received the appointment to the school with the help of one of her teachers from the missionary school. Her classes

included English grammar and literature, music, art, history, geography, and mathematics. She had also been assigned to the beginning French course. She astonished the class by answering, in perfect French, the first question posed to her. The shocked class did not think that an Indian would be able to speak the language with such fluency.[17]

Upon graduating from the Elizabeth Institute, Susette returned to the Omaha reservation. When she learned that qualified Indians received preference for teaching positions at Indian Agency schools, she sent a letter to Washington requesting the position at the Omaha Agency School. She knew that her qualifications would make her a better teacher than the white teacher in charge of the agency school.[18] Two years after asking for permission to teach at the agency school, she received a letter from Washington granting her the position at twenty dollars a month, one-half the salary of a white teacher doing the same job.[19]

The teaching post became the first position Susette involved herself with to aid her people. While teaching, she established a Sunday school. From her own savings she purchased an organ for the classroom. Susette married in 1881, and until 1900 spent most of her adult life speaking before white audiences in the United States and Europe trying to get them to see Indians as people with rights and feelings. She lectured about the American Indian on both sides of the Atlantic, spending 1887 in Britain. The government, which opposed her work, attacked her in the press much in the same manner as Sarah Winnemucca had been earlier. Susette became a prolific co-writer, with her husband. She died on May 26, 1903 at the age of forty-nine.[20]

La Flesche's other daughters made their mark in white society,

too. Marguerite and Susan also attended the Elizabeth Institute, graduating in 1882. From there, they both graduated from the Hampton Institute, as did sister Lucy and brother Carey. Susan graduated from Hampton with the honor of being the class speaker. Marguerite became a teacher at the agency and an interpreter at congressional hearings. Rosa became an active member of the Society of American Indians. Susan went on to have more impact on those around her than her sisters.

While at Hampton, Susan met Doctor Martha M. Waldron, one of the nation's first women doctors. The respect she felt for Dr. Waldron led Susan to apply for entry to the Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, the same school Dr. Waldron had attended. The medical college accepted her for the fall term of 1886. The women of the Connecticut Indian Association offered her complete financial support to attend the school which took care of Susan's concerns about tuition.

Susan spoke to women's groups while attending medical school. She lectured about the problems facing the Omaha living on the reservation. The Philadelphia Academy of Fine Arts asked her to play Pocahontas in a play. For the play, she wore a dress that had been in a display case at Hampton Institute. When Susan wrote to ask for permission to wear the dress, the school sent it to her without question because they thought so highly of her. In March 1889, Susan graduated in the top half of her class of thirty-six women. Susan received the appointment to be the medical officer at the agency school for the Omaha.[21]

Susan returned to the reservation and began working as the doctor for the agency's school. Susan soon received the commission to be the doctor for the entire Omaha reservation because the Omaha trusted her

more than the white doctors. When, at the age of twenty-eight, she physically wore herself out trying to care for the all the people on the reservation, two white male doctors replaced her. Upon regaining her strength in 1905, she became the first Native American to become a missionary for the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions. During this same year her husband of nine years died of alcoholism. Susan went on to accomplish many things. She helped organize the county medical society, became the health officer for her hometown, served on the State Medical Society, became the chairwoman for the state health committee, served on the board of the State Federation of Women's Clubs; lobbied the state legislature for better public health laws lobbied Congress for improvements in the treatment of the Omaha. With the help of a local white male doctor, and funds raised by the Omaha and the local white population, she saw her dream of a hospital being built on the Omaha Reservation realized. The hospital cared for anyone, regardless of race. Susan worked as the Doctor in Charge of the Hospital until she died in September 1915, at the age of fifty.[22]

Gertrude Bonnin, or Zitkala-Sa, is another notable female Native American. She was a Dakota Sioux born in the mid-1870's on the Yankton Sioux Reservation to a white father and a full-blood Dakota Sioux mother. In an attempt to tell her people's history, she intentionally placed herself in the position of becoming a story teller for her people through her written works. In 1913, she collaborated on the opera "Sun Dance", which, in 1937, the New York Light Opera Guild selected as the American Opera of the Year. She wrote two short stories which appeared in **Harper's Magazine**, and three autobiographical essays which appeared

in Atlantic Monthly.

When she wrote about her early life, she said Quaker missionaries coaxed her into attending a boarding school. They told stories of a land to the East with "big red apples" and a chance to ride the "iron horse." Arriving at White's Manual Institute in Wabash, Indiana, her life changed drastically. Being just twelve years old, the only thing familiar to her were the telegraph poles. She had her hair cut which she thought to be a terrible wrong because the Dakota only cut their hair when mourning. She told of the death of a female classmate who quit eating and gave up on life and of her own hatred for the woman who attempted to care for the girl.[23]

Upon graduating from the school in Wabash she returned home to the reservation. She found that she had forgotten most of her native language. After four years on the reservation, Bonnin decided to return to school. She attended Earlham College in Richmond, Indiana, for two years to become a teacher. At Earlham, she placed second in the 1896 Indiana state oratorical contest. The contest became important to her. During the evening a group of white boys waved a white banner with the word "squaw" on it, and the boys also yelled insults toward her. She overcame the insults to place second in the contest. She wrote, "The evil spirit laughed within me when the white flag dropped out of sight, and the hands which hurled it hung limp in defeat."[24] She saw her second place finish as both a personal victory and a victory against prejudice.

After Earlham, she became a teacher at the Carlisle Indian School. Being talented in music, she attended the Boston Conservatory of Music.

When the Carlisle school band traveled to Paris for the 1900 Paris Exposition, Bonnin went as a solo violinist. After leaving Carlisle in the first decade of the 20th century, she worked on reservations. She first went to the Standing Rock Reservation where she married Raymond Bonnin, also a Sioux working for the Indian Bureau. The couple transferred to a Ute reservation, in Utah, working there for the next fourteen years. Gertrude served as teacher, cook, clerk, band leader, home demonstration teacher, as well as wife and mother.[25]

In 1916, Gertrude became the Secretary for the Society of American Indians, the first organization managed solely by Native Americans. Other members of the society included medical doctors Charles Eastman (Dakota) and Carlos Montezuma (Yavapai), attorney Thomas Sloan (Omaha), Episcopalian minister Sherman Coolidge (Arapaho), and anthropologist Arthur C. Parker (Seneca). The Society's goals included the achievement of government reforms, codification of laws pertaining to Indians, the employment of Indians by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the establishment of a court to handle Indian land claims, and the preservation of factual Indian history. The society also pushed for Indian assimilation, the termination of common held tribal property, citizenship for all Indians, and for the B.I.A. to eventually be abolished. The Bonnins moved to Washington, D.C., which Gertrude used as her base to lecture from coast to coast and where she worked as the editor of the society's magazine, **The American Indian Magazine**. The society lasted for only four years, but this did not end Gertrude's work on the national level.

Six years later, she established the National Council of American Indians, and served as the Council's president until her death at the

age of sixty-one. While alive, she impressed the politicians in Washington in such a way that upon her death in 1938, Bonnin received a burial in Arlington National Cemetery. While living in Washington, she wrote articles on Indian's land and water rights, and lobbied for Indian rights. Bonnin had rebelled against the traditional role imposed on her by both Sioux and white societies. In response to criticism from male Indians about overstepping her position Gertrude responded by writing articles dealing with the historical leadership role of women.[26]

Ely Samuel Parker, another notable American Indian, also made the most out of the white education he received. Born in 1828, Parker, a member of the Seneca Iroquois, was selected by his people to obtain a Euro-American education. He learned about Iroquoian religion from his grandfather and at the same time learned the ways of the whites at the local Baptist school. He furthered his education at Cayuga Academy in Aurora, New York. In the 1840's he studied law at Ellicottville and obtained on the job training in engineering while working on the Genesee Valley Canal. After passing his examinations for his law certificate, the state denied the certificate because Parker was an Indian and thus not an American citizen.

During the American Civil War, Parker served on the staff of General Ulysses S. Grant. Grant chose him to write the surrender terms for Confederate General Robert E. Lee to sign at Appomattox Court House which officially ended the war for the Army of Northern Virginia. One story says Parker received this honor because he had the best hand writing of any member of the staff. While helping Grant win the war for the North, Parker faced a tense racial climate. Other members of

Grant's staff referred to him as "Grant's Big Injun". Parker often had to live in both the world of the whites and that of the Indians.

In the Indian world, the Seneca chose Parker to be a sachem. And in the white world, he served briefly as Grant's Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the first Native American to hold the post. He resigned from the position after being cleared of defrauding the government charges brought on by Grant's opponents, one of many scandals that surrounded Grant's administration. As commissioner, Parker called for the ending of reservations and the assimilation of Indians into the white culture.[27] Of the racism he faced as Indian Commissioner and the problems he faced while serving in that capacity he wrote:

> The Indians were universally pleased, and they were all willing to be quiet and remain at peace, and were even asking to be taught civilization Christianity. I put an end to all wars either among themselves or with their white brothers, and I sent professed Christian whites who waxed rich and fat from plundering the poor Indians, nor were there teacherships enough to give places to all the hungry and impecunious Christians. Then was the cry raised by all who believed themselves injured or unprovided for, "Nay, this Parker is an Indian genius; he is grown too great and powerful; he doth injure our business and take the bread from the mouths of our families and the money from our pockets; now, therefore, let us write and put him out of power, so that we may feast as heretofore.[28]

Charles Curtis, a Kansa Indian, became the Native American to hold the highest position in American politics by serving as Herbert Hoover's Vice-President. He had been a long time U.S. congressman and had served as the whip for the Senate. Curtis's worked to ensure the passage of the Indian Citizenship Bill in 1924. When Jim Thorpe, native American, graduate of Carlisle, professional baseball and football player, gold medal winner in the 1912 Olympics, could not afford tickets to the 1932 Olympics, Curtis invited Thorpe to attend with him.[29]

Although these "assimilated" Indians had the best interest of their people at heart when they acted, they did not always agree on the best course. Francis La Flesche saw the Pan-Indian faith of peyote religion to be an Indian version of Christianity. He favored the religion as a prevention against alcoholism and the destruction of the Indian family. Susan Bonnin saw peyote as an addictive drug, a return to paganism and a destroyer of Indian character. The continuance of the peyote religion remained threatened until the late 1920's when native religions, in the United States, received protection.[30]

While La Flesche and Bonnin debated the effects of peyote, the First People of Canada, like the Indians in the U.S., became teachers, artisans and medical doctors. In New Zealand, the government passed legislation which required that four Maori serve as members of the House of Representatives, two sit on the Legislative Council while one more serve as a Minister on the Dominion Cabinet.[31]

The above mentioned people are but a few of the native people who endeavored to improve their people's position within white society. They used their education which they received from white schools and worked with in and around the white system to achieve their goals. By using their educations they hoped to change white society from within. Each of them faced one constant problem, no matter how educated they became, most of white society still viewed them as just Indians. Being seen as simple Indians was a problem for the individual as well as tribes which tried to emulate white society.

