6-2017

"CRACKS IN THE MELTING POT": NATIVE AMERICANS, MILITARY SERVICE AND CITIZENSHIP

Brittany A. Kelley
California State University - San Bernardino

“CRACKS IN THE MELTING POT”:

NATIVE AMERICANS, MILITARY SERVICE AND CITIZENSHIP

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

Social Sciences and Globalization

---

by

Brittany Anne Kelley

June 2017

“CRACKS IN THE MELTING POT”:

NATIVE AMERICANS, MILITARY SERVICE AND CITIZENSHIP

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

Brittany Anne Kelley

June 2017

Approved by:

Ryan W. Keating, Committee Chair, History

James Fenelon, Committee Member

Cherstin M. Lyon, Committee Member

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on Native American military service in Euro-American Wars. It analyzes their reasons for fighting and compares those reasons to the reasons of other racial and ethnic groups. This paper explores how certain racial and ethnic groups are marginalized and “otherized” and how they occasionally attempt to assimilate into mainstream society through military service. Irish Americans and African Americans viewed the Civil War in this way, while Native Americans hoped they would be able to improve their individual situations. Native Americans fought for purposes of assimilation and citizenship in World War I, and while they were technically granted citizenship their conditions did not improve. Neither military service or various government policies have allowed Native Americans to fully integrate into mainstream society. Today they still suffer because they are seen as “others” and stereotypes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to my family, whose constant love and support has allowed me to do this.

Thanks to Dr. Gregory Elder, Dr. Larisa Broyles, Dr. Bonavita Qunito-Maccallum and Professor Ann Pfeifle at Moreno Valley College for inspiring me, listening, and helping me in so many ways.

Thanks to Dr. Cherstin Lyon for signing my acceptance letter, for listening, and for answering my many questions.

Thanks to Dr. Ryan Keating for being the most amazing teacher and advisor possible, for never giving up on me and making me wish I was a better student.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT vi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vii

INTRODUCTION 1

The Melting Pot 1

Methodology 24

CHAPTER ONE: BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR 25

Jamestown and Bacon's Rebellion 25

The Pequot War and King Phillip's War 29

French and Indian War 35

The American Revolution 38

The War of 1812 40

Removals 44

Conclusion 59

CHAPTER TWO: THE CIVIL WAR 61

The Cherokee 62

The Creek 68

The Iroquois of New York 69

The Oneida of Wisconsin 72

The Delaware 74

Home Guards 75

The Pamunkey and the Lumbee 77

Eastern Cherokee 78

The Catawba 79

The Ottawa and Ojibwa 81

The Pequot 82

Other 83

The West 85

Conclusion 90

CHAPTER THREE: AFTER THE CIVIL WAR 91

The Dawes Act, Boarding Schools, Question of Citizenship 95

World War I and Citizenship 100

CONCLUSION 115

BIBLIOGRAPHY 122

INTRODUCTION

The Melting Pot

The United States has often been referred to as “a melting pot,” a term that suggests that although men and women from around the world come to America as members of different groups, after time they assimilate, melting together to become Americans. This notion was first espoused as early as 1782 when J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur wrote, “What then is the American, this new man? He is either an European, or the descendant of an European. . .Here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men.”[1]

This early description of an “American” presents a problem for historians. De Crèvecoeur very clearly states that “an American” is European, or the descendent of a European. This is problematic because not all Americans are descendants of Europeans. What about the people who had been living in America before the Europeans arrived? What about the people who had arrived from Africa? These men and women all complicate the issue. In an apparent answer to the question of who is an American, the United States passed the Naturalization Act of 1790, restricting naturalization to “free white persons.” In 1870 a new Naturalization Act “extended citizenship to aliens of African nativity

[1] J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, accessed February 20, 2017, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/letter_03.asp.

or descent."[2] Other groups, such as Asians and Native Americans would have to wait for future laws to determine whether they were eligible for citizenship.

Regardless of J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur's statement that Americans, "are a mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, Germans, and Swedes"[3] and of the subsequent whiteness qualification for citizenship, these groups did not blend together so easily. "Whiteness" meant more than just the color of one's skin. As historian Matthew Frye Jacobson argues, "both in the nineteenth-century science and in popular understanding the white community itself comprised many sharply distinguishable races. The categories "Celt," "Slav," "Hebrew," and "Anglo-Saxon" represented an order of difference deeper than any current notions of "ethnicity." He further notes that, "The term 'race' was highly unstable and was applied with a staggering imprecision. It could connote a social difference whose basis was biological, historical, political, psychological, linguistic, or some combination of these, depending upon the speaker and upon the moment."[4] Sociologist James M. Henslin argues, furthermore, that race is a reality when one takes into account distinctive inherited biological characteristics,

---

[2] Karen L. Ishizuka, *Serve the People: Making Asian America in the Long Sixties*, (New York: Verso, 2016), 17.

[3] J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer*, accessed February 20, 2017. http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/letter_03.asp.

[4] Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Special Sorrows: The Diasporic Imagination, of Irish, Polish, and Jewish Immigrants in the United States*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995), 185-186.

however there is no agreement regarding what constitutes a particular race or even how many races there are.[5]

Following in this vein Jacobson argues that, “races are invented categories- designations coined for the sake of grouping and separating peoples along lines of presumed difference- Caucasians are made and not born.”[6] Jacobson points out that “as early as the eighteenth century there were some who saw whiteness not as monolithic but as variegated,” and cites Benjamin Franklin who, in 1751 wondered, “why should Pennsylvania, founded by the English, become a colony of aliens, who will shortly be so numerous as to Germanize us instead of our Anglifying them?,”[7] as proof of this.

A person was not considered “white” only because of their skin color. There were a number of other factors associated with the definition of “white” and the term became interchangeable with “Anglo-Saxon” with the arrival of a large number of Irish Catholics.[8] The forced immigration of men and women fleeing the potato famine brought to light, for some “Native Americans” that some white people were “undesirable”, and as Jacobson notes, “the period of mass European immigration, from the 1840s to the restrictive legislation of 1924,

---

[5] James M. Henslin*, Essentials of Sociology: A Down-to-Earth Approach,* 8th ed., (Pearson, 2009), 226-227.

[6] Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 2-4.

[7] Ibid., 40.

[8] Ibid., 41.

witnessed a fracturing of whiteness into a hierarchy of plural and scientifically determined white races."[9] The Irish were considered "undesirable" for several reasons "which are ordinarily grouped under the heading of nativism."[10] White Anglo-Saxon Protestants looked down on the Irish because of the work they did. Part of the reason they were not considered white was because they did not do what was considered "white man's work," which was "work from which Afro-Americans were excluded."[11] Political reasons also contributed to the Protestant majority's opposition of the Irish, as the majority of the Irish voted Democrat and tied to their support for the Democratic party was their support of slavery, which "came increasingly to vex those who sought to end its sway over the Union." This was a moral issue, as was the issue of temperance, which many Irish did not support.[12]

In Chicago, for example, the nativist press described the Irish as "coarse, loud, hard-drinking, and clannish, smelling of whiskey and boiled cabbage." By comparison, they noted the Scandinavians, "were portrayed in the local press as a model ethnic group, people who kept their homes and places of business spotlessly clean and who were eager to embrace American ways." The biggest

---

[9] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 3-4.

[10] Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*, (New York: Routledge, 1995),148-149.

[11] Ibid., 112.

[12] Ibid., 148-149.

problem for the Anglo Protestant majority, however, was the belief that Catholicism posed a "threat to the Protestant republic. A person could not be a papist and a true American. . . for a Catholic's true allegiance was to church rather than country."[13]

In response to the arrival of some 2 million immigrants between 1845 and 1854, the nativist American Party, commonly known as the Know Nothings, "burst upon the political scene."[14] The Know Nothings "regularly condemned 'rum, Romanism, and slavery' as the three evils cursing the nation."[15] They believed that Protestantism defined American society because it encouraged individualism and allowed free interpretation of the Bible. The Know Nothings wanted immigration modified so as to inhibit the entry of paupers and criminals, and the implementation of "legal limitations on both the extension of slavery and liquor consumption." They proposed new immigrants wait twenty-one years before getting the right to vote and they "urged voters to select only native born citizens for office and to elect only those who would not appoint immigrants to patronage positions" because "only those born and raised in America understood the complexities of operating a republican government."[16]

---

[13] Donald L. Miller, *City of the Century: The Epic of Chicago and the Making of America*, (New York, NY: Touchstone, 1997), 441-442.

[14] Tyler Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery: The Northern Know Nothings and the Politics of the 1850s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 3.

[15] Ibid., 106.

[16] Ibid.

Moments arise though, in which minority groups find themselves with access to opportunities to prove their dedication to their adopted nation by military service. According to Warren Young in *Minorities and the Military*, "in the case of war. . .the politicization process with regard to minority-military service can take the theme of "quid pro quo," that is, full support of the war effort on the part of the minority and its leadership in return for full citizenship rights or other benefits for minority-group members." Minority military service can also "take the theme of 'fighting on two fronts,' that is, fighting for freedom and justice abroad or in defense of the country and, at the same time, fighting for the attainment of full citizenship rights perceived by that group being denied the minority at home."[17]

Historian Christian Samito argues that Irish Americans viewed the Civil War as an opportunity to receive inclusion and equal treatment in American society.[18] He cites the 1863 letters of Peter Welsh which address the themes of "equal citizenship, American identity and inclusion based on military service. Welsh believed it was 'the duty of all Americans, whether native born or not, to support the Union because of the responsibilities that accrued with citizenship, as well as a moral obligation to help maintain for future generations the best

---

[17] Warren L. Young, *Minorities and the Military: A Cross-National Study in World Perspective*, (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1982), 255.

[18] Christian G. Samito, *Becoming American under Fire: Irish Americans, African Americans, and the Politics of Citizenship during the Civil War Era,* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2009), 103.

government ever known.'"[19] Sharing this line of thought, historian William Burton argues, "Ethnics fought, not to free the slaves, but to free themselves from prejudice."[20]

Samito also quotes the famous and influential African American abolitionist and orator Frederick Douglass, who encouraged African Americans to fight in the Civil War, stating that "the speediest, and best possible way open to us to manhood, equal rights and elevation, is that we enter this service."[21] In another speech Douglass declared, "The chance is now given you to end in a day the bondage of centuries, and to rise in one bound from social degradation to the plane of common equality with all other varieties of men."[22] Along with hopes of winning "emancipation and enfranchisement" there was a belief that military service on the part of "blacks of all classes and regions" would be viewed "as a badge of their manhood, countering racist conceptions of them as children or as little different from animals."[23] It was said that when you "put a United States uniform on his back…the *chattel* is a *man*."[24]

---

[19] Samito, *Becoming American under Fire*, 32-34.

[20] William L. Burton, *Melting Pot Soldiers: The Union's Ethnic Regiments*, (Fordham University Press, 1998), 69.

[21] Samito, *Becoming American under Fire,* 41.

[22] Eric Foner, ed., *Voices of Freedom: A Documentary History*, *Volume 1*, 3rd ed., (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2011), 282-3.

[23] Samito, *Becoming American under Fire*, 52.

[24] Ibid., 47.

Whatever the melting processes involved, over time many European immigrant groups ceased to be hyphenated ethnic groups and became American, while other groups did not. According to Mae M. Ngai though, "Unlike Euro-Americans, whose ethnic and racial identities became uncoupled during the 1920s, Asians' and Mexicans' ethnic and racial identities remained conjoined. The legal racialization of these ethnic groups' national origin cast them as permanently foreign and unassimilable to the nation."[25]

This could also be said of Native Americans, who according to historian Francis Parkman, are "hewn out of rock. . . Races of inferior energy have possessed a powerful expansion and assimilation to which he is a stranger; and it is this fixed and rigid quality which has proved his ruin. He will not learn the arts of civilization, and he and his forest must perish together."[26] This embodies the belief among white Americans that Native Americans were incapable of assimilation and would eventually die out as a result.

Not only were Native Americans viewed as unassimilable, they were victims of "Orientalism." According to historian Gary Y. Okihiro:

> The literary scholar Edward W. Said declared in his book *Orientalism* that, since antiquity, the Orient has been almost an invention of Europeans. He argued that Orientalism was a style of thought and a whole network of interests used to describe, structure, and dominate its subject. Although those representations constitute an imagined topography, they attain reality through

---

[25] Mae M. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2004), 7-8.