Chapter Six - When Assimilation Was Not Enough

> "That the American Indians were a race of men far above the ordinary grade of barbarism found on the other continents, is doubted by no one acquainted with their history; and among all tribes that have peopled our native forests, the Cherokees, it is believed, stood pre-eminent." - Reverend Cephas Washburn[1]

In this final chapter, the attempt by the Cherokee to assimilate into the Euro-American culture will be examined. The first part will examine the affect of European contact with the Cherokee. Some of the work conducted by missionaries attempting to assimilate the Cherokee into mainstream society will be explored. The effects will be looked at in four different time periods. The first period will be at the time of permanent contact between the Cherokee and the Anglo-Americans. Next, the period of time around the removal of the Cherokee from their native territory in the Southeastern United States to the area west of the Mississippi River. The third period will be around the time of the American Civil War with the final period being the formation of the State of Oklahoma.

At the time of permanent contact with the Europeans, the Cherokee had been farmers who lived in permanent villages, but they also relied on hunting and gathering to support themselves. They believed in a balance in life, a balance between winter and summer, day and night, war and peace.[2] The Cherokee practiced the concept of moieties, or the division of offices, within their towns and later their confederations. This division consisted of the "Whites", who argued for the peaceful resolution of conflicts, and the "Reds", who argued for war against perceived enemies. Although one could not always distinguish between

the two, the system effectively maintained the balance between harmony and bloodshed by providing a system in which both sides of an argument could be heard.[3]

Contact with the Europeans disrupted this balance. The English, who settled in the area of the Cherokee, had learned that the area did not have riches such as gold. However the area did have an abundance of other assets which could be exploited. These resources included deer hides and human slaves.[4] The hides could be shipped back to Europe and the slaves could be used on plantations in both the colonies and the Caribbean. By the 1690's fur traders from the Carolinas and Virginia had begun to intermarry with the Cherokee.[5]

The English traders exchanged copper pots, metal axes, clothing and weapons to the Cherokees for the hides and slaves. The Cherokee became more and more dependent on these European goods. The Cherokee became so dependent on European goods that in 1745, Chief Skiagunsta told the governor of South Carolina:

> My people cannot live independent of the English . . . The clothes we wear we cannot make ourselves. They are made for us. We use their ammunition with which to kill deer. We cannot make our own guns. Every necessary of life we must have from white people.[6]

This dependency led the Cherokee to rely on warfare with their neighbors in order to be able to trade captives for goods. Accordingly, the "Red" moiety eventually became more important in decision making than the "Whites". Prior to this development, the Cherokee normally went to war only to avenge a perceived offense against them, to revenge a wrong.[7] The revenge factor and the raids for captives to be sold as slaves gave the appearance that the Cherokee stayed in a constant state of war.

Europeans often pointed to the continual warfare of the Cherokee as a sign of their "barbarism". Initially, the Cherokee's "wars" often consisted of only a raid against the offender's village and the capture of "slaves" to replace the person the offending group had killed. The Cherokee believed the threat of such a reprisal to be the only form of protection available.[8] English traders enticed the Indians to fight and take captives. In 1674, the governor of South Carolina offered a bounty on any captured Indian brought to South Carolina. The governor sold the captives as slaves to help pay for the defense of the colony.[9]

The encroachment of whites into prime Indian lands combined with the constant warring with neighbors caused the Cherokee, and others, to move from independent towns to confederations. This change served as an attempt to match the Europeans in numbers and for protection against other Indians. By the 1750's, the Cherokee began to look, at least on the surface, like a unified nation. By 1768, a war chief became the leader of the confederated Cherokee Nation. Warriors had been excluded from high councils, earlier. Cherokee politics had reinvented itself in order to meet the needs of Cherokee society after European contact.[10]

The reduction of women's influence became another change which took place in Cherokee politics. The Cherokee, a matrilineal society, traced family through the mother's ancestry. All Cherokee belonged to one of seven matrilineal clans which could be found in every village and town council. Cherokee women sat in on council meetings as observers, and spoke at the meetings. The Cherokee found it hard to understand why the English did not allow their women to do the same. The English could not comprehend a woman being in a position of power. As the warrior

became more important in Cherokee society, and English culture showed more influence, the political influence of women lessened.[11]

During the American War for Independence the Cherokee fought beside the British. The Cherokee saw the colonists as the horde that had often violated treaties with the Indians. The Cherokee trusted that by supporting the British against the colonists the invasion into their land would be brought to an end.[12] Not until 1794 did the Cherokee accept a treaty with the United States. The Cherokee, and other Indians of the area, found themselves abandoned by the British, treated as defeated enemies by the Americans, their lands in shambles from years of war, and constant intrusion by whites into their lands. This set up the period of the Cherokees' removal from their traditional homeland.[13]

In 1794 the first of the Cherokee left the East, led by a headman named The Bowl. After being swindled by some white traders and having killed several white settlers along the Tennessee River, The Bowl led his people west of the Mississippi in an attempt to avoid prosecution by the Cherokee leadership negotiating the peace treaty. The group settled in Texas and ultimately moved to the area that would be called Indian Territory. The group became known as the "Cherokee Nation West", or the "Old Settlers", and by 1834 numbered nearly 6,000. By 1820, John Jolly, Principal Chief of the Old Settlers, established a written law, in English, based on the verbal law of the Cherokee. Chief Jolly also became the father-in-law of Texan Sam Houston.[14]

The Osage Indians saw the Cherokee Nation West as invaders. The Cherokee, being farmers, saw peaceful coexistence to be beneficial. The Osage, on the other hand, being hunters, saw war and pillage more suited

to their needs. Consequently, the Old Settlers had to constantly fight to establish themselves in their new found home. The Cherokee had to go on regular raiding parties to keep the Osage away. The Osage repeatedly broke peace agreements between the two groups. Not until the U.S. government became involved in the peace process did hostilities end.[15]

The Bowl's migration led many white Americans to think that the interest of the Indian could best be served by removing the Indians from the current frontier to an area where they would not be a bother or be bothered by white society. After 1790 the U.S. faced four possible ways to deal with the Indians. The government could exterminate the Indians, place the Indians on reservations while future white cities would grow around them, assimilate the Indian into crop-raising, church-going, school-attending model citizens of Anglo society, or remove the Indians to the unwanted land west of the Mississippi River.[16] Many Indians in the Southeast simply wished to be left alone.

By 1818, the Cherokee, and the four other tribes that became known as the Five Civilized Nations, had been well on their way to becoming like their white neighbors in the southern part of the United States. Cherokee women dressed almost entirely in cotton dresses which they had made themselves from cotton raised on Cherokee plantations. The Cherokee Nation had ten gristmills, several saw mills, a powder mill, plows, wagons, spinning wheels and looms, thousands of head of livestock and over 500 black slaves. They had improved their nation's infrastructure by building roads, schools, and churches.

In 1821, George Guess, also known as Sequoyah, had created a syllabet for the Cherokee language. Sequoyah could neither speak nor

understand English, but he saw the value whites placed on reading and writing. Sequoyah created his syllabet by taking English letters, his own modifications of the letters and characters of his own design. At first, some of the Cherokee feared the strange symbols he had developed and thought him to be practicing witchcraft. Acting upon their fear, they burned Guess's home and some of his work. He moved west to escape his neighbors. By 1828, the Cherokee had set up a printing press and printed a weekly newspaper, **The Cherokee Phoenix**, in a format that included both Cherokee and English. The Cherokee government printing office printed items which included religious tracts and Bible translations, books on Cherokee history, along with an annual almanac and novels by Cherokee writers. Half of the adult male Cherokee could read their own language. They printed law books and instituted courts. The Cherokee legislature honored Sequoyah with a medal and a lifetime pension, the first pension offered by an Indian government. Having never become a Christian, Sequoyah became upset when the Cherokee council used his invention to print a Cherokee translation of the New Testament. By then it was to late for him to recall the syllabet.[17]

Of the progress towards civilization made by the Indians of the Five Civilized Nations, Thomas Jefferson wrote in his Seventh Annual Presidential Message:

> The great tribes on our southwestern quarter, much advanced beyond the others in agriculture and household arts, appear tranquil and identifying their views with ours in proportion to their advancement. With the whole of these people, in every quarter, I shall continue to inculcate peace and friendship with all their neighbors and perseverance in those occupations and pursuits which best promote their own well-being.[18]

Jefferson saw the progress of the Indians and wished them well. But

then again most policy makers wished to do well for the Indian no matter how ill conceived their plans turned out to be for the Indian. Much of the "advancement" of the Civilized Tribes had come with the help of missionaries.

Missionary Samuel Worcester had recommended "Phoenix" as the name for the Cherokee newspaper. Like the Cherokee after the American Revolution, the Phoenix had risen from the ashes of defeat and lived again; it could never die. To Worcester the Phoenix also symbolized the sinner rising from sin to sainthood, of a pagan people rising to become a Christian people.[19]

The Cherokee invited missionaries to move into their nation and set up schools. After the first generation following the Revolutionary War, the Indians of the Southeast continued to establish themselves in the mold of their Euro-American neighbors. Many of these Indians claimed to be Christians; they received educations at schools in New England. They had become craftsmen and farmers; some owned black slaves. As the Indians became more like their whites neighbors, their white neighbors saw them as competition that had to be eliminated. Gold had been discovered within the borders of the Cherokee Nation by this time, which gave their white neighbors another reason to want the Cherokee to be gone.[20]

In 1829 the Georgia legislature passed a law that extended its authority over the part of the Cherokee Nation that it believed fell within the confines of the state. When Corn Tassel, a Cherokee, killed another Cherokee within the nation, the Georgia militia hustled him out of the nation and tried him in a Georgia court. The Georgia court found

Corn Tassel guilty and sentenced him to be executed. The Cherokee Nation appealed the conviction to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court, led by John Marshall, upheld the rights of the Cherokee, declaring them not to be a foreign nation, but dependent on the United States. As such, the Cherokee did not fall under the laws of the State of Georgia. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court did not hand down its decision until after Corn Tassel had been executed. In another case stemming from a Georgia law forbidding whites to live in the Indian country without state permission, Georgia arrested several missionaries. Again, John Marshall and the Supreme Court sided with the Cherokee, but to no avail. The officials of Georgia failed to recognize the decision of the Court and President Andrew Jackson never enforced it.[21]

Under Jackson, the tragedy of Indian removal began and resulted in many deaths among all the Indians forced to relocate. In 1830 the Indian Removal Act became law. Congress passed the act to pay the Indians for their land in the East by giving them land west of the Mississippi River. Four years later, Congress passed the Indian Intercourse Act to install a ring of forts around the new Indian Territory to keep the Indians in and the white man out.[22] Naturally, the plan did not work.