[26] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 215-216.

> institutions, laws, and practices, especially those determining the relationship of the colonizer and the colonized. In Said's view, Orientalists, or intellectuals engaged in the discourse of Orientalism, maintain that Orientals are incapable of representing themselves, and Europeans must represent them.[27]

Okihiro continues, "such was the power of Orientalism that Europeans who reached America, beginning with Christopher Columbus, projected what they had heard or read about Asia onto America and it's 'Indians.'"[28] The concept of Orientalism was applied to Native Americans when Judge John Marshall ruled that tribes were "domestic dependent nations" that were "in a state of pupilage" and that relationship "to the United States resembles that of a ward to his guardian."[29] Native Americans were considered aliens in their native country, unable to do anything about its laws but subjected to them, and placed under the charge of a Euro-American Indian agent.

While Native Americans fought in every war in which Euro-Americans fought, their involvement is more complicated than that of other groups. Native Americans cannot be lumped together. Each Native Nation or tribe had reasons specific to them for fighting or not fighting. In some cases, Native Americans fought against European conquest, in other cases they fought with the

---

[27] Gary Y. Okihiro, *American History Unbound: Asians and Pacific Islanders,* (University of California Press, 2015), 16-18.

[28] Ibid., 18.

[29] Case Text Inc. The Cherokee Nation V. The State of Georgia, accessed February 20, 2017. https://casetext.com/case/the-cherokee-nation-v-the-state-of-georgia.

Europeans. Their reasons for allying with Euro-Americans are complicated as well. Some fought to maintain the status quo, some fought in hopes of improving their circumstances, some fought to maintain their independence and sovereignty, some fought for inclusion in American society, and some fought for a type of dual citizenship in which they could still have their Native identity and the rights of mainstream Americans.

During the Civil War at least twenty thousand Native Americans fought for either the North or the South. Most historians have focused on the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole and their part in battles around Indian Territory. The focus of much historical discussion has been on Confederate general Stand Watie and Union general Ely S. Parker. Aside from these tribes and individuals, there were: forty-nine Oneida who served in the 14th Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, a large contingent of Ottawa troops who made up the 1st Michigan Sharpshooters, Ojibwa Indians who served in the 9th Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, Penobscot Indians from Maine who served in the Union army and navy, Catawbas who served in the 12th South Carolina Infantry, Iroquois who served in Company D of the 132nd New York State Volunteer Infantry, and others.[30]

While some Native Americans were fighting with whites, others fought against them as the Federal government violated treaties and white settlers

---

[30] Laurence M. Hauptman, ed., *A Seneca Indian in the Union Army: The Civil War Letters of Sergeant Isaac Newton Parker, 1861-1865* (Shippensburg, PA: Burd Street Press, 1995), 19-22.

moved west, into the Indian territories. Although many Indian Nations had been continual allies of the U.S., mainstream society continued to view Native Americans as "the other." Native Americans were not viewed as equal to whites and they were not treated equally. Native American tribes were often grouped together, viewed as an obstacle, as standing in the way of progress and enemies of civilization.[31] Because of this tendency even groups that aided Americans were forgotten. This encapsulates the age-old notion of American exceptionalism and the desire to create the "other", and the notion of Manifest Destiny. These ideas justified the abuse of Native Americans. Later portrayals of Native Americans in movies of the mid-to-late Twentieth century excuse these injustices by showing the Native Americans as barbaric and uncivilized, attacking and killing innocent white settlers for no reason, as obstacles standing in the way of progress and civilization.[32]

Following the Civil War and the promise that the nation would have a "new birth of freedom," new laws acknowledged African Americans as U.S. citizens, but Native Americans were not included. Anglo Americans continued to debate whether Native Americans should be granted citizenship, and under what circumstances citizenship should be granted. While serving on a Peace

---

[31] Mike Wallace, *Mickey Mouse History and Other Essays on American Memory*, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996), 138.

[32] The documentary *Reel Injun* (2009) covers this, and addresses Native American stereotypes and misconceptions perpetuated by movies.

Commission negotiating with the Cheyenne and some other southern Plains tribes, for example, General William T. Sherman wrote that he did not "expect to make of Indians good citizens", and that he had "no hope of civilizing the Plains Indians."[33]

Native Americans faced tremendous struggles assimilating because white people continued to view them as savages and because they were not white. Part of the melting process for the various white "races" was to place themselves above other races. As J. William Harris argues in his book *Plain Folk and Gentry in a Slave Society*, to prevent poor whites and African Americans from realizing they might benefit from joining together measures were taken to make the poor whites glad that slavery existed and that they were not part of the slave class. Racism was an important part of the republican liberty argument. Race based slavery was justified by arguments that it was "in nature's laws and God's degrees, that subordination is the normal condition of the negro."[34]

Arguments like these were also used to get non-slave holding whites to support the institution of slavery. Having a class system with black slaves on the bottom served to increase a feeling of equality among whites, "It matters not that he is no slaveholder; he is not of the inferior race; he is a freeborn citizen; he

---

[33] Martha A. Sandweiss, "Still Picture, Moving Stories: Reconstruction Comes to Indian Country", in *Civil War Wests: Testing the Limits of the United States* edited by Adam Arenson and Andrew R. Graybill, (Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2015), 158-166.

[34] J. William Harris, *Plain Folk and Gentry in a Slave Society: White Liberty and Black Slavery in Augusta's Hinterlands,* (Louisiana: Wesleyan University Press, 1985), 15.

engages in no menial occupation…The poorest white meets the richest as an equal; sits at his table with him; salutes him as a neighbor; meets him in every public assembly, and stands on the same social platform."[35] Sharing this line of thought, Noel Ignatiev argues that "the assimilation of the Irish into the white race made it possible to maintain slavery. The need to gain the loyalty of the Irish explains why the Democratic Party, on the whole, rejected nativism. It also explains why not merely slavery but the color line became so important to it."[36]

David Roediger concurs, arguing that Irish-Americans "treasured their whiteness as entitling them to both political rights and to jobs. They solidly voted for proslavery Democrats and opposed abolition." To distance themselves from African Americans (to whom they were often compared in negative ways) Irish attacked African Americans "on and off the job." Irish dockworkers in New York also attempted "to classify Germans as of a different color' as they attempted "to expel German longshoremen from jobs under the banner of campaigning for an 'all-white waterfront'-perhaps the most interesting and vivid example of the social construction of race." Later, the Irish would be leaders in the anti-Chinese movement in California.[37]

---

[35] Harris, *Plain Folk and Gentry in a Slave Society,* 65-6.

[36] Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*, 69.

[37] David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*, (London: Verso, 2007), 133-148.

During the 1870s strong anti-Chinese attitudes intensified in the United States, and in the West in particular, which stemmed from the fact that whites viewed Chinese immigrants as a group they could not compete with in the labor market, because the Chinese would accept less pay for the same jobs. White laborers believed they were entitled to these jobs because of their whiteness. Claims were made that "there is not sufficient brain capacity in the Chinese to furnish the motive power for self-government," and that, "upon the point of morals, there is no Aryan or European race which is not far superior to the Chinese as a class." In California an organization calling itself The Order of Caucasians for the Extermination of the Chinaman appeared in April of 1877. This organization's "aim was to 'drive the Chinaman out of California' by a regime of harassment" which "included the policy to 'pursue and injure'" Chinese immigrants. "Members pledged to oppose the Chinese 'to annihilation by every manner and means within the thin gauze of the law.'"[38] Along with being viewed as unintelligent and immoral, Chinese immigrants were characterized as uncivilized and pagan.[39]

Continuing this attacking of the "other", Irish nationalist John Finerty wrote in his 1890 memoir of the Indian wars, *Warpath and Bivouac*, "The Sioux must be descendants of Cain, and are veritable children of the devil. The rest are a very

---

[38] Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues*: *The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*, (New York: Hill and Wang, 2000, 76-78.

[39] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 73.

little behind them, except in point of personal appearance and daring, in which the Sioux excel nearly all other Indians. Most of them are greedy, greasy, gassy, lazy, and knavish."[40] In California "whites stereotyped the Indians as 'ignorant, bestial savages who deserved no rights' and lobbied for total removal of the Indians from the state borders in order to do away with the "Indian menace."[41] While the Chinese were viewed as potential labor competition, white people viewed Native Americans as obstacles to migration to, and economic expansion of, California. Acts of cruelty towards, and the passage of exclusionary laws against, the Chinese were believed to be justified because the Chinese were viewed as alien and unassimilable, and acts of cruelty towards, and the genocide of, Native Americans were excused because they too were perceived as alien and unassimilable.

Theodore Roosevelt wrote in *Winning of the West* (1889-96) that it did not matter whether the U.S. won lands from Indians as the result of a treaty or war, "so long as the land was won."[42] This is most apparent in the final battle in the "winning of the West," the Battle of Wounded Knee in 1890. In actuality this name is a misnomer, as it was really a massacre.[43] The Lakotas, unhappy with the

---

[40] Matthew Frye Jacobsen, *Special Sorrows: The Diasporic Imagination, of Irish, Polish, and Jewish Immigrants in the United States*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995), 184-185.

[41] Lawrence M. Hauptman, *Between Two Fires: American Indians in the Civil War*. (New York: Free Press, 1996), 6-8.

[42] Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color*, 218.

harsh conditions of their reservations, began embracing a new religious movement known as “the Ghost Dance.” They believed that this religious response would result “in the disappearance of whites and the return of the buffalo.”[44] Indian agents interpreted the dancing as a means of preparing for war and the army was called in. Following a failed attempt “to disarm the Indians, the soldiers opened fire on the encampment and massacred between two and three hundred men, women, and children. Many wounded Indians left to die on the site of the massacre succumbed to subzero temperatures as a blizzard hit the Plains.”[45]

After “winning of the West” the U.S. extended its influence abroad, justifying this through the notion of Manifest Destiny, to encompass the Western hemisphere, and the decade poignantly “ended with U.S. hegemony in Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines.”[46] The similarities between the wars America fought on its Western frontier and the one it fought in the Philippines were not lost on Americans at the time, as Secretary of State Hay noted, “America’s Far West became the Far East.”

> Many of the same troops who had fought against the Sioux and chased and captured the Apache chief Geronimo in the U.S. West marched against Filipinos. Major General Adna Romanza Chafee,

---

[43] Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues*, 6-7.

[44] Colin Calloway, *First Peoples: A Documentary Survey of American Indian History, 4th edition*, (New York: Bedford/St. Martins, 2012), 356-357.

[45] Ibid., 356-357.

[46] Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues*, 6-7.

> who led the 1901 invasion of the Philippines, had spent decades fighting against the Kiowas, Comanches, Cheyennes, and Apaches. A contemporary said of Chafee that he "brought the Indian wars with him to the Philippines and wanted to treat the recalcitrant Filipinos the way he had the Apaches in Arizona-by herding them onto reservations."[47]

Keeping with his attitudes regarding Native lands, Roosevelt "identified the world's unindustrialized regions as 'waste spaces,' and he had scoffed at the notion that 'these continents should be reserved for the use of scattered savage tribes, whose life was but a few degrees less meaningless, squalid, and ferocious than that of the wild beasts with whom they held joint ownership.'[48]

Echoing Kudyard Kipling's poem "The White Man's Burden" (1899) which claimed it was the white man's moral obligation to lift "childlike" non-white peoples out of ignorance and darkness, Senator Albert Beveridge announced in 1900:

> The Philippines are ours forever. . .And just beyond the Philippines are China's illimitable markets. We will not retreat from either. We will not repudiate our duty in the Orient. We will not renounce our part in the mission of our race, trustees under God, of the civilization of the world. And we will move forward to our work, not howling out regrets like slaves whipped to their burdens, but with gratitude for a task worthy of our strength, and thanksgiving to Almighty God that He has marked us as His chosen people, henceforth to lead in the regeneration of the world.[49]

---

[47] Okihiro, *American History Unbound*, 97.

[48] Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues*, 3.

[49] Ibid., 226.

The fact that the people they were dealing with were not white was not lost on Philippine commissioner William Howard Taft, who calculated in 1900 "that 90 percent of the Philippine population was 'in a hopeless condition of ignorance, and utterly unable intelligently to wield political control.'" He figured, "'Our little brown brothers'...would need 'fifty or one hundred years' of close supervision 'to develop anything resembling Anglo-Saxon political principles and skills.'"[50] These same attitudes regarding Native Americans resulted in the General Allotment Act in 1887 and federal legislation requiring Native American children be educated at boarding schools off their reservations.

The Philippine-American War officially lasted from 1898 to 1902 (part of the Spanish-American War), and "required approximately two hundred thousand U.S. soldiers and resulted in over 4,300 American deaths. Tens of thousands of Filipinos perished; some figures put the number of deaths as high as nearly a million, including those who died of disease and starvation as a result of the fighting."[51] While the leader of the Filipino Republican Army, Emilio Aguinaldo, was captured in March 1901 "fighting continued, especially in the southern, Muslim islands."

> The Muslim peoples of the island of Mindanao were especially effective in resisting conquest by both the Spaniards and Americans, and the U.S. Army framed its campaign against them as a war between Christianity and Islam. In March 1906, the army trapped some one thousand Taosug Muslims in Bud Dajo, an

---

[50] Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues*, 227.

[51] Okihiro, *American History Unbound*, 99.

> extinct volcano, on Jolo Island. For four days troops shot, bayoneted, and threw grenades at the men, women, and children, killing them all. A week after the massacre, President Theodore Roosevelt sent a telegram to the U.S. commander, Major General Leonard Wood, to congratulate him and his men "upon the brave feat of arms wherein you and they so well upheld the honor of the American flag."[52]

Correlations do not exist only between Wounded Knee and Bud Dajo, but are seen in other "battles" between whites and Native Americans as well, such as the Sand Creek Massacre. On November 29, 1864 (while Native Americans were fighting for the Union in the Civil War) Colonel John Chivington lead a massacre against Arapaho and Cheyenne in Union-ruled Colorado. While the massacre at Sand Creek was unprovoked, and the majority of victims had been women and children, Chivington believed that it "had been a noble and necessary part of winning the West" and "wanted the episode written into the national narrative as a glorious battle." [53] The extreme violence shown towards women and children who were not white in these massacres is further proof that these indigenous peoples were not viewed as equal to whites and deserving of equal rights, but as obstacles to dispose of.

When African American historian, sociologist, and Civil Rights activist W.E.B. Du Bois proclaimed in 1903, "'the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color line,'" he knew that the color line was global."[54] For the sake

---

[52] Okihiro, *American History Unbound*, 99.

[53] Ari Kelman, *A Misplaced Massacre,* (Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 9-23.

of this paper it was not simply Black and White. As Young emphasizes, “The effort of the United States to put down the Philippine insurrection that followed about a year after the American conquest was, however, opposed by many Negroes, who saw it as an independence movement paralleling their own struggle for equal rights.”[55] Sharing this sentiment, Lewis H. Douglass, the son of Frederick Douglass, stated, “It is a sorry, though true, fact that whatever this government controls, injustice to dark races prevails. The people of Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii and Manila know it well as do the wronged Indian and outraged black man in the United States.” Douglass concludes, “It is hypocrisy of the most sickening kind to try to make us believe that the killing of Filipinos is for the purpose of good government and to give protection to life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness…Now its expansion means extension of race hate and cruelty.”[56]

The extension of race hatred and cruelty outside of the U.S. indicates a vicious circle, one in which race hatred at home justifies it abroad which justifies it at home. The fact that African Americans saw similarities between Native Americans and Filipinos in this context means white Americans likely did as well,

---

[54] Ishizuka, *Serve the People*, 42.

[55] Young, *Minorities and the Military*, 200.

[56] Lewis H. Douglass, “Lewis H. Douglass on Black Opposition to Mckinley (November 17, 1899),” in *Voices of a People’s History of the United States,* ed. by Howard Zinn and Anthony Arnove, (New York, NY: Seven Stories Press. 2009), 243.

and used these similarities to justify their treatment of Native Americans, and not include them in mainstream society but continue to subject them to repressive laws because they were not viewed as ready for participation in society.

Jacobson points out that most Americans were not only ignorant of the brutality of the Philippine-American War, they are ignorant that such a war ever happened. Leaving the Philippine-American War out of the mainstream historical narrative is problematic because it then, "becomes easy to suppose a radical historical disjuncture separating the Plains wars of the mid-nineteenth century and the Southeast Asian wars of the mid-twentieth: that U.S. soldiers referred to areas within Vietnam as "Indian Country" becomes a matter of simple metaphor, not of deeper ideology."[57]

Not only were Native Americans the victims of genocide and cultural genocide in wars for dominance of the North American continent because they were viewed as the racialized other, they were also used as models for how to treat other non-white indigenous peoples in imperialistic wars for global dominance. As with other groups who slipped through the cracks of the melting pot, they continue to fight for their civil rights and today a majority still live as though they are a vanquished people. Their sacrifices in American wars, in most cases considered the strongest demonstration of nationalism and patriotism, are often left out of the mainstream historical narrative. This puts the focus on the

---

[57] Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues*, 263-4.

abuses they have suffered, and stereotypes them as victims in continuous need of assistance instead of as individuals who have been active in their own attempts to improve their circumstances, and continue to want the means and ability to do so.

Ethnicity and race are not irrelevant to modern nationalism "since visible differences in physique are too obvious to be overlooked and have too often been used to mark or reinforce distinctions between 'us' and 'them,' including national ones."[58] Imagined communities still exist, appearing to separate Native Americans from mainstream society. Tribal membership and territory is limited and tribes are sovereign.[59] While over 200 tribes own casinos, many of which generate hundreds of thousands of dollars for tribal members, as a whole Native Americans have the highest suicide rate and lowest life expectancy of any racial-ethnic group in the U.S. and only 14 percent graduate college.[60]

Pine Ridge Reservation, the site of the Wounded Knee massacre, was made up of the poorest counties in the U.S between 1980 to 2000. It was ranked the third poorest county in 2000 only because conditions worsened on two other South Dakota Indian Reservations. The statistics for 2007 show that Pine Ridge Reservation has: an unemployment rate of 80% to 90%, 8 times the U.S. rate of

---

[58] E. J. Hobsbawn, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality,* (Cambridge University Press, 1990), 65.

[59] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, (London: Verso, 2006), 7.

[60] Henslin*, Essentials of Sociology: A Down-to-Earth Approach,* 253-254.

diabetes, 5 times the U.S. rate of cervical cancer, twice the rate of heart disease, 8 times the U.S. rate of Tuberculosis, an alcoholism rate estimated as high as 80%, a suicide rate more than twice the national rate, a teen suicide rate 4 times the national rate, infant mortality three times the national rate, and the lowest life expectancy in the U.S.[61] Looking at such an extreme disparity one sees that when it comes to some Native Americans the lines separating "us" from "them" may be imaginary, but the consequences are not.

The conditions of Pine Ridge Reservation are not too dissimilar from those of a shanty town called Bridgeport, where the Irish settled in Chicago during the 1800s. There "the Irish faced. . . a desperate struggle for survival, living in vermin-infested shacks. . . Bridgeport became a name synonymous with cholera, alcoholism, and violence, and its tenants- many of them forced to forage for food in the city's garbage holes."[62] The Irish are no longer associated with living in such conditions today because they are no longer seen as alien and different by mainstream society. Native Americans however, are still marginalized despite their involvement and sacrifices in Euro-American wars because, unlike the Irish, they are not and cannot become white.

---

[61] Re-member. Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, accessed February 20, 2017, http://www.re-member.org/pine-ridge-reservation.aspx.

[62] Miller, *City of the Century: The Epic of Chicago and the Making of America*, 441-442.

Methodology

This paper uses secondary sources and primary sources regarding Native American military service. The primary sources come from newspapers, as well as published letters and memoirs. This paper also uses the methodology of Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* and Edward Said's *Orientalism*. Anderson's *Imagined Communities* argues that nations are imaginary because they are social constructions which exist only because people believe they do. Nations are imagined by the people who perceive themselves to be a part of the nation. In this vein, this paper shows how Native Americans have not been seen as part of the nation. Anderson also argues that newspapers played a role in the creation of the nation because they use a common vernacular which connects the people of that nation to each other and separates them from "others". Said's *Orientalism* is used to show how Native Americans have been subjected to injustices because of the way Anglo Americans have viewed them as "others" and the extent to which this is still a problem.

This paper also uses Warren Young's *Minorities and the Military*, William Burton's *Melting Pot Soldiers*, and Christian Samito's *Becoming American under Fire*, to show how minorities who have been excluded from rights of citizenship will sometimes fight in a war in return for the rights of citizenship, and it uses the works of Colin Calloway, Lawrence M. Hauptman, Susan Applegate Krouse, and Thomas A. Britten to determine the extent to which Native Americans have done this.

CHAPTER ONE

BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR

Jamestown and Bacon's Rebellion

While John Cabot, an Italian sailing for King Henry VII of England, explored the coasts of Maine and Nova Scotia in 1497 and 1498, it was not until 1607 that the first permanent English settlement was founded at Jamestown, Virginia. Most of the settlers at Jamestown were not farmers, but men who had traveled to the New World in search of wealth and adventure. As a result of their lack of farming experience half of them died in the first year. Before the English could establish a starting point they had to establish relations with the some of the local Native Americans. Initial relations were uneasy at first as neither group fully understood the culture of the other, and relations became even more complicated as the English colonists and the Native Americans became competitors for the best farming lands in the Potomac Valley, and the resources of the Potomac River. The results of this competition would be "catastrophic for the Native Americans."[63]

The most dominant of the Native American groups in the area was the Powhatan chiefdom, which was made up of approximately thirty tribes extended across most of eastern Virginia. Powhatan did not appear to view the English

---

[63] Calloway, *First Peoples*,102-104.

settlers as a threat, being few in number (at first), and obviously unable to survive unassisted in their new environment, the Indians supplied corn to the colonists. Powhatan may have wanted to incorporate the English into his domain, but the English leader, John Smith, was not interested in becoming a secondary leader, and the colonists became demanding. No longer trading for corn they started taking what they wanted.[64] While both the English settlers and the Native Americans had difficulties interacting with each other from the beginning, the English treated the Indians with whom they were in conflict different than they would have treated French or Spanish if they were having a similar conflict with them. For example, the English responded to the assumed theft of a silver cup by burning an Indian village. The English also threw Indian children into water and shot them.[65]

As the English increased in numbers, their settlements along the James River increased, encroaching more and more on Native lands, resulting in “the Virginia massacre.” Four hundred colonists were killed during the Virginia Massacre, which was led by Opechancanough, Powhatan’s brother, in 1622. The massacre did not succeed in ridding the Natives of the colonists however, and

---

[64] Calloway, *First Peoples*,102-104.

[65]Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1975), 130.

war and disease continued to devastate the Native population while the English population increased.[66]

Following their defeat in the war of 1644, the Native Americans agreed to a treaty which gave the English the majority of the territory east of the mountains, establishing a boundary, west of which the English were prohibited from settling. However, Virginia's population increased from 8,000 to 40,000 between 1640 and 1660, and by 1652 there were three English settlements in the territory that the treaty had reserved for the Indians.[67] Violence between the English settlers and the Indians escalated again during the 1660s, as recently freed indentured servants had trouble finding enough land to settle on. The settlers attacked the Indians and the Indians fought back. By 1676, newly arrived settler Nathaniel Bacon attacked Indians without authorization and led a rebellion against Virginia governor William Berkeley, who was more interested in preserving peace with the Indians than protecting the settlers in the far western reaches of the colony.[68]

Bacon did not care that the governor was on good terms with some of the Native tribes and conducted a crusade against all Indians. The Occaneechee was one of the tribes on good terms with the settlers, and they captured a

---

[66] Morgan, *American Slavery*, 102-4.

[67] Alan Brinkley, *The Unfinished Nation Volume 1: To 1877.* 6th ed., (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2010), 34-5.