However, the theory to remove the Indian to the "Great American Desert" did not originate with Jackson. Thomas Jefferson came up with the idea in 1803. He recommended the removal of the Indian to the recently purchased Louisiana Territory. Jefferson saw this move to be in line with his wish to establish a colony for freed slaves in Africa. Jefferson viewed the removal policies to be a way to eliminate elements

he deemed detrimental to the progress of the nation. James Madison also saw the removal of the southern Indians as a good thing for the Indians but refused to use force to make them move. Finally, James Monroe asked Congress to draw up a law for the removal of the Indians from within the boundaries of current states and compensate the Indians with permanent title to lands in the West.[23]

Monroe made his request despite the Cherokee having successfully argued their case (Cherokee Nation v. Georgia) before the United States Supreme Court, the highest court in the land. The Cherokee Nation had assimilated itself into white culture as farmers, just as Thomas Jefferson had once recommended. By 1827, they had established their own constitutional government with a senate, a house of representatives, and an elected chief. The Cherokee based their constitution on the United States Constitution and went as far as to limit the borders of the Cherokee Nation.[24] After the Cherokee had become "civilized", arrogant white society still saw the Cherokee as simply Indians who were in the way of Anglo-American destiny. The politicians in Georgia viewed Cherokee progress, along with Cherokee refusal to cede any more land, as proof that the Cherokee had become too civilized.[25]

In the early 1820's, while trying to show the promise the Cherokee held, Baptist Minister Humphery Posey wrote that the Cherokee children learned "`as fast as any Children I ever saw. They are kind, obedient, and industrious. [Their] mental powers appear to be in no respect inferior to those of whites. . . . I assure you, their mental powers are white - few white children can keep pace with them in learning.'"[26]

To stop the forced removal of the Cherokee, Jeremiah Evarts,

Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, composed what became known as the "William Penn" Essays. He asked:

> How would an intelligent foreigner, a German, a Frenchman, or an Englishman, be astonished to learn, that the Cherokees are neither savages, nor criminals; . . . -that their only offence consists in the possession of lands, which their neighbors covet; . . . -that they have a regularly organized government of their own, consisting of legislative, judicial, and executive departments, formed by the advice of the third President of the United States, and now in easy and natural operation; - that a majority of the people read their own language, which was never reduced to writing till less than seven years ago; - that a considerable number of the young, and some of the older, can read and write the English language; . . . - and that to crown the whole, that they are bound to us by the ties of Christianity which they profess, and which many of then exemplify as members of regular Christian churches . . . They are to be made outlaws on the land of their fathers; and, in this condition, to be allowed the privilege of choosing between exile and chains.[27]

In 1835 a group of Cherokee men, acting on their own behalf, and without the permission of principal Chief John Ross, signed the Treaty of New Echota which required the Cherokee to move west. This group, called the "Treaty Party", included Major Ridge, described as a farmer, "a legislator, and a civil magistrate: exhibiting in each a capacity, a discretion, and dignity of character worthy of better education".[28] Major Ridge's son, John Ridge, also a member of the Treaty Party, had been educated at a school in Connecticut where he met his wife. Two brothers, Buck and Stand Oowatie, also signed the Treaty of New Echota as well. Stand changed his last name to Waite. Buck took the name Elias Boudinot, the name of a white mentor. Boudinot, the editor of the **Cherokee Phoenix**, also married a white woman from Connecticut.[29]

John Ross served as the principal Chief of the Cherokee for nearly 40 years, starting in 1828. He owned a plantation and had black slaves to work the fields. He had a Cherokee mother and a Scottish father.

His father had John taught by white teacher but raised him as an Indian. When John grew up, he married a Cherokee woman. Ross had fought with Andrew Jackson against the Creek and had been the head of the Cherokee council since 1813. His group, the largest of the three groups, became the "Ross Party".

Ross and his supporters believed that they would not be required to leave their homes in the East. Nearly 16,000 Cherokee signed a petition, which they sent to Washington, declaring the removal treaty to be null and void. President Jackson, Ross's former comrade-in-arms, ignored the petition and Ross's pleas. In 1838, General Winfield Scott led 7,000 troops into the Cherokee Nation to round up the Cherokees and concentrated them in prison camps until they could be moved west. The trip did not start until October of that year. Over four thousand of the Cherokee,including John Ross's wife, died from hunger, exposure and illness on the six month journey west.[30] General Scott did not entirely succeed in capturing all the Cherokees in the area. Those who eluded Scott became the present day Eastern Cherokees with a reservation in North Carolina.[31]

Once the Cherokee from the east had been moved to Indian Territory they reunited with the Old Settler Cherokee. This reunion brought about an internal conflict between the Old Settlers and the Ross Party. The conflict resulted over who would retain leadership of the Cherokee people. Both groups had been officially recognized by the United States through separate treaties. The Cherokee held a conference to discuss the problem of who would be the principal chief. The leadership of the Treaty Party did not stay around very long to help settle the dispute.

It is possible that they feared for their personal safety. One week after the council, assassins killed Major Ridge, John Ridge and Elias Boudinot on the same day.[32]

The murders likely resulted from the continuance of a policy of revenge that had been part of the Cherokee way of life for centuries. In 1806, Major Ridge had taken part in the murder of Doublehead, a member of an earlier treaty party that had ceded lands to the United States. A Cherokee court charged a young Cherokee named Bird, the son of Doublehead and a member of the Ross Party, with taking part in the assassinations. Ironically, John Ridge, in October 1829, had drawn up a Cherokee law that had made death the penalty for signing land cession treaties without council consent. The court decided that the murders had been the proper result of signing a treaty without approval of the council. Conflict, although not open civil war, resulted in the deaths of several hundred more people by 1846 when a treaty finally brought the factions to an agreement. The Old Settlers had tried to hold out for better representation against the larger number of the Ross Party, but had been convinced by the U.S. Army officer directing the discussions to accept at this time. The pact basically duplicated the Constitution of the Cherokee Nation from 1828.[33]

A religious revival occurred in the Cherokee Nation at this time, but not the type hoped for by missionaries. The revival focused more on the symbols of the Old Testament than the New. The revival also focused on traditional religion and Cherokee nationalism. Equating Ross to Moses the Cherokee believed that like the Hebrews of the Old Testament they had come out of "Egypt", journeyed through the wilderness and

arrived in the promised land the white man had mistakenly called the Great American Desert. The Cherokee had made the "desert" into a "land of milk and honey" with their homes and farms. The Cherokee nation had risen again and enjoyed prosperity from 1846 to 1861.[34]

As part of this Cherokee religious rebirth, Ross, the Cherokee Council and a group of missionaries, in 1850, established the Cherokee Female Seminary. They patterned the school after Mount Holyoke Seminary (later Mount Holyoke College) where many Cherokee women had previously been educated. The school burnt down in 1887 and was rebuilt in 1888. The name of the school changed in 1909 to Northeastern State Normal School and then Northeastern Oklahoma State University when the State of Oklahoma purchased the school.

The building of the seminary had shown the Cherokee belief in universal education for their girls, as well as for their boys. This concept had not yet been accepted by the Euro-American society of the time. The Cherokee initially instituted the school to teach traditional Cherokee education. However, in increasing increments the schools became more and more like white schools. Most of the teachers, women of European descent, came from the East. The teachers segregated the full-blooded girls from the half-blooded girls. The full-blooded girls received less respect than their classmates who had white blood.[35]

When hostilities broke out between the peoples of the northern and southern United States the Cherokees became involved in the conflict, as did the other Four Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory. The Five Civilized tribes included the Cherokee, the Creek, the Choctaw, the Chickasaw, and the Seminole. All five Indian Nations had been forced to

move from homelands in the southeastern part of the United States. A total of more than 20,000 Indians, from all Indian peoples, took part in the war wearing either Union Blue or Confederate Gray, or both. The Cherokee had no obligation to participate in the war on the side of either belligerent. Principal Chief Ross supported Cherokee neutrality. Ross took this stance even though he, and other Cherokee, still owned slaves. The majority of Cherokee, led by the Keetowah Society, a Cherokee Christian group, favored the position of neutrality.

The Keetowahs had been organized to preserve ancient tribal and religious rites before they completely disappeared. The Society had been reestablished in 1859 with the help of Baptist missionary, Evan Jones. The new goals of the Society included the promotion of Cherokee treaty rights, and the prevention of any man suspected of treason against the United States or the Cherokee Nation from obtaining any political position. However, a small group in the nation favored coming into the war on the side of the Confederacy. Removal treaty signer Stand Waite led those who favored this position. By this time, Waite had become a successful lawyer, the owner of a general store, the owner of a large two-story log home, and a slave holder of the Cherokee landed gentry patterned after the plantation owners of the South.[36]

Not until federal troops withdrew from the Cherokee Nation and Confederate troops replaced them did the Cherokee make the decision about which course to follow. Confederate occupation, Federal defeats at First Bull Run, and Wilson Creek, Missouri, along with the United States failing to pay the annuities due to the Indians persuaded Ross to side with the South. The Cherokee's neighbors, both white and red, had

already joined the Confederates, as had many of the former Indian agents of the federal government.

Joining the Southern cause still did not have wide support among the Cherokee. Civil war, within the Cherokee Nation, once again appeared on the horizon. Both Ross and Waite worked to ensure it did not happen.[37] Although, Ross never gave up his support for neutrality, his son became a colonel under Waite. Waite eventually became a general in the Confederate Army. Waite's nephew, Elias Cornelius Boudinot, who became the Cherokee Representative to the Confederate Congress, quickly pointed out to his uncle, "John Ross and you are rivals."[38]

Despite efforts, a full scale civil war did come to the Cherokee just as it had to the whites. While John Ross visited Washington, Waite's troops burned Ross's home and killed most of his slaves. The Cherokee National Council, in 1863, chose Waite to be the Principal Chief of the Cherokee because of Ross's absence from the Nation. The Council passed a conscription law which drafted all Cherokee men from the age of 18 to 45, later upped to 50. By August 1864, Waite's troops killed every negro they found in the Indian Territory.[39]

What did the alliance mean for the Confederacy? First, they obtained troops to fight in the western theater of the war. Second, the Confederates had assured themselves that if the Indians of the Indian Territory fought with them, the Confederacy needed not worry about an Indian uprising taking troops away from the fight with the North, thus a safe western flank. The Confederate government could avoid a situation like the one faced by the federal government when the Sioux in Minnesota attacked white settlements in 1862.