[68] Janet L. Coryell and Nora Faires. *A History of Women in America*. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2012), 79.

number of Susquehannahs for Bacon. After Bacon's men executed the Susquehannah prisoners they turned their guns on the Occaneeches, killing most of them and proving that Bacon was determined to exterminate "all Indians in generall for…they were all Enemies." More of the friendly Algonquians were killed than the hostile Susquehannok because they were closer and easier to catch.[69] Bacon received considerable support for his attacks against the Indians and for his attacks against eastern elites ruling Virginia. In an attempt to force Virginia authorities in Jamestown to attack the Indian raiders, Bacon successfully stood for election to the House of Burgesses. He then marched on the colonial capital, and built fortifications to place Jamestown under siege. The governor's troops attacked his fortifications but the attack failed. After the governor's troops left, Bacon burned Jamestown. The conflict that had inflamed the entire colony ended unexpectedly a month later in October 1676 when Bacon suddenly died of an intestinal ailment.[70] Following Bacon's Rebellion, the nation's first Indian reservations "were established for the survivors of the tribes that had once composed the powerful Powhatan chiefdom."[71] New lands were opened to white

---

[69] Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, 259.; Alan Taylor, *American Colonies: The Settling of North America,* (New York: Penguin Books, 2001), 149.

[70] Morgan, *American Slavery* 80.

[71] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 102-4.

settlement in 1677, after the Indians hesitantly signed a new treaty to that effect.[72]

The Pequot War and King Phillip's War

In 1620 a discontented group of English separatists, known as the Pilgrims, arrived in present day Massachusetts. They established Plymouth Colony north of Cape Cod and initiated permanent English settlement in New England.[73] The Pilgrims arrived to find the area depopulated as the result of an epidemic, and believed that God "had prepared the way for their coming." Following their first winter, which resulted in the deaths of more than half their number, the Pilgrims received assistance from some of the local Native Americans. Samoset, an Abenaki from Maine, facilitated a meeting between the Pilgrims and Squanto, a Patuxet, who had learned English as the result of his having been kidnapped, taken to Spain and then traveling to England. He was able to teach them the basics of survival, such as planting corn and the best places to fish. He was also able to act as "an intermediary in their dealings with the local Indians."[74]

---

[72] Brinkley, *The Unfinished Nation Volume 1: To 1877*, 35.

[73] Ibid., 36.

[74] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 105.

In 1621 Massasoit, chief of the Wampanoags of southern Massachusetts and Rhode Island made a treaty of peace and friendship with the Pilgrims. After the English crown chartered Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1629 the English presence in New England grew by more than twenty thousand over the next fourteen years.[75] While the English settlers arrived at an increasing rate, the Indian people found themselves pushed off their lands, deprived of game, and cheated in trade. Smallpox also struck the Indians of New England in 1633-34 deeply affecting the Pequot Indians, who suffered appalling losses because of the epidemic.

The Pequots had once been a powerful people who controlled the region's trade in Wampum (strings of shells used in intertribal trade and diplomacy) because of their location at the mouth of the Connecticut River. Two years after the smallpox epidemic, the English went to war against the Pequots.[76] The colonial leaders, wanting to extend their authority into the Mystic River Valley of southeastern Connecticut, "demanded that the resident Pequot pay a heavy tribute in wampum, give up several of their children as hostages, and surrender suspects accused of killing a trader."[77] When the Pequot refused to pay this tribute the Connecticut, Plymouth, and Massachusetts colonies declared war.

---

[75] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 105.

[76] Ibid., 105-7.

[77] Taylor, *American Colonies*, 194-5.

The Narragansett and Mohegan tribes, long times rivals of the Pequot, agreed to help the colonists fight because they believed they were joining the winning side and they would be able to add the Pequot prisoners to their numbers.[78] The Puritans transformed the war into a struggle between savagery and civilization. The English won the war after they broke Pequot resistance in a surprise attack on their main village in 1637. After setting the village on fire, the Puritans attacked those who ran from the flames with gunfire and swords. This indiscriminate slaughter was the total opposite of the way the Indians fought wars, causing them to complain that the New English type of war was "too furious and slays too many people."[79] Throughout the rest of 1637 the remaining Pequot were captured or killed. Some of the captives were executed, while others were sold into slavery in the West Indies and bartered to the Narragansett and Mohegan in exchange for Wampum. The English terminated Pequot sovereignty and outlawed the use of the tribal name at the Treaty of Hartford in 1638.[80]

The New English colonists did not live amongst each other without conflict, however, they usually put aside these differences to unite as a common people against Indians. The Narragansett sachem Miantonomi noticed how powerful the colonists were when they joined together and, in 1642, urged Native Americans to

---

[78] Taylor, *American Colonies*, 194-5.

[79] Ibid., 195-6.

[80] Ibid., 195-6; Calloway; *First Peoples*, 105-7.

join together in a common union against the colonists, “For so are we all Indians as the English are, and say brother to one another, so must we be one as they are, otherwise we shall all be gone shortly.”[81] Miantonomi’s Pan-Indian proposal was ruined however, by the Mohegan sachem Uncas. Uncas aided the colonists against the Pequot in 1637 in order to establish Mohegan independence from the Pequot, and in 1640 Uncas formally ceded his territory and people to Connecticut. The acquisition of this territory gave Connecticut the ability to claim independence from Massachusetts, in return Connecticut’s leaders gave Uncas presents and a position of authority. As such, Uncas did not want to help the Narragansett fight the colonists and seized Miantonomi. Following his execution, the various Indian bans continued to operate individually, uncertain whether they should fight to remain autonomous or surrender and become the wards of the New English.[82]

The Pequot War also resulted in conflict with the Wampanoags. Massasoit worked to preserve the peace he had made with the English in 1621, and to a point, the colonists and Indians became economically interdependent and both Indians and English settlers managed to share the same world for a time. However, Puritans continued to believe that Indians were heathen savages and continued to trespass on their lands and when Massasoit died in 1661 relations deteriorated. Massasoit’s son Wamsutta, (whom the English called Alexander),

---

[81] Taylor, *American Colonies*, 196.

[82] Ibid., 196-7.

continued to sell lands to the English as his father had, but in 1662 the Plymouth colonists feared they would not be able to control the young sachem (chief), and brought Wamsutta to Plymouth at gunpoint for questioning. The colonists released Wamsutta, who was ill, but kept his two sons as hostages. Wamsutta died on the way home causing many Wampanoags to believe the English had poisoned him.[83]

Wamsutta's younger brother, Metacomet (whom the English called King Philip), became the leader of his people at this precarious moment. The Puritans continued to intrude on Wampanoag land and to assert their authority over Indian actions, having arrested and imprisoned Indians who were hunting for "trespassing" on lands the English now claimed as their own. In 1671, as the Indians became increasingly resentful towards the colonists, Metacomet was told to surrender the Wampanoags' weapons. Faced with ever-increasing attacks on their sovereignty Metacomet began to forge a multi-tribal coalition, and Indians and colonists prepared for war.

As it appeared that war would be inevitable the various tribes had to decide whose side they were on. Several were hesitant "to sever the ties they had built with their English neighbors over the previous generation" including Wetamoo, the female sachem of the Pocassets (and widow of Wamsutta). However, while she was hesitant many of her warriors supported Metacomet, as

---

[83] Taylor, *American Colonies*, 107.

did most of the Nipmucks in central Massachusetts. Awashunkes, the female sachem of the Rhode Island Sakonnets, allied with the English, and "put her people under the protection of the Plymouth colony."[84]

What began as "scattered acts of violence" soon escalated into King Philip's War, which, in proportion to the population of the area, was the bloodiest war in American history.[85] In November 1675, after "Metacomet's warriors ambushed English militia companies and burned English towns," the English declared war against the neutral Narragansetts. They interpreted the fact that they offered sanctuary to noncombatants from other tribes as an act of hostility, and in December more than a thousand English men "attacked the main Narragansett stronghold near Kingston, Rhode Island. Hundreds of Narragansett men, women, and children died in what became known as the Great Swamp Fight."[86] The surviving Narragansetts joined forces with Metacomet in his war of resistance.[87] Hunger and cold caused suffering on both sides, as homes and fields had been destroyed, and disease spread through the Indian camps. In an attempt to expand the war Metacomet attempted to recruit the Mahicans and the Abenakis. The Governor of New York, Edmund Andros, persuaded "the

---

[84] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 108.

[85] Coryell and Faires. *A History of Women in America*, 79.

[86] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 109-10

[87] Ibid., 109-10.

Mohawks to attack Metacomet's army in its winter camps, a devastating blow to the Wampanoag alliance, which now found itself fighting on two fronts." Metacomet was killed on the night of August 11, leaving "Indian power and independence" broken in southern New England as "the war continued along the coast of Maine." Many Native American refugees went north, "joining Abenakis in Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire and siding with the French in future conflicts against the English who had driven them from their homelands. The war left a searing impression on New England and a bitter legacy for Anglo-Indian relations."[88]

French and Indian War

The center of French attention in the New World during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the St. Lawrence River Valley. According to historian James Morris:

> The seas off the Gulf of St. Lawrence were prized as one of the best fishing grounds in the New World. Its navigable waters led hundreds of miles into a forested interior teeming with wildlife valued for their pelts. Farther on were the five Great Lakes with the tremendous expanse of territory they drained. Not far beyond the western shores of the Great Lakes lay the headwaters of the Mississippi, that great river whose tributaries gathered water all the way from the crest of the Appalachians in the east to the Rockies in the west.[89]

---

[88] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 110.

[89] James M. Morris, *America's Armed Forces: A History*, 2nd ed. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1996), 2-3.

The French settling between the Appalachians and the Atlantic coast treated the Native inhabitants more humanely than the English settlers. Consequently, the Native Americans were willing to ally themselves with the French against the infringement of the English, who viewed the French and their allies as a challenge to their desire to extend their territories.[90]

While the English and French colonies in North America grew and prospered it seemed inevitable that conflict would erupt because of their different national, cultural, economic, and religious beliefs and goals. Although New France was thinly populated, "its network of fortified trading posts on all the key river passages gave it a stranglehold on the American interior that the English and their American colonists did not appreciate." Additionally, the Protestant English believed the Catholic French were heretics, their Indian allies were a mortal danger, and their fur trade "was a source of great wealth flowing away from English purses."[91] Similarly, the French colonists could lose much due to the infringement of their fishing grounds off Nova Scotia and Newfoundland by English fisherman. After British traders attempted to capture the profitable French fur trade with the Indians (along with the Indians' loyalties) British settlers and

---

[90] Morris, *America's Armed Forces,* 2-3.

[91] Ibid., 3

land speculators moved across the Appalachians into the Ohio Country, boding ill for future French development in America.[92]

Beyond these colonial resentments, England and France competed for the national, economic and religious domination of Europe as Spain and Holland lost their sea power and economic strength. “Wars for Empire” broke out between England and France in 1689 and continued intermittently on until 1763, when the final such war, the Seven Year’s War as it was called in Europe or the French and Indian War as it was called in North America, settled the question of European and colonial dominance.[93] The continued expansion of the British in into regions claimed by France in North America sparked the French and Indian War, which was fought between 1754 and 1763.[94] During this war, Native Americans allied with both the French and the British, and in some cases tribes were split. Those who fought did so not for continental domination, but for reasons of trade, alliance, kinship ties, promises of war honors, and to protect their land from foreign domination.[95] The Miamis, Sacs, Potawatomies, Ojibwas, Ottawas, Wyandots, Huron, and the Iroquois, Delawares and Shawnees who lived on the Allegheny allied with the French. The bulk of the Iroquois

---

[92] Morris, *America’s Armed Forces,* 3.

[93] Ibid.*,* 4-8.

[94] Coryell & Faires. *A History of Women in America*, 113.

[95] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 173-5.

Confederacy- also known as the Six Nations, which included the Oneida, Onoganda, Seneca, Mohawk, Cayuga, and Tuscarora- and the Cherokee (until the Cherokee and the British went to war) and the Choctaw allied with the British. The British were victorious, and in 1763 Britain and France signed the Treaty of Paris, ending the Seven Years' War. The terms of the treaty were disastrous for the Indians of the Ohio Valley. France ceded to Britain all of its North American territory east of the Mississippi, except for New Orleans, and even gave up Native lands without their consent.[96] The Iroquois alliance with the British came apart shortly after the peace settlement, and for the next fifty years the tribes would continue to challenge the English control of the Ohio Valley.[97]

The American Revolution

During the American Revolution Indian tribes were again split over which side to support. The majority of tribes allied with the British, their experiences with land hungry American settlers having convinced them that a British victory was their best hope for survival. The Cherokee in the Southeast (who had already lost land in a series of treaties and feared losing more), joined northern Shawnee, Delaware, and Mohawk in resistance to the revolutionary Americans. The Iroquois Confederacy was split, two of the Six Nations, the Oneida and

---

[96] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 175.