What did the Cherokee receive for providing troops? With the pact made by General Albert Pike, Indian Commissioner for the Confederate States, the Confederacy agreed never to enter into an agreement with any Cherokee except through the proper constitutional authorities. Adherence to such an agreement with the federal government would have prevented the forced removal of the Cherokee in 1838 because the removal treaty would not have been signed without council approval. The Cherokee had the right to sell excess land when they wanted and the authority to expel intruders by the use of Cherokee civil officers or with Confederate troops. The Indian agents of the United States had been politically appointed without Cherokee approval. By the terms of the agreement, the agents appointed by the Confederate States required approval by the Cherokee. When the agent requested assistance, the military had to respond. Also the troops stationed in the Cherokee Nation would be Cherokee. This clause would have prevented hostility between the people and the troops as had flared up previously.

These agreements had been made by Pike prior to receiving permission from the Confederate government. Pike urged leniency towards the Indians because it had not been that long ago that some of the people he dealt with had been forced from their homes located in land now part of the Confederacy. Pike pointed at the Second Seminole War which had only been concluded in 1842, less than a generation before.[40]

The Confederacy installed a circuit court in the nation with some of the officials being Cherokee. The treaty deemed Cherokee citizens competent to testify in any court within the Confederacy, a right denied by the United States, because of the Cherokee were not citizens of the

U.S. The treaty also allowed the Cherokee to send a delegate to the Confederate Congress. The delegate had the same rights as a delegate from any territory. Also, the Southern government held out to the Cherokee the possibility of becoming a state in the Confederacy.

The Confederacy agreed to accept the financial obligations of the United States, including $500,000, with interest, due to the Cherokee since 1835. Unfortunately for the Cherokee the Confederate leadership proved no more capable than the Federal Government had been at keeping its word. Many Cherokee troops ultimately deserted and joined the Union Army.[41] The Cherokee, among the last rebel units to surrender in both the Eastern and Western theaters, once again found themselves on the losing end in another white man's war and viewed by the powers in Washington to be a conquered foe.[42] President Andrew Johnson sent a commission, headed by Ely Parker, to make peace with the Indians. The commission recommended that clemency being given the Indians who had taken part in the war on the side of the Confederacy. The commission believed a policy would not be misunderstood but would "result in Future good conduct on the part of the Indians."[43] The leniency was repaid with Cherokees becoming guides for the American Army.

After the Civil War, the federal government began the policy of "pacifying" the western Indians. While on assignment in 1867, a young Lt. Henry Pratt found himself in Indian Territory with the newly formed Tenth Calvary, a regiment of African-American troops. While on this assignment, he had the opportunity to work with Cherokee scouts working for the Army. Of the experience he wrote:

> I talked more with the Indian sergeant and his men of the scouts and found that most of them had received English

> education in their home schools conducted by their Cherokee tribal government. They had manly bearing and fine physiques. Their intelligence, civilization, and common sense was a revelation, because I had concluded that as an army officer I was there to deal with atrocious aborigines.[44]

By the turn of the century the Cherokee once again found themselves fighting to retain control of their land. The Dawes Act of 1887 allotted Indian reservations into 160 acre lots. The Indians received first choice of plots with the remaining land being allotted to Euro-Americans for farms. The Act did not apply to the Cherokee but the Indians to the west of the Cherokee. Many whites had no idea where to find their allotments and often trespassed on Cherokee land.

The Curtis Act in 1898 extended the Dawes Act to include the Cherokee, and the other Civilized Tribes, who had previously held title to their lands. The allotment of land within the Five Civilized Tribes took a different process for each tribe. Freedmen living among the tribes had to be included in the allotment process. This act also abolished the constitutional government of the Cherokee and took away their control over their schools. By the time the allotments occurred, including those for townsites, schools, and minerals rights, the Cherokee left little land for white settlement.

In November, 1902, the Cherokee along with the Creek, and Choctaw, with support from the Chickasaw, ratified a statement against a union between the Indian Territory and the Oklahoma Territory. In 1905, the Five Civilized Tribes pushed for statehood for the Indian Territory. The Indian Territory had a population greater than Maine, it had numerous miles of railroads, incorporated towns, and resources that exceeded those in the Oklahoma Territory. A union with Oklahoma would

bring together two political entities, with different pasts and diverse problems. In November, the people of the Indian Territory ratified a proposed state constitution by a nine to one ratio. The proposed state would be named Sequoyah. Bills supporting the move appeared in both houses of the U. S. Congress, the bills received no action and died. Statehood for Indian Territory did not receive the support of President Theodore Roosevelt, either. Roosevelt wanted joint statehood for Oklahoma Territory and Indian Territory which he got in 1907.[45]

Roosevelt's motivation for opposing the Indian Territory becoming an independent state stemmed from his strong belief in Manifest Destiny. A month before taking office as the president he said, "It is our duty toward people living in barbarism to see that they are freed from their chains."[46] In **The Winning of the West** Roosevelt wrote, "Whether the whites won the land by treaty, by armed conquest, or was actually the case by a mixture of both, matter comparatively little so long as the land was won. It was all important that it should be won for the benefit of civilization and in the interests of mankind."[47] Thus, he believed it to be in the best interest of all involved that the two territories be united. Roosevelt saw the winning of the American West to be the Anglo-Saxon race's most "crowning and greatest achievement,"[48] and believed that "no conquering and colonizing nation has ever treated the original savage owners of the soil with such generosity as has the United States."[49] With these beliefs, it was only natural that he would oppose the statehood of the Indian Territory.

It mattered not that the Cherokee had become as "civilized" as their Euro-American neighbors, his white neighbors never considered the

Indian to be an equal. The Cherokee became literate, in both their own language and in English. They became farmers and Christians. The Cherokee received praise from other Indians for becoming "civilized" like their white neighbors. While visiting Carlisle Indian School, Kushiway, a member of a delegation from the Sac and Fox Nations, told the students, "We know it is good for you children to be here among the white people. There is only one tribe that knows much; that are like the white people - that is the Cherokees. They have men today equal to the Great Father; they are educated, they are wise."[50] No matter what the Cherokee did, white society continued to look down its collective nose at the "savages". Yet it matter not to white society how civilized the Cherokee, or other Indians, became, white society's prejudices never allowed the whites as a whole to see the Indians as equals.

Conclusion

In this thesis I examined several aspects of Anglo-European contact with the native peoples of the United States and drew parallels with the Indians of Canada, the Aborigines of Australia and the Maori of New Zealand. First, I reviewed the greater than thou attitude of the European and the actions they took against native people because of this attitude. I examined the work of the missionary in achieving the goals of Anglo society in trying to fashion the indigenous people into "civilized" beings came next. I explain the educational process to help the native become civilized and a citizen in the third chapter. In chapter four, I explored the Native American response to the actions taken by the Euro-Americans. Next, I reported on the work of some Native Americans who used what white society taught them in an attempt to help their people. Then finally I described how the Cherokee became practically carbon copies of their white neighbors, but were often still seen by white society as still just being Indians and thus an obstacle to white destiny. My conclusions are as follows.

In Chapter One, I presented that the leading force behind the Europeans attempt to "civilize" the new people they came in contact with was his conviction of the superiority of the European way of life. This haughtiness included the belief that Christianity was better than the native religions. Thus, the European believed it was through religion and education that the native could be refined and enlightened to take his place among the cultivated of God's chosen. This was especially true for the British, and their descendants on the North American and

Australia continents as well as New Zealand. But, as John F. Povey points out, skin color would never allow the Indian to fully assimilate into the Anglo-European culture.[1] This was also a major problem for the Aborigines and the Maori.

Next, I show that although well meaning the missionaries work was flawed. This fall can be summed up by Daisy Bates who spent most of her early life among the Aborigines of Australia. In writing about the death of an Aboriginal woman, she tells how she had wished to comfort the woman by teaching her the Lord's Prayer. She could only go as far as "Our Father which art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name," in the language of her friend. "Thy Kingdom come" could not be explained because any land that the Aborigine did not belong to was the land of an enemy. The forgiving of a trespass would not work because the Aborigines would have killed a trespasser on the spot and then forgot the trespass along with the trespasser. Deliverance from temptation was also a mute point with the Aborigine. Bates then puts her finger on one of the major problems the missionaries failed to realize when dealing with the Aboriginals, or the native of any country.

She points out that the missionaries held too strongly to the "perfected creeds of the present day." And did not allow for the native religions any place. She writes that the early leaders of the Christian faith "merged as many of these pagan beliefs into the Christianity of those days as they could be safely welded in accordance with the tenets of their religion. . . . So the magic of the heathen became the miracle of the Christian . . ." The early Christian leadership did not have the conceit of those who travelled with the early explorers, and

those who followed them.[2] The work of the missionary led to the founding of schools for the native people and the belief that once they became educated Christians they could become citizens of the countries in which they found themselves as I explained in chapter three. I examined the native response to the work of the white governments and the predicament faced by the Native American in the next two chapters.

The native people either fought the incursion made by the whites or they accepted what they received from the whites. A Fox Indian tale illustrates the dilemma that many people of natives faced when they accepted white ways:

> Once there was an Indian who became a Christian. He became a very good Christian; he went to church, and he didn't smoke or drink, and he was good to everyone. He was a very good man. Then he died. First he went to the Indian hereafter, but they wouldn't take him because he was a Christian. Then he went to Heaven, but they wouldn't let him in - Because he was an Indian. Then he went to Hell, but they wouldn't admit him there either, because he was so good. So he came to [be] alive again, and he went to the Buffalo Dance and the other dances and taught his children to do the same thing.[3]

As the tale points out, the native often could not win until he was able to find a place where he fit in.

In chapter six, I showed the problems faced by the Cherokee when trying to emulate their Anglo neighbors, but parallels can easily be drawn between the Cherokee and the Maori. Like the Cherokee, prior to their removal, many of the Maori in the 1850's had accepted Christianity and white ways. They had turned to agriculture with a vigor. The Maori raised corn, potatoes, and so much wheat that they exported it to Australia. The Maori owned 6,000 head of livestock, four water powered mills, and numerous water vessels. Auckland storekeepers became extremely dependent on the Maori's trade.[4] The "civilized" Maoris loss

much of their gains when the second Maori War began. The war began because of land demands by the Euro-New Zealanders. Had they been given the protection, as British citizens, they had been promised under the Treaty of Waitangi, the war would never have taken place.

Thus the arrogance of the British colonist and their decedents in the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand can still be seen today as the natives of these countries can be called second class citizens, although to varying degrees, in all four countries.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1.Robert Famighetti (ed), The World Almanac and Book of Facts 1996, (Mahwah, NJ: World Almanac Books, 1995), p. 382.

2.Havry Rasky with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, The War Against the Indians [Volume 1: Video], (Quebec: Maday Entertainment, 1992).

3.Bruce Heydt, "The Last Days of the Raj", British Heritage, June/July 1997, p.10.

4.Alice B. Kehoe, North American Indians: A Comprehensive Account (Second Edition), (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1992), p. 327.; Bill Jonas and Marica Langton, et al., The Little Red, Yellow, & Black (and green and blue and white) Book: A Short Guide to Indigenous Australia, (Adelaide: Lane Brothers Printing, 1994)., p. 30.

5.William R. Hutchinson, Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), p. 15.

6.Francis Paul Prucha, The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians, (Abridged Edition), (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), pp. 48-49.

7.Dark Rain Thom, Kohkumthena's Grandchildren, The Shawnee, (Indianapolis: Guild Press of Indiana, 1994), pp. 264-266.

Chapter One

1.V. G. Kiernan, The Lords of Human Kind: Black Man, Yellow Man, And White Man an Age of Empire, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969), p. 268.

2.Charles Darwin, The Voyage of the Beagle, (New York: P.F. Collier & Sons, 1909), p.459.

3.Ibid, p. 458.

4.Peter Matthiessen, In the Spirit of Crazy Horse, (New York: Penguin Books, 1991), p. 5.

5.Josepha Sherman, Indian Tribes in North America, (New York: Crescent Books, 1996), p. 63.

6.William Brandon, The Last Americans: The Indians in American Culture, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), p. 377.

7.Albert L. Hurtado, Indian Survival on the California Frontier, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), pp. 24-25.

8.Aboriginal and Torres Islanders Commission [ATSIC]. Aboriginal People of Victoria, (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1990), p. 8, 10.; ATSIC. Aboriginal People of New South Wales, (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1992), p. 11.; ATSIC. Victoria, p. 10.

9.Kiernan, The Lords of Human Kind, pp. 266-267.; Hurtado, Indian Survival, p. 23.; Belshaw, New Zealand, p. 55.; Rayna Green, Women in American Indian Society, (New York: Chelsa House Publishers, 1992), p.36.

10.K.S. Inglis, The Australian Colonists: An Exploration of Social History, 1788-1870. (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1974), p. 160.

11.ATSIC. New South Wales, p 10.

12.Council for Aboriginal Conciliation and ATSIC, Aboriginal People of Tasmania, (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1992), p. 8.

13.Ibid., pp. 264-265; Inglis, The Australian Colonists, pp. 162-163.; ATSIC, Tasmania, p. 9.

14.Jonas. The Little Red...Book, p. 29; Inglis. The Australian Colonist, p. 165.

15.Inglis, The Australian Colonists, p. 163

16.Ibid., p. 164.

17.Jonas. The Little Red...Book, p.29.; ATSIC, New South Wales, p. 11.

18.Ibid.; Australian InFo International, Australian Aboriginal Culture, (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1993), p. 9.; ATSIC, Aboriginal People of the Northern Territory, (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1992), p. 11.

19.Clyde A. Milner,et al. (eds), The Oxford History of the American West,(New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 179.; Peter Naboov, Native American Testimony: A Chronicle of Indian-White Relations From Prophecy to the Present, 1492-1992, (New York: Penguin Books, 1992), pp. 187-188; Prucha. The Great Father, pp. 146, 149-150.; Matthiessen, Spirit of Crazy Horse, p. 6.

20.Letter from Edwin Eells to Rev. M. E. Strieby, September 23, 1882, American Missionary Association Archives, Fisk University, document #H2-37.

21.Eric Foner, A Short History of Reconstruction, 1863-1877, (New York: Harper & Row, 1990), pp. 238-239.

22.Milner, History of the American West, pp. 179-180.; Prucha, The Great Father, pp. 154-155.

23.Edna McGuire, The Maoris of New Zealand. (New York: MacMillan, 1968), p. 139.

24.Inglis, Australian Colonists, pp. 163-167.

25.John Greenway, Australia: The Last Frontier, (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1972), p. 80.

26.Darwin, The Beagle, p. 449.; Kiernan, Lords Of Human Kind, p. 262.; Horace Belshaw (ed.), New Zealand, (Berkeley: University of California, 1947), pp. 54-55.

27."Wonderful Results Of Missionary Labor", American Missionary, Vol. 1, No. 6, April 1847, p. 46.

28."New Theory of Colonization", Edinburgh Review, Vol. 71, July 1840, p. 534.

29.Edinburgh Review, Vol. 173, Article IX, October 1890, p. 535.

30.ATSIC. Northern Territory, p. 11.

31.Edinburgh Review, Vol. 37, June 1822, pp. 267-268.

32.Hugh A. Dempsey, William Parker: Mounted Policeman, (Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, 1973), p. 7.

33.Ibid., p. 105, 129-130.

34.Jean Farnfield, Frontiersman: A Biography of George Elphistone Dalrymple, (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 1-3.

35.Ibid., pp. 35, 67, 69.

36.D'Arcy McNickle, "Indian and European: Indian-White Relations from Discovery to 1887", The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 311, May 1957, p. 11.

37.David R. Woodward, Trial By Friendship: Anglo-American Relations, 1917-1918, (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1993), p.6.

Chapter Two

1.Brother Spencer, American Missionary, Vol. 1, No. 6, April 1847, p. 44.

2.Department of Interior, Office of Indian Affairs, Indian Missions of the United States, Bulletin 8, 1922, pg 1.

3.Isai Belenkin and Alexei Bashin, "The Missionaries: 200 Years of Orthodox Faith In America.", Russian Life, Vol. 37, No. 4, Fall 1994, p. 21.

4.Clyde A. Milner II, et al (eds), The Oxford History of the American West, (new York: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 573-576.

5.Belenkin, "The Missionaries", pp. 21-23, 30.

6.Edinburgh Review, Vol. 40, Article VII, July 1824, p. 429.

7.William Howitt, Colonization and Christianity: A Popular History of the Treatment of the Natives by the Europeans In All Their Colonies, (London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Greene, & Longmans, 1838); Reprint: (New York: Negro University Press, 1969), pp. 64-65, pp. 66-67.

8.Letter from Myron Eells to M.E. Strieby, April 18, 1882, American Missionary Association Archives, Fisk University, document #H2-28.

9.Addison Merrill, "The Miami Nation", American Missionary, Vol. 1, No. 7, May 1847, pp. 50-51.

10.Marie Louise Schulte, "Catholic Press Reaction to the Custer Disaster", Mid America, Vol. 32, No. 4, 1955, p 208.

11.Ibid., pp. 206-207.

12.Ibid., pp. 210-211.

13.Letter from John McCarthy to William Kincaid, March 20 1893, American Home Missionary Society, Oklahoma files.

14.Arthur E. Kewley, "John Strachan versus Peter Jones", Bulletin of the United Church of Canada, Vol. 16, 1963, pp. 16-28.

15.Maurice H. Lewis, "The Anglican Church and Its Mission School Dispute", Alberta Historical Review, Vol. 14, No. 4, 1966, p. 8.

16.Ibid., p. 9.

17.Ibid., p. 10.

18.Ibid., pp. 10-13.

19.Cephas Washburn, Reminiscences of the Indians, (Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1869); Reprint: (New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1971). pp. 125-126.

20.Ibid., pp. 232-233.

21.Tatum, Our Red Brothers, p. 298.

22.Augustus Field Beard, A Crusade of Brotherhood: A History of the American Missionary Association, (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1909); Reprint: (New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1970) p. 69-70.

23.Kehoe, North American Indians, p. 571.

24.Riggs, Tah-Koo Wah-Kan, p. 338.

25.Ibid., p. 400.

26.Ibid., pp. 401-403.

27.McGuire, The Maoris, p. 140.

28.McGuire, pp. 140-141.; Belshaw, New Zealand, pp. 54, 55-56.

29.Beard, Crusade for Brotherhood, pp. 79-80

Chapter Three

1.Francis La Flesche, The Middle Five: Indian Schoolboys of the Omaha Tribe, Forward by David A. Baerreis, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963), p. 95.

2.Edna McQuire, The Maoris of New Zealand, (New York: MacMillian, 1968), p. 162.

3.Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present, (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), p. 145, p. 171.

4.Mr. Bernard, "Letter From Mr. Bernard of the Red Cedar Lake Mission", American Missionary, Vol. 1, No. 6, April 1847, p. 43.

5.Dempsey, "Last Letters", p. 22.

6.Ibid., p. 26.

7.Leslie A. White (ed), Lewis Henry Morgan: The Indian Journals, 1859-62, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1959) p. 33.

8.Ibid., pp. 53-54.

9.Officer, Indians in School, pp. 8-11.

10.Richard Henry Pratt: Robert M. Utley (ed.), Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964), pp. 181-182.

11.Benjamin Capps, The Great Chiefs, (Alexanderia, VA, Time-Life Books, 1985) pp. 45-53.;Foner, A Short History of Reconstruction. p. 66.; Morel, "Pratt's School", pp. 29-30.

12.Ferris, Native American Doctor, pp. 32-34.

13.Ibid., p. 261.

14.Letter from G.C. Freeman, Secretary, Y.M.C.A. to Reverend Parker, A.H.M.S. Oklahoma Territorial Auditor and Superintendent of Public Instruction, January 18, 1893. American Home Missionary Society Papers, 1816-1894, Reel 232, Oklahoma, et al.

15.Officer, Indians in School, p. 11.

16.Ibid.

17.Ibid., p. 12.

18.Ibid., p. 15.

19.Ibid., p. 17.

20.Letter from Edwin Eells to Rev. M. E. Strieby, Sept 23, 1882, A.M.A. Archives #H2-37.

21.Beard, Crusade for Brotherhood, pp. 68-69.

22.Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs, Educating the Indians, Bulletin 9, 1921, p. 9.

23.Chief [Luther] Standing Bear, Land of the Spotted Eagle, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1933), pp. 230-232.

24.Ibid., pp. 232-234.; McLuhan, Touch the Earth, p. 103.

25.Capps, Great Chiefs, p. 92.

26.Standing Bear, Land of the Spotted Eagle, p. 235.; Morel, "Pratt's School" p. 64.

27.Charles W. Hobart, "Some Consequences of Residential Schooling", R. Merwin Deever, et al., (eds), American Indian Education, (Tempe: Arizona State University, 1974), p. 46.

28.Ibid., pp. 46-47.

29.Ibid., p. 47.

30.Ibid., p. 47.

31.Ibid., pp. 48-50.

32.Ibid., p. 51.

33.Standing Bear, *Land of the Spotted Eagle*, p. 251.

34.Australian InFo International. *Aboriginal Culture*, p.10.; ATSIC. *Northern Territory*, p. 11.

35.ATSIC. *New South Wales*, pp. 12-13.

36.Belshaw, *New Zealand*, p. 61.; H. B. Hawthorn "The Maori: A Study of Acculturation", *American Anthropological Association*. Vol. 46, No. 2, Part 2, April 1944.

37.Hugh A. Dempsey,(ed.), "The Last Letters of Rev. George McDougall", *Alberta Historical Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1967, p. 23.; Loring Benson Priest, *Uncle Sam's Stepchildren*, (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1942), p.168.

38.James Walker, "My Life in the North-West Mounted Police", *Alberta Historical Review*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1960, p. 14.