[97] Brinkley, *The Unfinished Nation Volume 1: To 1877*, 223.

Tuscarora, allied with the Americans. This was partly because of the "influence of their missionary, Samuel Kirkland, who favored breaking with the Church of England."[98]

For Native Americans, the War of Independence was a war for their survival. Following the French and Indian War in 1763, the British government had tried to limit American settlers to the lands east of a line drawn down the ridge of the Appalachian Mountains called the Proclamation Line. That line was gone after the Revolutionary War, as the British turned over control of the trans-Appalachian lands to the Americans as part of the Peace of Paris in 1783.[99] The treaty "acknowledged American sovereignty over all territory south of the Great Lakes, east of the Mississippi, and north of Florida." Once again the Native Americans who lived there were not consulted as their lands had been given away by their defeated.[100] Betrayed by their British allies, Indians were now faced with an ambitious nation that regarded them as a defeated enemy, while they viewed the white settlers as a "plague of locusts," determined to occupy all of their lands.[101]

---

[98] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 223-4.

[99] Coryell and Faires. *A History of Women in America*, 127.

[100] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 227

[101] Coryell & Faires. *A History of Women in America*, 127.

During 1784, 1785 and 1786 the Congress of the newly formed United States attempted to persuade Iroquois, Choctaw, Chickasaw and Cherokee leaders to cede land in a series of treaties. In 1786 the leadership of the Iroquois Confederacy renounced the treaty it had signed in 1784, and other tribes never accepted the treaties that affected them. Violence on the Northwest frontier increased as Indians fought against whites moving into their lands. The Miami defeated U.S. forces in two major battles in 1790 and 1791, but no treaty was settled because the U.S would not agree to refrain from settling west of the Ohio River. Finally, in 1794 General Anthony Wayne led 4,000 soldiers into the Ohio Valley and defeated the Indians in the Battle of Fallen Timbers. Following their defeat, the Miami ceded substantial new land to the U.S. in the Treaty of Greenville. In exchange for the land the U.S. had to formally acknowledge the Miami's claim on the territory they retained. This was the first time the U.S. recognized an Indian nation's sovereignty, and it established a precedent that only tribes could cede their lands.[102]

The War of 1812

A movement to unite all the tribes of the Mississippi Valley against white encroachment on Indian land emerged in 1809 led by Tecumseh, a Shawnee whose brother Tenskwatawa (also called the Prophet) preached against contact

---

[102] Brinkley, *The Unfinished Nation Volume 1: To* 1877, 137.

with white people and the dangers of emulating their life style.[103] Tenskwatawa's teachings and Tecumseh's vision alarmed the U.S. government, especially the governor of Indiana Territory, General William Henry Harrison, who had built his career by carrying out Thomas Jefferson's policies of white American expansion and Native American removal.

In the winter of 1811-12 Tecumseh spoke to the Osages, in an attempt to recruit them to his cause.

> Brothers, -The white men are not friends to the Indians: at first, they only asked for land sufficient for a wigwam; now, nothing will satisfy them but the whole of our hunting grounds, from the rising to the setting sun. Brothers, -The white men want more than our hunting grounds; they wish to kill our warriors; they would even kill our old men, women and little ones. . . Brothers, -My people are brave and numerous; but the white people are too strong for them alone. I wish you to take up the tomahawk with them. If we all unite, we will cause the rivers to stain the great waters with their blood. Brothers, -If you do not unite with us, they will first destroy us, and then you will fall an easy prey to them. They have destroyed many nations of red men because they were not united, because they were not friends to each other.[104]

In 1811 Harrison led an army in a preemptive strike against the Prophet's village at Tippecanoe while Tecumseh was away in the South. The battle was a relatively minor affair but the Americans claimed a victory, the Prophet lost

---

[103] Brinkley, *The Unfinished Nation Volume 1: To* 1877, 186.

[104] "Tecumseh's Speech to the Osages (Winter 1811-12)" in *Voices of a People's History of the United States* ed. by Howard Zinn and Anthony Arnove, (New York: Seven Stories Press. 2009), 134-135.

prestige, and Tecumseh's confederacy suffered a setback and loss of momentum.[105]

Despite the setback there were still Indian warriors who were ready for a fight, and during the spring of 1812 they raided white settlements and terrified settlers along the frontier. The bloodshed along the western borders was largely a result of the Indians' own initiative, but Britain's agents in Canada had encouraged and helped supply the uprising.[106] Tension between Indians and Americans persisted into the War of 1812. The U.S declared war on Britain for a number of reasons, including the fact that the British were seizing American ships and impressing American sailors into the royal navy (forcing them into service). The fact that the British were arming Indians also played a part, and British weapons had been found at Tippecanoe.[107] Many Americans were also looking for an excuse to conquer Canada and to Harrison and the majority of white residents on the frontier regions annexing Canada to the U.S. seemed like the only way to make the west safe for Americans.[108] In that conflict, Tecumseh sided with the British in a last attempt to stem the tide of American expansion. The British-Indian alliance won some victories early in the war, but Britain was

---

[105] Calloway, *First Peoples: A Documentary Survey of American Indian History*, 279.

[106] Brinkley, *The Unfinished Nation Volume 1: To 1877*, 187.

[107] Morris, *America's Armed Forces: A History*, 45.

[108] Brinkley, *The Unfinished Nation Volume 1: To 1877*, 187.

also involved in a war against Napoleon and its attention was divided. Tecumseh was killed fighting Harrison's army at the Battle of the Thames in Ontario in 1813, and "the last hope of Indian unity east of the Mississippi also died."[109]

Tecumseh influenced Indians in the south as well as those in the Northwest with his message of united Indian resistance. The Creek were divided over whether or not to fight against the U.S. Many Creeks of the Upper Creek towns were deeply persuaded by Tecumseh and advocated militancy against the encroachment of the U.S. The Creeks of the Lower Towns wanted peaceful relations with the U.S. and advocated accommodation. A civil war broke out with the militant Upper Town Creeks (who became known as the "Red Sticks" because of red clubs they carried) attacking the Upper Town Creeks who wanted to remain neutral.[110] The Creek civil war soon "spilled over into attacks on American settlers" beginning the Creek War of 1813-14. During this conflict General Andrew Jackson "led a series of devastating campaigns that concluded with the slaughter of some eight hundred Creek warriors at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend on the Tallapoosa River in Alabama in March 1814." While Jackson's allies included some five hundred Cherokees and one hundred Lower Creeks "their contribution was not recognized." To add insult to injury, as the ensuing Treaty of Fort Jackson "deprived the Creek Nation of 23 million acres, or

---

[109] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 279.

[110] Angie Debo, *The Road to Disappearance: A History of the Creek Indians*. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979), 78.

two-thirds of their tribal domain, most of which was taken from Jackson's Lower Creek allies."[111]

Removals

For decades prior to the War of 1812, Americans, by way of missionaries and Indian agents, sought to impose their way of life and their beliefs onto the Indians. These individuals organized Indian economic life around intensive agriculture, and redefined gender roles in Indian families. In the South, many Cherokees, Creeks, Chickasaws, and Choctaws accommodated to American ways as the best way to survive in the new nation. They began to wear European styles of clothing, changed their farming and settlement patterns (plowed fields and fenced lands), and raised more stock, and cultivated corn and cotton for the market.[112] According to historian Colin Calloway, "some were Christian and literate in English. Influential sons of Scottish traders and Creek mothers had already begun inculcating property values and reorienting Creek society toward a market economy."[113]

While Europeans had encroached upon Indian land since their earliest arrivals in America, it was not until the presidency of Thomas Jefferson that

---

[111] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 280.

[112] Ibid., 280.

[113] Ibid.

Indian removal became a government policy and goal. Jefferson believed that having too much land served as a disincentive for the Indians to become "civilized." By restricting their lands, they would give up hunting and become "civilized" as farmers.[114] In 1801, Jefferson had offered the Indians of the Northwest a choice: they could become a part of white society as settled farmers or they could move west to the Mississippi. Either way they had to give up their lands in the Northwest.[115]

By the mid-nineteenth century Indian removal was part of the growing concept of "Manifest Destiny," the notion that white Americans were ordained by God to control the entire North American continent. It was a racist doctrine, tied to white nationalism, espousing the notion that white Americans were a superior race who were justified in their enslavement of African Americans and extermination of American Indians because these were believed to be inferior races.[116]

Not all white Americans advocated Indian removal, while those who favored removal had different reasons for doing so. Some hated them and wanted their lands while others sympathized with them and believed moving them would be the only way to protect them from their greedy neighbors. Those

---

[114] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 286.

[115] Brinkley, *The Unfinished Nation Volume 1: To 1877*, 187.

[116] Darlene Clark Hine, William C. Hine, and Stanley Harrold, *African Americans: A Concise History,* 4th ed., (New Jersey: Pearson, 2012), 190.

who favored removal received a boost in 1828 with the election of Andrew Jackson, as he was a famous Indian fighter. In Jackson's 1830 State of the Union address he made it sound as if the Creeks and Cherokees were wandering hunters, while he knew personally that they were stationary and agriculturally based. The Indians would be better off in the West, where they could live undisturbed Jackson argued. Jackson argued that Indians were racially inferior and incapable of change, and therefore, even the so-called civilized tribes were "savages." "Civilization" and "progress" demanded that "savages" be removed, and the Indians would be better off in the west where they could live undisturbed.[117]

Ironically, the Indians whom Americans seemed most anxious to expel from their lands were people whom Americans termed "civilized." According to Calloway, in 1827 the Cherokees

> restructured their tribal government into a constitutional republic modeled after that of the U.S., with a written constitution, an independent judiciary, a supreme court, a principal chief and a two-house legislature. They had a written language based on the syllabary developed by Sequoyah who devoted a dozen years to creating a written version of the Cherokee language. In 1828 they established a newspaper, the *Cherokee Phoenix*, published in both Cherokee and English.[118]

A census taken among the Cherokees in 1825 showed that they owned:

---

[117] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 288.

[118] Ibid., 288.

> 33 grist mills, 13 saw mills, one powder mill, 69 blacksmith shops, two tan yards, 762 looms, 2,486 spinning wheels, 172 wagons, 2,923 plows, 7,683 horses, 22,531 cattle, 46,732 pigs, and 2,566 sheep. The Cherokees seemed to have everything the U.S. required of them to take their place in the new nation as a self-supporting, functioning republic of farmers, but it did not save them. Indeed, their very success and prosperity only increased pressure from neighbors eager to get their hands on Cherokee land.[119]

The Cherokee, whose population had decreased to approximately 10,000 people and had lost three-quarters of their territory by the end of the American Revolution.[120] Cherokee territory originally extended into five southeastern states, but by the 1820s most of the remaining Cherokees were confined to Georgia. Following the discovery of gold in Cherokee country in 1827 prospectors flooded into the area and the Georgia legislature passed a resolution which declared its dominance over Cherokee lands within the state's borders. Georgia then demanded that the U.S. government begin negotiations to convince the Cherokees that they should cede their land. The Cherokees were then subjected to harassment, intimidation, deception, and an assault on their government. Georgia applied special laws to the Cherokees, with their intent being "to destroy the political, economic, and social infrastructure of the nation."[121] Tribal council meetings were prohibited, the tribal courts were closed and Cherokees were deprived of their right to legal protest. These laws also

---

[119] Calloway, *First Peoples,* 288-9.

[120] Ibid., 289-90.

[121] Ibid.

made it illegal for Cherokees to testify in court against whites, dig for gold, or try to convince other Cherokees not to move west. In 1830, the Georgia Guard was created to patrol Cherokee country and over the next few years the guard harassed Cherokee people, arrested Principal Chief John Ross, and seized his papers and the Cherokee printing press.[122]

In May 1830 the U.S. Congress passed the Indian Removal Act, which authorized the president to negotiate treaties of removal with all of Indian tribes living east of the Mississippi. This led to an increased campaign of harassment Georgia was implementing against the Cherokee Nation. The Cherokees decided to fight Georgia in court and sued the state of Georgia in the U.S. Supreme Court. Chief Justice John Marshall declared Cherokees were neither U.S. citizens nor an independent nation, and therefore the Court lacked jurisdiction over the case.[123] The following year Samuel Worcester brought suit against Georgia because of its law requiring all white people living in the Cherokee Nation to take an oath promising to obey the laws of Georgia or to receive a special permit from the governor. If a white person did not take the oath and did not receive the permit the punishment was prosecution and imprisonment with hard labor.[124] Because the suit involved a U.S. citizen, it fell within the jurisdiction

---

[122] Calloway, *First People*., 289-90.

[123] Ibid., 290-1.

[124] Theda Perdue and Michael D. Green, *The Cherokee Nation and the Trail of Tears*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2007), 84-5.

of the Supreme Court. In *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832) the Court found that the Cherokee Nation was “a distinct community, occupying its own territory” in which “the laws of Georgia can have no force.” The Court’s decision was one of the most important in the history of U.S.-Indian relations, because it ruled that Cherokee Nation was “a distinct community, occupying its own territory” instead of ruling that it was a “dependent domestic nation.” This ruling was not enough to save the Cherokees however. Georgia had no intention of accepting that Cherokee sovereignty was protected by the federal government and ignored the Supreme Court’s ruling.[125]

By the 1830s, nearly half of the cotton that was used worldwide was produced in the American South and the south had grown rich exporting it, leading southerners to believe that the lands the Southern Indians were inhabiting were too valuable to be left in their hands. Faced with the choice of gradual destitution or removal most Indians in the south accepted the unavoidable. As early as 1820, the Choctaw chief Pushmataha made a treaty with Andrew Jackson ceding lands in Mississippi to the United States and accepting new lands in the West in return. Ten years later, the Choctaws signed the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, ensuring the removal of most of the tribe, although some Choctaws remained in Mississippi. Under the guise that the Creek living in Alabama and Georgia were being “civilized” too slowly and that

---

[125] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 290-1.

white agricultural development was being impeded because of them the U.S. government convinced William McIntosh, the metis ("mixed blood") chief from the Lower Towns to sign an agreement at Indian Springs early in 1825, consenting to voluntary removal and handing over most of the Creek's eastern lands in exchange for a region in Indian Territory. Signing this agreement was in direct violation of a Creek law passed nearly two years before and resulted in the killing of McIntosh "by the leadership of the non-metis majority associated principally with the Upper Towns". While the murder of McIntosh caused the federal government to put aside the Indian Springs treaty the federal government it did not prevent Creek removal because in January 1826 another treaty not drastically different from the one McIntosh signed was signed by his critics,[126] and in 1836 the Creeks embarked on a bitter march west.[127]

While the majority of the Cherokee led by Principal Chief John Ross were opposed to removal, a few leaders, such as John Ridge and his cousin Elias Boudinot, began to have second thoughts as pressures increased and Georgia perpetrated ever more outrageous crimes against the Cherokee People.[128] Boudinot, who had been the editor of the *Cherokee Phoenix*, and Ridge had

---

[126] W. David Baird and G. W. Grayson. *A Creek Warrior for the Confederacy: The Autobiography of Chief G.W. Grayson*, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988), 4-5.

[127] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 291.

[128] Clarissa W. Confer, *The Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007), 19-22.

been educated in Connecticut and both fell in love and married local white women. The reaction to these interracial marriages was extremely hostile and while they continued to believe that education and "civilization" were important for the Cherokees they did not believe the Cherokee people would ever be accepted into American society. Only by preserving their separate and distinct identity could the Cherokee people be happy and could their "civilization" unfold.[129]

In 1835 the U.S. signed the Treaty of New Echota with a minority of Cherokees who agreed to move west voluntarily. The "Treaty Party" included John Ridge, his father Major Ridge, Elias Boudinot, his brother Stand Watie, and others who had formerly resisted removal but now felt they had no alternative but to migrate. Major Ridge knew what the consequences of his action would be, he himself had authored that Cherokee law prohibiting land sales, and he had executed a Cherokee chief named Doublehead for doing so. "I have signed my death warrant," he said when he put his name to the treaty.[130] In 1837 Boudinot wrote, "If one hundred persons are ignorant of their true situation, and so completely blinded as not to see the destruction that awaits them we can see strong reasons to justify the action of a minority of fifty persons to do what the majority *would* do if they understood their condition-to save a nation from political thralldom and moral degradation."[131]

---

[129]Perdue and Green, *The Cherokee Nation and the Trail of Tears*, 46-47.

[130] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 291.

John Ross and the majority of his people denounced the treaty as fraudulent and refused to abide by it. In 1838, citing the Treaty of New Echota, federal troops rounded up most of the Cherokees, placed them in stockade internment camps, and then relocated them across the Mississippi. In 1890, Private John Burnett, who served in the mounted infantry, told his children his memories of the Trail of Tears. In his account Burnett relates that the "doom of the Cherokees" was sealed in 1828 when an Indian boy "sold a gold nugget to a white trader." Following this "crimes were committed that were a disgrace to civilization. Men were shot in cold blood, lands were confiscated. Homes were burned and the inhabitants driven out by the gold-hungry brigands." Chief John Ross sent Chief Junaluska to plead with Andrew Jackson "for protection of his people." Junaluska was sent because he knew the President personally. During the battle of the Horse Shoe "Junaluska had taken 500 of the flower of his Cherokee scouts and helped Jackson to win the battle. . . And in that battle Junaluska had drove his Tomahawk through the skull of a Creek warrior, when the Creek had Jackson at his mercy." During Junaluska's audience with Jackson however, the President's "manner was cold and indifferent toward the rugged son of the forest who had saved his life. He met Junaluska, heard his plea but curtly said, 'Sir, your audience is ended. There is nothing I can do for you.' The doom

---

[131] Perdue and Green, *The Cherokee Nation and the Trail of Tears*, 91.

of the Cherokee was sealed."[132]

Burnett witnessed first-hand the cruelties the Cherokees were subjected to during their removal. He "saw the helpless Cherokees arrested and dragged from their homes, and driven at bayonet point into the stockades. . .saw them loaded like cattle or sheep into six hundred and forty-five wagons and started toward the west." He saw an old man whipped to "hasten him into the wagon." In snow and freezing temperatures the Cherokees slept "on the ground without fire." Among those who died as a result of "ill treatment, cold, and exposure" was "the beautiful Christian wife of Chief John Ross. . . This noble hearted woman died a martyr to childhood, giving her only blanket for the protection of a sick child. She rode thinly clad through a blinding sleet and snow storm, developed pneumonia and died in the still hours of a bleak winter night." Burnett witnessed Chief Junaluska with "tears gushing down his cheeks and lifting his cap he turned his face toward the heavens and said, 'Oh my God, if I had known at the battle of the Horse Shoe what I know now, American history would have been differently written.'"[133]

About one quarter of the Cherokees (approximately four thousand) died on the Trail of Tears.[134] Most Cherokees did not ride in wagons or on horseback, but walked. Shelter and subsistence presented a number of problems as tents

---

[132] John G Burnett, "The Cherokee Removal Through the Eyes of a Private Soldier," in *Voices of a People's History of the United States* ed. by Zinn and Arnove, 142-146.

[133] Burnett, "The Cherokee Removal Through the Eyes of a Private Soldier," 142-146.

[134] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 291.

were pitched in wind, rain and snow, and drinking water was scarce. Immune systems were weakened by exposure and fatigue, and measles, whooping cough, dysentery and respiratory infections plagued the groups.[135] Women who were forced to march while they were in labor and to give birth as best they could along the side of the road.[136] Angry and resentful towards the treaty signers for the role they played in the devastating relocation Elias Boudinot, John Ridge, and Major Ridge were assassinated on June 22, 1839 by Cherokees as punishment for violating the law which forbade the sale of tribal lands. Stand Watie, survived numerous attempts on his life[137]and became the leader of the pro-treaty party, which continued to serve as the opposition to the Ross anti-removal party.[138]

Some Choctaws managed to resist removal and stayed in Mississippi, and some Cherokees survived in North Carolina as the Eastern Band of Cherokees. Florida Seminoles refused to remove and fought the U.S. army to a standstill from their stronghold in the Everglades in the Second Seminole War (1835-42). Florida served as the most durable community for escaped slaves in North America, and even after Florida ceased to be a territory of Spain runaway slaves continued to seek refugee there among the Seminole. Part of the reason for

---

[135] Perdue and Green, *The Cherokee Nation and the Trail of Tears*, 136-8.

[136] Coryell & Faires. *A History of Women in America*, 176.

[137] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 44.

[138] Confer, *The Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*, 22.

fighting the Seminole War was to destroy this refuge.[139] Even though their leader, Chief Osceola, was captured under a flag of truce and died in prison, some Seminoles remained defiant in their Florida homelands.[140] Following a war that was aimed in part towards the destruction of a slave refuge the Cherokees created an economy dependent on black slave labor in Oklahoma. By 1860 there were 7,000 slaves there, 14 percent of the population, far more than the other western territories.[141]

Carrying out the policy of Indian removal in the Northern U.S. meant dealing with a variety of tribes and bands, many of which had either migrated previously from one place to another and were already living on a fraction of the land that had made up their former homes. According to Calloway, "Between 1829 and 1851 the U.S. signed eighty-six treaties with twenty-six northern tribes between New York and the Mississippi. Sometimes several tribes participated in a treaty; sometimes a single tribe signed several treaties."[142] In 1832 Ohio Shawnees moved west and in 1838 sixteen Seneca chiefs, who were coerced by threats, bribery, and alcohol, agreed to sell their remaining lands in New York to the Ogden Land Company, give up their four reservations, and move to Kansas

---

[139] Hine, Hine, and Harrold, *African Americans: A Concise History*, 70.

[140] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 293.

[141] Hine, Hine, and Harrold, *African Americans: A Concise History*, 127.

[142] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 293.

in the fraudulent Treaty of Buffalo Creek. This treaty was put together by New York politicians, transportation interests, and land speculators who conspired to convert Iroquois homelands into American real estate. Charges of bribery and fraud by the commissioners hindered the treaty's ratification by the U.S. Senate, and four years later the Senecas were able to negotiate a compromise treaty which allowed most of them to stay in western New York.[143] Many of those who did migrate to Indian Territory died of cholera, exposure, or starvation.[144] The "compromise treaty" of 1842 allowed the Senecas to regain the Allegany and Cattaraugus but not the Buffalo Creek and Tonawanda reservations.[145] The Tonawanda Band of Senecas was eventually allowed to purchase a small part of its reservation back from the Ogden Land Company with money set aside for their removal to Kansas in 1857.[146]

The Oneida, another member of the Iroquois Confederacy, had difficulty avoiding relocation even though they had fought with America in the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812. A group of Oneida was moved from New York to Wisconsin in 1821.[147] The Ogden Land Company and other land

---

[143] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 293.

[144] Laurence M. Hauptman, *The Iroquois in the Civil War: From Battlefield to Reservation*, (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1992), 12.

[145] Ibid.

[146] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 163.

[147] Lawrence M. Hauptman and L. Gordon McLester III. *The Oneida Indians in the Age of Allotment, 1860-1920*, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006), 3.

speculators and swindled land from them and corrupt missionaries and Indian agents enticed them to go west.[148] During the 1830s and beyond some Wisconsinites attempted to remove the Oneidas. Henry Dodge, the territorial governor of Wisconsin, began negotiations with Oneidas in 1845 to enable their removal.[149]

The Delaware were divided during many Euro-American wars. They fought on both sides during the Revolutionary War and there were many who fought against Tecumseh during the War of 1812.[150] They once lived in an area "stretching from Delaware Bay in the south to the Mid-Hudson River Valley of New York in the north and from western Long Island in the east to the second branch of the Delaware River in the west."[151] They were removed by American policy makers many times, migrating to Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, Texas, Indian Territory, Kansas, Wisconsin, and Ontario. The Mexican government invited a group of the Delaware to live in Texas which later allied with the United States during the Mexican American War. Because of their support during the Mexican American War this group was rewarded with lands along the Brazos River in Texas in 1853. White Texans did not want them there however, and this band

---

[148] Hauptman, *The Iroquois in the Civil War*, 68-69.