39.Ibid., p. 4.

40.Capps, *Great Chiefs*, pp. 208-211.

41.Walker, "My Life...", p. 12.

42.McLuhan, *Touch the Earth*, p. 91.

43.Tom McHugh, *The Time of the Buffalo*, (New York, Alfred A. Knoff, 1972), pp. 10-11, 58-59.

44.Dempsey, "Last Letters", p. 26.

45.Ibid., p. 21.

46.Brandon, *The Last Americans*, pp. 379-380.

47.Ibid.

48.Kehoe, *North American Indians*, pp. 543-544.

49.Hartwell Bowsfield, *Louis Riel: The Rebel and the Hero*, (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 16-19.

50.Ibid., pp. 84-85.

51.Malcolm Montgomery, "The Six Nations and the MacDonald Franchise", *Ontario History*, Vol. 57, No. 1, 1965, pp. 13-15.

52."The Red Indian: His Status in Canada: Progress Towards Full Citizenship", *The Times*, May 25, 1920, p. 24.

53.Maureen Harrison and Steven Gilbert (eds.), Thomas Jefferson in His Own Words, (New York: Barnes & Nobles Books, 1996), p. 388.

54.Ibid., p. 145.

55.Pratt, Battlefield and Classroom, p. 268.

56.Ibid., p. 269.

57.New Zealand Government, The Treaty of Waitangi: The symbol of our life together as a nation, Wellington, 1989(?), pp. 8-15.; Milner, History of the American West, p. 823.; Belshaw, New Zealand, pp. 56-57, 61.

58.ATSIC. New South Wales, pp. 12-13.

59.ATSIC. Northern Territory, p. 13.; ATSIC. New South Wales, p. 16.

60.Associated Press, "Tribal Schools neglected, decaying: Equal Funding Rules Ignored", The Herald-Dispatch. August 29, 1995.

Chapter Four

1.Dempsey, William Parker, p. 42.

2.James E. Officer, Indians in School: A Study of the Development of Educational Facilities for Arizona Indians, (Tucson: University of Arizona, 1956) p. 5.

3.T.C. McLuhan (ed.), Touch the Earth: A Self Portrait of Indian Existence, (New York: Promontory Press, 1971), p. 48-49.

4.Ibid., p. 57.; Hildegard Thompson, "Education Among American Indians", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Vol. 311, May 1957, p. 96.

5.Nabokov, Native American Testimony, (New York: Penguin Books, 1992), p.121-123.

6.McLuhan, Touch the Earth, pp. 60-61, 63.

7.Brandon, The Last Americans, p. 350.

8.O.O. Howard, Famous Indian Chiefs that I Have Known, (New York: Century Co., 1908); Reprint: (Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1989), pp. 177-178.

9.Lawrie Tatum, Our Red Brothers: And the Peace Policy of President Ulysses S. Grant, (Philadelphia: John C. Winston & Co., 1899), p. 95.

10.S. C. Bartlett, Historical Sketches of the Missions of the American Board. (Boston: American Board, 1876); Reprint: (New York: Arno Press, 1972), pp. 39-40.; Stephen R. Riggs, Tah-Koo Wah-Kan or the Gospel Among the Dakotas. (Boston Congregational Publishing Society, 1869); (New York: Arno Press, 1972), pp. 339-340.; Harvy, The War (second volume).

11.John M. Carroll and Colin F. Baxter (eds.), The American Military Experience: From Colonial Times to the Present, (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1993) p. 109.; Oliver O. Howard, My Life and Experiences Among Our Hostile Indians, (Hartford, CT: A. T. Worthington & Co., 1907); Reprint: (New York: Da Capo Press, 1972), pp. 105-109.

12.Roy W. Meyer, "The Canadian Sioux Refugees From Minnesota", Minnesota History. Vol. 57, No. 1, 1968, p. 15, 17.

13.Ibid., p. 20, 22, 23, 25.

14.Letter from Edward Morris to M.E. Strieby, September 5, 1877, American Missionary Association Archives, Fisk University, document #H6.

15.Letter from Brother John Johnson to J.P. Bardwell [extract], American Missionary, Vol. 1, No. 6, p, 44.

16.Kehoe, North American Indians, p. 386.

17.Sherman, Indian Tribes in North America, p. 75.

18.Howard, Famous Indian Chiefs, pp. 185-193.

19.Chief Joseph, "An Indian's View of Indian Affairs", The North American Review, Vol. 128, No. 269, April 1879. pp. 422-430.; Sherman, Indian Tribes in North America, p. 75.; Kehoe, North American Indians, pp. 386-389.; Carroll, The American Military Tradition, p. 101.; Lyric Wallwork Winik, "Nez Perce", Parade Magazine, June 15, 1997. p. 4.

20.Kehoe, North American Indians, p. 389.

21.Schulte, "Catholic Press Reaction", p. 205: Quoted from General George Custer, My Life on the Plains, New York, 1876, p. 18.

22.Nabokov, Native American Testimony, p. 189.

23.Chief Joseph, "An Indian's View", pp. 431-432.

24.Ibid., p. 433.

25.Edith Jones, "The Native Races of Australia", Times, January 27, 1938, p. 8.

26.John N. Q'land, "What Queensland Is Doing", Times, February 25, 1938, p. 12.

27.Sherman, Indian Tribes of North America, pp. 13-15.; Kehoe, North American Indians, pp. 462-464.; Harvy, "The Hunter Becomes the Hunted", The War Against the Indians [Volume 2: Video].

28.Kehoe, North American Indians, pp. 182, 375-376.; McHugh, The Time of the Buffalo, p. 290.; Capps, The Great Chiefs, pp. 222-233.

29.Milner, Oxford History of the American West, pp. 820-821.

30.Christine Lesiak and Matthew Jones, In the White Man's Image.[Video] The American Experience Series, Public Broadcasting Service, 1991; Mary Kay Morel "Captain Pratt's School", American History. May/June 1997, p. 64.

31.Capps, Great Chiefs, pp. 220-222.; McHugh, Time of the Buffalo, p. 290.

32.Lesiak, In the White Man's Image [Video].

33.Havry, "Dispossessed", The War Against the Indians [Volume 3: Video].

34.Ibid.

Chapter Five

1.Howard, Famous Indian Chiefs, p. 222.

2.Paula Gunn Allen, The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine In American Indian Traditions, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1986), pp. 32-33.

3.Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins, Life Among the Paiutes, Their Wrongs and Claims, (Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co., 1883); Reprint: (Bishop, CA, Chalfant Press, 1969), pp. 70-72, 178.; Dorothy Nafus Morrison, Chief Sarah: Sarah Winnemucca's Fight for Indian Rights, (Portland, Oregon Historical Society Press, 1990), pp. 11-53.; Marion E. Gridley, American Indian Women, (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1974), pp. 54-55.; Howard, Famous Indian Chiefs, pp. 218-219, 224.

4.Morrison, Chief Sarah, pp. 75-81.; Gridley, American Indian Women, p. 56.

5.Morrison Chief Sarah, pp. 89-94, 95-99; Gridley, American Indian Women, p. 56-57.

6.Morrison, Chief Sarah, pp. 108-115.; Gridley, American Indian Women, p. 57-58.

7.Morrison, Chief Sarah, pp. 126-138.; Gridley, American Indian Women, pp. 59-60.

8.Morrison, Chief Sarah, pp. 140-145.; Gridley, American Indian Women, p. 60. Kehoe, North American Indians, p. 378.

9.Morrison, Chief Sarah, pp. 146-150.

10.Ibid., pp. 150-152; 152-158.; Gridley, American Indian Women, p. 60.

11.Hopkins, Life Among the Paiutes, p. 207.

12.La Flesche, The Middle Five, pp. 3-5.

13.Ibid., pp. 111-122.; Jeri Ferris, Native American Doctor: The Story of Susan La Flesche Picotte, (Minneapolis: Carolrhoda Books, 1991), p. 21.

14.Ferris, Native American Doctor, pp. 13-17.; Norma Kidd Green, Iron Eye's Family: The Children of Joseph La Flesche, (Lincoln, NE: Johnson Publishing, 1969), pp. 28-30, 47.

15.Ferris, Native American Doctor, p. 47.

16.La Flesche, The Middle Five, p. xi.; Gridley, American Indian Women, p. 75.; Kehoe, North American Indians, p. 598.

17.Ibid., p. 41.; Norma Kidd Green, Iron Eye's Family, p. 47.

18.Margaret Crary, Susette La Flesche: Voice of the Omaha Indians, (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1973), p.55-57.

19.Ibid., p. 61.; Norma Kidd Green, Iron Eye's Family, p. 49.; Ferris, Native American Doctor, p. 24.

20.Crary, Susette La Flesche, pp. 65-67; 167-168; 144-145; 171.; Gridley, American Indian Women, p. 74.; Norma Kidd Green, Iron Eye's Family, pp. 67-69, 76.; Ferris, Native American Doctor, p. 82.

21.Ferris, Native American Doctor, pp. 49-51.; Crary, Susette La Flesche, p. 169.; Gridley, American Indian Women, p. 76.

22.Ferris, Native American Doctor, pp. 52, 62-63, 69-70.;Gridley, American Indian Women, pp. 76-78.

23.Zitkala-Sa, American Indian Stories, (Washington: Hayworth Publishing, 1921); Reprint: Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1985), Forward, p. 54, p. 67.; Gridley, American Indian Women, pp. 81-82.

24.Zitkala-Sa, American Indian Stories, pp. 79-80.; Gridley, American Indian Women, pp. 82-83.

25.Gridley, American Indian Women, p. 84.

26.Rayna Green, Women in American Indian Society, pp. 78-80.

27.Kehoe, North American Indians, p. 267.; Nabokov, Native American Testimony, p.202.; Laurence M. Hauptman, Between Two Fires: American Indians in the Civil War, (New York: The Free Press, 1995), pp. 175-178.

28.Nabokov, Native American Testimony, p. 204.

29.Jane R. Smith, "Triumph and Tragedy", American History. May/June 1997, pp. 52-53.

30.Ibid., 278.

31."The Red Indian", The Times, p.24.; "The Maoris: Their Origins and Destiny", The Times, May 25, 1920, p. 26.

Chapter Six

1.J.W. Moore, "Biography of Rev. Cephas Washburn", Cephas Washburn. Reminiscences, p. 33.

2.Henry Neuison (producer/director), The Cherokee: Ani-yun-wiya (The Principle People), (Bala Cynwyd, PA, Library Video Co., 1993).

3.Kehoe, North American Indians, pp. 183-84.

4.Ibid., p.189.

5.Neuison, The Cherokee.

6.William G. McLoughlin, Cherokee Renascence in the New Republic, (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 3.

7.Ibid.

8.Theda Perdue, Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society, 1540-1866, (Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1979), p. 5.

9.Ibid., pp. 23-25.

10.Kehoe, North American Indians, p. 192.

11.Ibid., pp. 192-93; McLoughlin, Cherokee Renascence, pp 10-11.

12.Neuison, The Cherokee.

13.Kehoe, North American Indians, p. 194.

14.Ibid.; Morris L. Wardell, A Political History of the Cherokee Nation, 1838-1907, (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1938). pp. 5-6.; Washburn, Reminiscences of the Indians, pp. 75-79.

15.Washburn, Reminiscences, pp. 112-122.

16.Nabokov, Native American Testimony, p. 147.

17.Wardell, A Political History, p. 4; Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Famous Indians: A Collection of Short Biographies, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing office, 1966), p. 17; Kehoe, North American Indians, pp. 196-198; Brandon, The Last Americans, pp. 259-260.; Bartlett, Historical Sketches, p. 9. More information about Sequoyah can be found in Grant Foreman, Sequoyah, (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1938).

18.Harrison, Thomas Jefferson, p. 135.

19.William G. McLoughlin, Cherokees and Missionaries, 1789-1839, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986) p. 351.

20.Kehoe, North American Indians, p. 195.

21.Robert V. Remini, Andrew Jackson, (New York, Perennial Library, 1969) pp. 128-29.

22.Ibid.; Geoffrey Norman, "The Cherokee: Two Nations, One People", National Geographic, Vol. 187, No. 5, May 1995, p.86.

23.Berkhofer, The White Man's Indian, p. 157-159.; John Ehle, Trail of Tears: The Rise And Fall Of the Cherokee Nation, (New York: Anchor Books, 1988) p. 125.; Carroll, The American Military Tradition, p. 95.

24.Neuison, The Cherokee.; Norman, "The Cherokee: Two Nations, One People" p. 78.

25.Berkhofer, The White Man's Indian, p. 159.

26.Ehle, Trail of Tears, pp. 192-193.

27.Francis Paul Prucha (ed.), Cherokee Removal: The "William Penn" Essays and Other Writings By Jeremiah Evarts, (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1981), pp. 175-77.

28.Wardell, A Political History, p. 8.

29.Ibid., pp. 8-9.

30.Ibid., pp. 9-11; Dept. of Interior, B.I.A., Famous Indians, pp. 18-19.

31.Norman, "The Cherokee", pp. 82-89.

32.Wardell, A Political History, pp. 13-15.

33.Ibid., pp. 17-20; Kehoe, North American Indians, pp. 201-202.

34.McLoughlin, Cherokees and Missionaries, p. 351.

35.Rayna Green, Women in American Indian Society, pp. 67-69.

36.Hauptman, Between Two Fires, p. 46.

37.Ibid., pp. 130-33.

38.Edward Everett Dale and Gaston Litton (eds), Cherokee Cavaliers, (Norman, University of Oklahoma, 1940), pp. 110-11.

39.Hauptman, Between Two Fires, pp. 49-55.

40.Prucha, The Great Father, p. 85.

41.Wardell, A Political History, pp. 139-41; For more information about the Agreement between the Cherokee and the Confederacy see Albert Pike, Mission to the Indian Nations, Reprint:(Washington, D.C.: Supreme Council, 33°, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, 1968).; Hauptman, Between Two Fires, p. 48.

42.Hauptman, Between Two Fires, p. x.

43.Howard, My Life and Experiences, pp. 101-102.

44.Pratt, Battlefield and Classroom, pp 4-5.

45.Kehoe, North American Indian, pp. 204-205. Prucha, The Great Father, pp. 260-262.

46.Howard K. Beale, Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power, (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1956), p. 34.

47.Theodore Roosevelt, The Winning of the West(Abridged), (New York: Hasting House, 1963), p. 183.

48.Edmund Morris, The Rise of Theodore Roosevelt, (New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc., 1979), p. 462.

49.Roosevelt, Winning of the West, p. 183.

50.Pratt, Battlefield and Classroom, p. 278.

Conclusion

1.John F. Povey, "American Education and French Assimilation: A Comparison", Midwest Quarterly, (Vol. 11, No. 3, Spring 1970) pp. 268-69.

2.Daisy Bates, The Passing of the Aborigines, A Lifetime Spent with the Natives of Australia, (New York: Frederick A. Pager, 1967), pp. 154-155.

3.Nabokov, Native American Testimony, p. 57.

4.Belshaw, New Zealand, pp. 57-58.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

MICROFILM

American Home Missionary Society Papers, 1816-1894. Reel 232, Oklahoma, et al.

American Missionary Association Manuscripts. Ohio-Oklahoma-Oregon, Roll 22.

----- Washington-West Virginia, Roll 1.

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

American Missionary
Edinburgh Review
The Times (London)

PUBLISHED WORKS

Associated Press. "Tribal Schools Neglected, Decaying: Equal Funding Rules Ignored", The Hearld-Dispatch. Huntington, WV, August 20, 1995.

Bates, Daisy. The Passing of the Aborigines, A Lifetime Spent with the Natives of Australia. New York, Fredrick A. Pager, 1967.

Benson, Henry C. Life Among the Choctaws, and Sketches of the South West. Cincinnati, L. Swormstodt & A. Poe, 1860; Reprint: New York, Johnson Reprint, 1986.

Campbell, Maria. Halfbreed. McClellard & Stewart Limited, 1973.

Chief Joseph. "An Indian's View of Indian Affairs," North American Review. April 1879, Vol. 128, No. 269, pp.412-433.

Dale, Edward Everett and Litton, Gaston (eds.). Cherokee Cavaliers: Forty Years of Cherokee History as Told in the Correspondence of the Ridge Waite-Boudinot Family. Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1940.

Darwin, Charles, The Voyage of the Beagle, New York, P. F. Collier & Son, 1909.

Dempsey, Hugh A., (ed.). "The Last Letters of Rev. George McDougall", Alberta Historical Review. Vol. 15, No. 2, 1967, pp. 20-30.

----- William Parker: Mounted Police. Edmonton, Hurtig Publishers, 1973.

Harrison, Mureen & Gilbert, Steve (eds.). Thomas Jefferson: In His Own Words. New York, Barnes & Noble books, 1993.

Hobart, Charles W. "Some Consequences of Residential Schooling", Deever, R. Merwin, et al. (eds.). American Indian Education. Tempe, Arizona State University, 1974.

Hopkins, Sarah Winnemucca. Life Among the Paiutes. Boston, Copples, Upham & Co., 1883; Reprint: Bishop, CA, Chalfant Press, 1969.

Howard, Oliver. O. Famous Indian Chiefs I Have Known. New York, Century Co., 1908; Reprint: Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1989.

----- My Life and Experiences Among Our Hostile Indians. Hartford, CT, A.T. Worthington & Co., 1907; Reprint: New York, Da Capo Press, 1972.

La Flesche, Francis. The Middle Five: Indian Schoolboys of the Omaha Tribe. Forward by David A. Berris, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1963.

Long, E. B. (ed.). Personal Memoirs of U. S. Grant. Cleveland, World Publishing, 1952.

Nevins, Allan (ed.). Letters of Grover Cleveland, 1885-1908. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1933.

Parker, George F. (ed.). The Writings and Speeches of Grover Cleveland. New York, Cassell Publishing, 1892.

Pike, Albert. Mission To the Indian Nations. Washington, D.C., Supreme Council, 33°, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, 1968.

Pratt, Richard Henry: Utley, Robert M. (ed.). Battlefield and Classroom, Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1964.

Prucha, Francis Paul (ed.). Cherokee Removal: The "William Penn" Essays and Other Writings by Jeremiah Evarts. Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1981.

Riggs, Stephen R. Tah-Koo Wah-Kan or The Gospel Among the Dakotas. Boston Congregational Publishing Society, 1869; Reprint: New York, Arno Press, 1972.

Rooosevelt, Theodore. The Winning of the West. New York, Hastings House, 1963 (Abridged).

Standing Bear, Chief [Luther]. Land of the Spotted Eagle. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1933.

Tatum, Lawrie. Our Red Brothers: and the Peace Policy of President Ulysses S. Grant. Philadelphia, John C. Winston & Co., 1899.

Walker, James. "My Life in the North-West Mounted Police", Alberta Historical Review. Vol. 8, No. 1, Winter 1960, pp. 1-14.

White, Leslie A., (ed.). Lewis Henry Morgan: The Indian Journals, 1859-62. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1959.

Williams, T. Harry (ed.). Hayes, The Dairy of a President. New York, David McCoy Co., 1964.

Zitkala-Sa (Gertrude Bonnin). American Indian Stories. Washington, Hayworth Publishing House, 1921: Reprint: Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1985.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abbie, A. A. The Original Australians. New York, American Elsevier Publishing, 1970.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission. Aboriginal People of Victoria. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service, 1990.

Allen, Paula Gunn. The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions. Boston, Beacon Press, 1986.

Australian InFo International, Australian Aboriginal Culture. Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service, 1993.

Bartlett, S. C. Historical Sketches of the Missions of the American Board. Boston, American Board, 1876; Reprint: New York, Arno Press, 1972.

Beale, Howard K. Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power. Baltimore, John Hopkins Press 1956.

Beaver, R. Pierce. "American Missionary Efforts to Influence Government Indian Policy", Journal of Church and State. Vol. 5, No. 1, 1963, pp. 77-94.

Belenkin, Isai and Bashin, Alexei. "The Missionaires: 200 Years of Orthodox Faith in America", Russian Life, Vol. 37, No. 4, Fall 1994, pp. 20-24, 29-30.

Belshaw, Horace (ed.). New Zealand. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1947.

Berkhofer, Robert F., Jr. The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian From Columbus to the Present. New York, Vintage Books, 1979.

Bowsfield, Hartwell. Louis Riel: The Rebel and the Hero. Toronto, Oxford University Press, 1971.

Brandon, William. The Last Americans: The Indian in American Culture. New York, McGraw-Hill Books, 1974.

Capps, Benjamin. The Great Chiefs. Alexandria, VA, Time-Life Books, 1985.

Carroll, John M. & Baxter, Colin F. The American Military Tradition: From Colonial Times to the Present. Wilmington, DE, Scholarly Resources, 1993.

Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation and the Aboriginal and Torres Islander Commission. Aboriginal People of New South Wales. Canberra, Australian Government Printing Service, 1992.

----- Aboriginal People of the Northern Territory. Canberra, Australian Government Printing Service, 1992.

----- Aboriginal People of South Australia. Canberra, Australian Government Printing Service, 1992.

----- Aboriginal People of Tasmania. Canberra, Australian Government Printing Service, 1992.

Crary, Margaret. Susette La Flesche: Voice of the Omaha Indians. New York, Hawthorn Books, 1973.

D'Elia, Donald J. "The Argument over Civilian or Military Indian Control, 1865-1880", Historian. Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 207-225.