[149] Ibid., 69-70.

[150] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 18

[151] Ibid., 17.

was removed to Oklahoma in 1859.[152] Once again, as was the case with the Lower Creeks and Cherokees who fought with Jackson, whether or not they were American allies did not protect them from land loss and removal.

The Ottawa, who had been allies of the French during the French and Indian War and allies of the British during the American Revolution, lost lands in 1819 and 1821 treaties. Between 1831 and 1833, Ottawa bands along the Maumee River in Ohio were removed to a reservation in Franklin County, Kansas. The Treaty of 1836, also known as the Treaty of Washington, forced Ottawa were to cede all of their remaining lands in the Lower Peninsula, covering half the State of Michigan. They retained title to these lands for a five-year period and the right of occupy them until it was decided that these lands were "required" for white settlement.[153]

Repeated attempts to coerce the Ottawa to move west followed the Treaty of Washington, as did white intruders squatting on Indian lands and cutting Indian maple groves. By the 1850s, a majority of Ottawa men became farmers, abandoning their traditional life as fishermen and hunters because most of the Indian fishing grounds were depleted. The Treaty of Detroit in 1855 was an allotment agreement which allowed Indian heads of families to select fee simple lands of eighty acres-forty acres for single adults over twenty-one years of age-

---

[152] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 19-20.

[153] Ibid., 131-2.

from townships. The treaty provided that, after these selections were concluded, the remaining Ottawa lands would be put up for sale to the general public.[154]

Conclusion

Initial encounters between Europeans and Native Americans varied by who was settling and by region. While cultural differences were obvious from the beginning, as the Europeans relied less on their Native allies for survival and as the number of Europeans increased, relationships increased in tension and hostility. The Puritans in New England believed the war they fought against the Pequot was a war against savagery and civilization. Nathaniel Bacon in Virginia believed all Indians were enemies. As the Native American population decreased they were conflicted as to what they should do in order to survive. Some wanted to fight, others began acculturating and converting to Christianity.

Their relationship to the United States changed over time and through various laws. United States recognized Indian Sovereignty with the Treaty of Greenville (1795), “If any citizen of the United States, or any other white person or persons, shall presume to settle upon the lands now relinquished by the United States, such citizen or other person shall be out of the protection of the United States.”[155] Then in *Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia* (1831)it was

---

[154] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 133.

[155] The Treaty of Greenville 1795, accessed February 20, 2017, http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/greenvil.asp.

ruled, “it may well be doubted whether those tribes which reside within the acknowledged boundaries of the United States can…be denominated foreign nations. They may…be denominated domestic dependent nations…they are in a state of pupilage. Their relation to the United States resembles that of a ward to his guardian.”[156]

It became apparent that it did not matter who they allied with at war time, they would never enjoy the benefits of victory. When Elias Boudinot and John Ridge supported Cherokee relocation from Georgia to Oklahoma it was because they believed it did not matter how much the Cherokee imitated white people they would never be seen as same as white people. Based on the treatment they were subjected to during relocation it is obvious that this was true. They were an obstacle to be removed, and treated like animals in the process. The westward expansion of white people had always been something Native Americans worried about, and as they continued to move west things continued to worsen for Native Americans.

[156] Case Text Inc. The Cherokee Nation V. The State of Georgia, accessed February 20, 2017, https://casetext.com/case/the-cherokee-nation-v-the-state-of-georgia.

CHAPTER TWO

THE CIVIL WAR

The Mexican-American War (1846-1848) was controversial even at the time. Many who opposed it believed that its purpose was to acquire new land in which to spread slavery. In 1846 Frederick Douglass gave a speech in Belfast, Ireland describing the annexation of Texas as a "conspiracy from beginning to end . . . for the purpose of upholding and sustaining one of the darkest and foulest crimes ever committed by man." In his 1849 Address to the New England Convention at Faneuil Hall in Boston, Massachusetts Douglass denounced "the Mexican war, as a murderous war-as a war against the free States-as a war against freedom, against the negro, and against the interests of the workingman of this country-and as a means of extending that great evil and . . . curse, negro slavery."[157] Douglass was correct in this belief that the war would exacerbate tensions regarding slavery. Eventually the Civil War would settle that matter, but it would also prove devastating to Native Americans, those who participated in it and those who lived West of the fighting.

---

[157] Frederick Douglass, "Address to the New England Convention (May 31, 1849)" in *Voices of a People's History of the United States* ed. by Zinn and Arnove, 158-9.

The Cherokee

As southern states were succeeding from the Union the chiefs and councils of the Five Civilized Tribes residing in Indian Territory were approached by emissaries from Texas and Arkansas who wanted the Tribes as their allies in the coming Civil War. To Arkansas the allegiance of the Five Nations was viewed as so important to protect its western border that the western counties of Arkansas were not sure they wanted to declare secession without them. The U.S government did not try to dissuade the Five Nations not to ally with the Confederacy, in fact the actions it took only succeeded in convincing them to ally with the Confederacy. The first mistake the U.S government made was to stop sending the payment of tribal annuities in 1861 to prevent it from falling into enemy hands. These annuity payments funded the bureaucracy, including schools and police forces for the Five Nations and tribal leaders saw "little reason to trust a government that had suspended payments guaranteed by treaty."[158] The second mistake the U.S government made was in regard to defense, withdrawing the soldiers from the forts in Indian Territory early in 1861. This action left the area unprotected, and gave Texas troops an opportunity to quickly commandeer the abandoned forts. Due to the long history of violent relations between Texans and Indians "it made sense to be with them rather than against them."[159]

---

[158] Confer, *The Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*, 45-46.

While the Creek, Chickasaw, Choctaw and Seminole agreed to the terms of the Confederacy, Chief Ross was unwilling to commit to the Confederate war effort. He initially insisted on neutrality because he feared alienating his major supporters, the Keetowah Society (who wore crossed pins on their coats or shirts as a sign of their membership in this society causing them to also be referred to as "Pin Cherokees"). The Keetowah Society numbered around five thousand Cherokee who were organized for the "purpose of cultivating a national feeling among full-bloods, in opposition to the innovating tendencies of the mixed blood element." The Keetowahs maintained a friendly relationship with the United States, advocated the abolition of slavery, and promoted Cherokee treaty rights. Their goal was also to oppose the efforts of Watie and his supporters, an opposing society called the "Knights of the Golden Circle"[160] whose members included many of the pro-removal party which represented Cherokee slaveholding interests. Besides opposing Ross's group, their principal objective was assisting in capturing and punishing abolitionists who interfered with slavery in the Cherokee Nation.[161]

---

[159] Confer, *The Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*, 45-46.

[160] The Knights of the Golden Circle's goal was the creation of a great slaveholding empire centered in Havana and radiating in a huge "golden circle" to include all states and countries from the Mason-Dixon Line to Brazil (Alvin M. Josephy, Jr, *The Civil War in the American West*, 17)

[161] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 46.

While Ross was insisted on neutrality Watie was rallying his followers for the Confederacy. Watie's actions combined with the rising Confederate tide after major its victories in the summer of 1861 at Bull Run and Wilson's Creek convinced Ross to sign a treaty with the Confederacy. According to *The Papers of John Ross*, the Principal Chief of the Cherokee wrote to the Chiefs of the Creek Nation, the Chiefs of Osage Nation, and the Chiefs of the Shawnees, Senecas, and Quapaws in order to convince them to join an alliance with the Confederacy. In his letters he uses language like: "If you love your people, your land and your country";[162] "we hope to find a strong friend in the Southern Confederacy to support us, in the defense of all our rights";[163] and "Brothers-my advice and desire, under the present extraordinary crisis, is for all the red Brethren to be united among themselves in the support of our common rights and interest by forming an alliance of peace and friendship with the Confederate States of America."[164]

Under the agreement signed on October 7, 1861, the Confederate States of America assumed all of the treaty obligations due the Cherokee from the government of the United States. The Confederates also guaranteed the Cherokee protection from invasion, respect for Cherokee title to their lands,

---

[162] John Ross and Gary Moulton, *The Papers of John Ross, Volume II 1840-1866,* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985), 486

[163] Ross and Moulton, *The Papers of John Ross, Volume II*, 486-7.

[164] Ibid., 488.

payments of Indian annuities, and the recognition of the Cherokee right to maintain the institution of slavery. Ross pledged "perpetual peace and friendship, and an alliance, offensive and defensive, between the Confederate States of America, all of their states and the people, and the Cherokee Nation and all of the people thereof."[165] Along with the Cherokee the Osages, Shawnees and Senecas in Indian Territory also signed a treaty with the Confederacy.[166] The Cherokee agreed to furnish "a regiment of ten companies of mounted men, with two reserve companies" for the South and to allow the rebels to construct military posts and roads within the Cherokee Nation. No Indian regiment raised was to be called on to fight for the Confederacy outside of the Indian Territory. As a symbol of the Confederate commitment to the Indians, the treaty also allowed the Cherokees to send a delegate to the Confederate Congress at Richmond.[167]

While Ross's nephew John Drew and Stand Watie both led Cherokee regiments to fight on the Confederate side Drew's forces proved to be reluctant fighters for the Confederacy, showing that the pre-removal schism still existed. In December 1861, a majority of Drew's regiment deserted because they refused to fight Creek Chief Opothleyahola's Union forces. After the Confederate defeat at the three-day battle of Pea Ridge (a battle outside Indian Territory) Drew's

---

[165] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 48.

[166] Confer, *The Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*, 50.

[167] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 47-48.

Second Indian Mounted Rifles defected to the Union. In the summer of 1862 federal troops invaded Indian Territory and captured Chief Ross. After being paroled Ross declared Cherokee loyalty to the Union and three of his sons, three of his grandsons and three of his nephews later served the Union. In his absence Watie was elected Principal Chief of the Cherokee Nation.[168]

The South noted this change, reporting: "We learn from the Fort Smith Bulletin that the Cherokee Nation have exercised the right of all freemen- they have reorganized their government which John Ross would have "sold to the Dutch." We now know who our friends are- all honor to Stand Watie and his associates-the people of the South will sustain and uphold him."[169] Not long after this election Stand Watie presented an address in which he expressed his thoughts regarding the division:

> Since the organization of our present Government, our people have been subjected to changes of condition consequent upon the war in which the Nation has been engaged. Soon after the General Mass Convention, held by that intelligent portion of the Cherokee people who could not be infected with the deliberate treachery of their principal rulers, Confederate forces of this District made an advance northward, the enemy was expelled from our borders and our prospect was fair for a continued possession of our country. The campaign upon the whole however, proved disastrous to our common cause. All that portion of our country lying north of Arkansas river was wrested from us by overwhelming numbers, and our women and children forced to flee from the merciless traitors who had sworn with ourselves to protect them from the common enemy.[170]

---

[168] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 48-49.

[169] "The Cherokees," *Natchez Daily Courier*, October 2, 1862, 2.

A number of battles were fought in Cherokee Country including Caving Brooks in 1861; Cowskin Prairie, Old Fort Wayne, and Locust Grove in 1862; the First Battle of Cabin Creek and Webber's Falls in 1863; and the Second Battle of Cabin Creek in 1864.[171] The regiments in Indian Territory also capture Union supplies, the most notable capture was Watie's capture of provisions from the steamboat *J.R. Williams*. Carrying supplies from Fort Smith to Fort Gibson for the Union Cherokees it was crippled by a rapid barrage allowing the boat and cargo to be commandeered. The Creek and Seminole soldiers, who were poorly supplied, rejoiced at the availability of flour, bacon, and other foodstuffs, and carried as much as they could to their destitute family members. A more valuable capture came a few months later, when Watie's Cherokees encountered and drove off the Union Cherokees guarding three hundred wagons bound for Fort Smith providing his men with ammunition, clothing, and food and desperately needed medical items. While his raids did little to regain his homeland they made Watie a legendary figure.[172]

---

[170] "Cherokee Indians," *Wilmington Journal*, November 17, 1864, 1.

[171] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 41-61.

[172] Confer, *The Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*, 90-92.