Dempsey, Hugh A. "The Thin Red Line in the Canadian West", American West. Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 24-30.

Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Bill C-31. Ottawa, September 1995. [ONLINE] http://www.inac.gc.ca/pubs/information/info02.html

----- Indian Residential Schools. Ottawa, April 1993. [ONLINE] http://www.inac.gc.ca/pubs/information/info46.html

----- Indians in Canada and the United States. Ottawa, 1995. [ONLINE] http://www.inac.gc.ca/pubs/information/info37.html

----- The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND). Ottawa, September 1995. [ONLINE] http://www.inac.gc.ca/pubs/information/info15.html.

Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. American Indians and the Federal Government. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

----- Excellence in Indian Education Through the Effective School Process (Final Review Draft). U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1988.

----- Famous Indians: A Collection of Short Biographies. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

----- Federal Indian Polices... From the Colonial Period Through the Early 1970's. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Department of Interior, Office of Indian Affairs. Educating the Indians. Bulletin 9, 1921.

----- The American Indian and Government Indian Administration: Speech by Edgar B. Merritt, Assistant Indian Commissioner, Delivered November 1, 1922 before the Maryland Federation of Women's Clubs in Baltimore, Maryland. Bulletin 12, 1922.

----- Indian Missions of the United States. Bulletin 8, 1922.

----- Indians, North America. Bulletin 6, 1920.

Eastman, Elaine Goodale. Pratt: The Red Man's Moses. Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1935.

Ehle, John. Trail of Tears: The Rise and Fall of the Cherokee Nation. New York, Anchor Books, 1989.

Famighetti, Robert (ed). The World Almanac and Book of Facts 1996. Mahwah, NJ, World Almanac Books, 1995.

Farnfield, Jean. Frontiersman: A Biography of George Elpinstone Dalrymple. Melbourne, Oxford University Press, 1968.

Ferris, Jerri. Native American Doctor: The Story of Susan La Flesche Picotte. Minneapolis, Carolhoda Books, 1991.

Foner, Eric. A Short History Of Reconstruction. New York, Harper & Row, 1990.

Foreman, Grant. Sequoyah. Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1938.

Green, Norma Kidd. Iron Eye's Family: The Children of Joseph La Flesche. Lincoln, Nebraska, Johnson Publishing, 1969.

Green, Rayna. Women in American Indian Society. New York, Chelsa House, 1992.

Greenway, John. Australia: The Last Frontier. New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1972.

Gridley, Marion E. American Indian Women. New York, Hawthorn Books, 1974.

Hauptman, Laurence M. Between Two Fires: American Indians in the Civil War. New York, The Free Press, 1995.

Hawthorn, H. B. "The Maori: A Study of Acculturation", American Anthropological Association. Vol. 46, No. 2, Part 2., April 1944.

Heinrichs, Alfred. "The Indians and the Canadian Mennonites", Mennonite Life. Vol. 22, No. 1, 1967, pp. 27-28.

Heydt, Bruce. "The Last Days of the Raj", British Heritage. June/July 1997, pp. 10-14.

Howitt, William. Colonization and Christianity: A Popular History of the Treatment of the Natives by the Europeans In All Their Colonies. London, Longman, Orme, Brown, Greene, & Longmans, 1838; Reprint: New York, Negro University Press, 1969.

Hurtado, Albert L. Indian Survival on the California Frontier. New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, 1988.

Hutchison, William R. Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Inglis, K. S. The Australian Colonist: A Exploration of Social History, 1788-1870. Carlton, Melbourne University Press, 1974.

Jonas, Bill & Langton, Marcia, et al. The Little Red, Yellow & Black (and green, and blue and white) Book: A Short Guide to Indigenous Australia. Adelaide, Lane Brothers Printing, 1994.

Kehoe, Alice B. North American Indians: A Comprehensive Account (Second Edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall, 1992.

Kewley, Arthur E. "John Strachan versus Peter Jones", Bulletin of the United Church of Canada. Vol. 16, 1963, pp. 16-28.

Kidwell, Clara Sue. Choctaws and Missionaries in Mississippi, 1818-1918. Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1995.

Kiernan, V. G. The Lords of Human Kind: Black Man, Yellow Man, and White Man in an Age of Empire. Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1969.

Lemkin, Raphel. Axis Rule in Occupied Europe, Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government Proposals for Redress. Washington, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944.

Lewis, Maurice H. "The Anglican Church and Its Mission School Dispute", Alberta Historical Review. Vol. 14, No. 4, 1966, pp. 7-13.

Luri, Nancy Oestreich. "Lady From Boston and the Omaha Indians", American West. Vol 3, No. 4, 1966, pp. 31-33, 80-85.

Matthiessen, Peter. In the Spirit of Crazy Horse. New York, Penguin Books, 1992.

McGuire, Edna. The Maoris of New Zealand. New York, MacMillan, 1968.

McHugh, Tom. The Time of the Buffalo. New York, Alfred A. Knoff, 1972.

McLoughlin, William G. Cherokee Renascence in the New Republic. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1986.

----- Cherokees and Missionaries, 1789-1839. New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, 1984.

McLuhan, T. C. (ed.). Touch the Earth: A Self Portrait of Indian Existence. New York, Promontory Press, 1971.

McNickle, D'Arcy. "Indian and European: Indian-White Relations from Discovery to 1887", The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Vol. 311, May 1957, pp. 1-11.

Meyer, Roy W. "The Canadian Sioux Refugees from Minnesota", Minnesota History. Vol. 41, No. 1, 1968, pp. 12-28.

Milner, Clyde A., II, and et al. (eds.). The Oxford History of the American West. New York, Oxford University Press, 1994.

Montgomery, Malcolm. "The Six Nations and the MacDonald Franchise", Ontario History. Vol. 57, No. 1, 1965, pp. 13-18.

Moore, James T. Indian and Jesuit: A Seventeenth Century Encounter. Chicago, Loyola University Press, 1982.

Morel, Mary Kay. "Captain Pratt's School", American History. May/June 1997, pp. 26-32, 62-64.

Morris, Edmund. The Rise of Theodore Roosevelt. New York, Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc., 1979.

Morrison, Dorothy Nafus. Chief Sarah: Sarah Winnemucca's Fight For Indian Rights. Portland, Oregon Historical Society Press, 1990.

Nabokov, Peter. Native American Testimony: A Chronicle of Indian-White Relations From Prophecy to the Present, 1492-1992. New York, Penguin Books, 1992.

New Zealand Government, The Treaty of Waitangi: The symbol of our life together as a nation. 1989(?).

Norman, Geoffery. "The Cherokee: Two Nations, One People", National Geographic. Vol. 187, No. 5, May 1995, pp. 72-97.

Officer, James. Indians in School: A Study of the Development of Educational Facilities for Arizona Indians. Tucson, University of Arizona, 1956.

Oliver, W. H. & Williams, B. R. (eds.). The Oxford History of New Zealand. Wellington, Oxford University Press, 1981.

Patterson, E. Palmer, II. "Arthur E. O'Meara, Friend of the Indians", Pacific Northwest Quarterly. April 1967.

Perdue, Theda, Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society, 1540-1866. Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1979.

Povey, John F. "American Education and French Assimilation: A Comparison", Midwest Quarterly. Vol. 1, No. 3, Spring 1970, pp. 265-279.

Priest, Loring Benson, Uncle Sam's Stepchildren: The Reformation of United States Indian Policy, 1865-1887. New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press, 1942.

Prucha, Francis Paul, A Bibliographical Guide to the History of Indian White Relations in the United States. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1977.

----- American Indian Policy in Crisis: Christian Reformers and The American Indian, 1865-1900. Norman, Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1976.

----- (ed.). Americanizing the American Indians : Writings by the Friends of the Indian", 1880-1900. Cambridge, Harvard University, 1973.

----- "Andrew Jackson's Indian Policy: A Reassessment", Journal of American History. Vol. 56, No. 3, 1969, pp. 527-539.

----- The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians (Abridged Edition). Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1986.

----- (ed.). The Indian in American History. New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

----- The Indians in American Society: From the Revolution to the Present. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1985.

Remini, Robert V. Andrew Jackson. New York, Perennial Library, 1969.

Schulte, Marie Louise. "Catholic Press Reaction to the Custer Disaster", Mid America, Vol. 37, No. 4, 1955, pp. 205-214.

Seiberling, Daniel Gideon. Genocide also known as FEDERAL INDIAN POLICY. [ONLINE] http://mercury.sfsu.edu/~cypher/genocide.html#children December 1996.

Sheehan, Bernard W. Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1973.

Sherman, Josepha. Indian Tribes in North America. New York, Crescent Books, 1996.

Slosser, Gavis Jackson. "Walter Lowrie, Mission Organizer", Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society. Vol. 36, No. 1, 1958, pp. 3-18.

Smith, Jane R. "Triumph and Tragedy", American History. May/June 1997, pp. 34-38, 52-53, 57.

Sohl, Louis B. and Buergenthal, Thomas. International Protection of Human Rights. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1973.

Staurt, George E. "Etowah: A Southeast Village in 1491", National Geographic. Vol. 180, No. 4, October 1991, pp. 54-67.

Strong, William Ellsworth. Story of the American Board. New York, Arno Press & The New York Times, 1969.

Thom, Dark Rain. Kohkumthena's Grandchildren, The Shawnee. Indianapolis, Guild Press of Indiana, 1994.

Thompson, H. P. The History of the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701-1950. London, S.P.C.K., 1951.

Thompson, Hildegard. "Education Among American Indians", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Vol. 311, May 1957, pp. 95-115.

Tinker, George E. Missionary Conquest: The Gospel and the Native American Cultural Genocide. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1993.

Torbert, Robert G. A History of the Baptist (Third edition). Valley Forge, PA, Judson Press, 1975.

Trennert, Robert A., Jr. Alternative to Extinction: Federal Indian Policy and the Beginnings of the Reservation System, 1846-51. Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1975.

United Nations. "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 1948", Brownlie, Ian (ed.). Basic Documents on Human Rights (Third Edition). Oxford, Claredon Press, 1992.

Wardell, Morris L. A Political History of the Cherokee Nation, 1838-1907. Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1938.

Winik, Lyric Wallwork. "Nez Perce", Parade. June 15, 1997. pp. 4-6.

Woodward, David R. Trial By Friendship: Anglo-American Relations, 1917 1918. Lexington, University Press of Kentucky, 1993.

VIDEOS

Borg, Kristen in Association with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Dakota Exile. Los Angles, Video Finders, 1996.

Lesiak, Christine, and Jones, Matthew. In the White Man's Image. The American Experience Series, Public Broadcasting Service, 1991.

Neuison, Henry, (producer/director). The Cherokee: Ani-yun-wiya (Principle People). Bala Cynwyd, PA, Library Video Co., 1993.

Rasky, Havry in association with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. The War Against the Indians (3 volumes). Quebec, Maday Entertainment, 1992.