The Creek

The Creeks were divided over involvement in the American Civil War. The full bloods, who were characteristically conservative, loyally stood by their old commitments, but they had no avenue of communication with the federal government. The mixed bloods who were educated and in a position to make policy, enthusiastically made an alliance with the Confederate States without real consent of the tribe.[173] Economic considerations, especially slavery, caused the metis party of the Lower Towns and their supporters to identify with the southern states, while loyalty to old treaties encouraged adherents of the Upper Towns to align with the federal government and the northern states. Dividing the total population of 13,537 into almost equal parts, each of the two factions furnished troops for the contending armies.[174] The treaty that the Creek signed with the Confederacy was more favorable to the Creeks than any treaty ever made with the United States. Explicit guarantees were made against territorial government and allotment and the annuities that had formerly been paid by the federal government were assumed by the Confederate government. Slavery was also clearly legalized and placed entirely under Creek jurisdiction. The mounted regiment the Creeks agreed to provide for service in the Confederate army was

---

[173] Debo, *The Road to Disappearance,* 142.

[174] Baird and Grayson, *A Creek Warrior for the Confederacy*, 5.

to be paid the same as other soldiers and the Creeks along with the Seminoles permitted a delegate in the Confederate Congress.[175]

The Iroquois of New York

The Indian tribes in Indian Territory were the only ones approached by either the Confederate government or the Federal government. Until 1862 New York recruiters continued to reject Iroquois who wanted to enlist. This was because of overt racism, and, as Isaac Parker wrote, "I.N. Parker is not accepted in the volunteers service for the 'U.S. Army'. The officer of the 'Mustering Office of the U.S. Office' could not accept me because there is no regulation, that is no law for accepting the 'red man' in the 'U.S.'"[176] However, other places in the North, such as Pennsylvania, allowed Seneca Indians immediate entry into the military.[177]

Part of the reason the Iroquois joined the Union cause may have been that war had a key status function. Validation of tribal leadership had been an important part of life in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and was still meaningful to Iroquois youth in the mid-nineteenth century. Talented individuals could take their place in the community by gaining recognition and prestige on

---

[175] Debo, *The Road to Disappearance*, 146.

[176] Hauptman, *A Seneca Indian in the Union Army*, 47.

[177] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 165.

the “warpath.”[178] The most important Iroquois commander during the Civil War was Lieutenant Cornelius C. Cusick, a Tuscarora with a family history of military service. His grandfather, Nicholas Kaghnatsho, served in the American Revolution as “the bodyguard and interpreter for General Marquis de Lafayette.”[179] When New York refused to allow Indians to enlist Cusick appealed federal officials to change this. After the change occurred Cusick commanded the 132nd New York State Volunteer Infantry.[180] The 132nd New York State Volunteer Infantry was popularly called “the Tuscarora Company” even though it included more Germans than Iroquois and four times as many Seneca that Tuscarora. [181] Twenty-five Indians severed in this company from the Allegany, Cattaraugus, Onondaga, Tonawanda, and Tuscarora reservations.[182] One of these twenty-five was Isaac Newton Parker, whose father, Chief William Parker, Jo-no-es-sto-wa had served with the Americans during the War of 1812.[183] Isaac Parker was a noncommissioned officer who eventually served as the Third Sergeant and Color Bearer of the 132nd New York State Volunteer Infantry. He was stationed in the vicinity of New Bern, North Carolina from 1863 to 1865, guarding the rails at this

---

[178] Hauptman, *The Iroquois in the Civil War*, 15.

[179] Ibid., 40.

[180] Ibid., 39-41.

[181] Ibid., 28.

[182] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 166.

[183] Ibid., 162.

major transportation nexus,[184] which General Ambrose had seized from the Confederacy in 1862 and General Robert E. Lee wanted to recapture.[185]

Ely Samuel Parker, brother of Isaac, did not participate in the war until he received a commission in June 1863. As a captain in the Union army, Parker joined General John E. Smith's command as division engineer of the Seventh Division, Seventeenth Army Corps. On September 18, he was assigned as assistant adjutant general on Grant's personal military staff.[186] He was present at the Battle of Cattanooga in November 1863, which he described in letters to his family.[187] Following this battle Parker served as Grant's military secretary until the end of the war, serving as the scribe for Lee's surrender at Appomattox Court House.[188]

Prior to the Civil War the Iroquois had long been involved in maritime trades and many served in the war in capacities from ordinary seamen to pilots. The diary of ordinary seaman William Jones describes the part his ship, the USS *Rhode Island*, took in the successful Union blockade of Confederate ports off the Carolina coast and the Battle of Fort Fisher during January 1865.[189] Jones

---

[184] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 162.

[185] Hauptman, *The Iroquois in the Civil War*, 41-42.

[186] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 176.

[187] Hauptman, *The Iroquois in the Civil War*, 50-56.

[188] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 181-182.

[189] Hauptman, *The Iroquois in the Civil War*, 59-61.

contracted bronchial pneumonia due to his exposure to the wet and cold, from which he never fully recovered, and he was injured when his left side was crushed during a naval bombardment between his ship and the Confederate Steamer *Vixen*.[190] Initially denied his pension in 1871 because the surgeon who examined him claimed he found "no evidence of disability," Jones was eventually able to receive a "half pension of $4 per month because of a severe cough and bronchial condition that were attributed to his Civil War service."[191]

The Oneida of Wisconsin

Wisconsin's Oneida are an example of how relocation resulted in the motivation to enlist. Their position in Wisconsin had been tentative since Wisconsin became a territory in 1836. In 1839, Henry Dodge, governor of Wisconsin Territory, suggested exchanging Oneida lands for lands in Indian Territory. Dodge believed this move was necessary due to the increasing numbers of white settlers and "history has shown that the Indian never prospered in the vicinity of the white man."[192] Dodge believed the Indians were an obstacle due to their location, but also maintained that because they were loyal allies to the United States they deserved protection and citizenship.[193] The fear of another removal motivated

---

[190] Hauptman, *The Iroquois in the Civil War*, 64.

[191] Ibid., 65.

[192] Hauptman and McLester, *Chief Daniel Bread*, 104.

Principal Chief Daniel Bread to work with the local Indian agent and advocate a course of acculturation. Following the construction of the first permanent Episcopal Church Bread arranged for the Episcopal bishop Jackson Kemper to visit. A friendship was developed and Kemper served as a protector of the Oneidas against those who called for their relocation up until the Civil War.[194]

Despite internal disagreements and the struggle to resist the relocation push there are still strong indications that the majority of the Oneida still felt they were allies of the United States. On July 7, 1860 *The Bay City Press* reprinted a notice posted by the Oneida inviting the public to a Fourth of July celebration, which included "a great Ball play" as well as "everything to make up a good dinner and serenade and beer."[195] On June 27, 1861 *The Appleton Motor* printed a request from Chiefs of the Oneida for the donation of an American flag. The request stated:

> To the friends of Freedom in Appleton, we the undersigned, Chiefs of the Oneidas, in view of the fact that some of our ancestors aided in the achievement of the Liberty of this country, costing them their lives, and a desire to perpetuate the celebration of the Fourth of July in a patriotic way, we make an appeal to you, to donate us a flag to be raised on that day.[196]

---

[193] Hauptman and McLester, *Chief Daniel Bread*, 105.

[194] Ibid., 106-7.

[195] "Great Celebration in the Oneida Settlement on the Forth July," *The Bay City Press*, July 7, 1860, 3.

[196] "To the Friends of Freedom in Appleton," *The Appleton Motor*, June 27, 1861, 2.

Regardless of this appeal made after the outbreak of the Civil War, the Oneida were initially reluctant to enter the war because they had received little in return from white Americans in return for their participation in the American Revolution and the War of 1812. When the Oneida did begin enlisting it was largely due to economic factors, having need of the bounties the War Department was paying having suffered two years of drought, and livestock losses due to severe winters. The War Department was paying $300 for new three-year recruits and local bounties were could be as much as $200.[197] It is estimated that out of the 1,100 reservation residents between 111 and 142 enlisted. Of these volunteers at least 46 were killed, went missing, or died of disease. Major smallpox epidemics also hit the Oneida Indian Reservation in 1862 and between late 1864 and early 1865. As a result the Oneida population declined by 4-5%.[198]

The Delaware

The Delaware living in Kansas were motivated to participate in the Civil War because, being a small, weak and often moved tribe, they had grown dependent on the U.S government for survival and had developed the strategy of "currying favor" with the "Great Father" in Washington in order to survive among the new Indian and non-Indian neighbors.[199] This was the situation following the Kansas-

---

[197] Hauptman, *The Iroquois in the Civil War*, 68-72.

[198] Hauptman and McLester, *The Oneida Indians in the Age of Allotment, 1860-1920*, 13.

Nebraska Act (1854), which brought increasing number of intruders, squatters, horse thieves and land speculators desirous of removing the Delaware from their Kansas home.[200] While 170 out of 201 eligible Delaware males between ages eighteen and forty-five volunteered for service in the Union Army the most documented Delaware of Kansas and Indian Territory served as scouts and home guards.[201]

Home Guards

When the war began, Lincoln's Secretary of War Simon Cameron Lincoln stated that, "The nature of our present national troubles, forbids the use of savages", and the idea of recruiting Native Americans was rejected.[202] After the Confederate defeat at Pea Ridge the appeals of "loyal" Creeks and Seminoles[203], who had spent the winter in overcrowded refugee camps, sick and starving, were finally supported.[204] Major General James G. Blunt was authorized "to recruit

---

[199] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 23.

[200] Ibid., 20-21.

[201] Ibid., 18-22.

[202] Alvin M. Josephy, Jr., *The Civil War in the American West,* (New York: Vintage Civil War Library, 1991), 354

[203] The Seminoles were divided, half of them desired a Confederate alliance, and half wanted to remain loyal, yet neutral. Chief Billy Bowlegs and John Chupco were opposed, but John Jumper met secretly with the Confederate commissioner Albert Pike, and "the Seminoles allied with the Confederacy on August 1, 1861." (Albert C. Ellithorpe, The First Indian Home Guards, and the Civil War on the Trans-Mississippi Frontier, edited by M. Jane Johansson, (Louisiana State University Press, 2016), 11)

Indian soldiers from among the loyal tribes in the refugee camps and on the small reservations in Kansas" for the purpose of returning the refugees to their homes, "eliminating Stand Watie's Cherokees and other small forces of Confederates that were raiding southern Kansas and southwestern Missouri, and securing the Indian Territory as a base from which Blunt could attack the new Confederate army that Major General Thomas C. Hindman was forming in Arkansas."[205]

Two Indian "Home Guard" regiments of mounted rifles in Kansas who would receive the same pay and benefits as white volunteers."[206] The First Kansas Indian Home Guards was made up of Creek and Seminole. The Second Kansas Indian Home Guards was composed of Delaware, Kickapoo, Osage, Shawnee, Seneca, and members of some of the Five Civilized Tribes. Many Confederate Indian soldiers, especially Cherokee, deserted, soon enlisting in the Second Kansas Indian Home Guards.[207]

---

[204] The Wisconsin newspaper *The Appleton Motor*, reported on Feb. 20, 1862 that Senator James Doolittle of Wisconsin presented "a joint resolution for the relief of some 5,000 loyal Creek, Chickasaw, and Choctaw Indians in Kansas who. . .were entirely destitute and almost in a state of starvation; which was adopted." ("Senator Doolittle has presented a petition from the Oneida Indians," *The Appleton Motor*, Feb. 20, 1862, 2).

[205] Josephy Jr., *The Civil War in the American West*, 354.

[206] Ibid., 354-5.

[207] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires,* 32.

The Pamunkey and the Lumbee

The Pamunkey of Virginia and the Lumbee of North Carolina were motivated to join the Union side because of their intense dislike for the South's subservient treatment of their communities.[208] White Virginians believed Indians were sympathetic to free Negroes and planning to ally with them to "against white authority." From the 1830's to the beginning of the Civil War the people of Virginia passed repressive legislation-denying them the right to serve on juries, to testify against whites, to vote and learn to read and write-, attempted to disarm the Pamunkey, and attempted to remove the Pamunkey from their reservation, claiming they had intermarried with free blacks to the point that "their Indian character had vanished." North Carolina passed the same restrictive legislation in 1835 and prohibited all "free persons of color" from owning or carrying weapons. During the war the Confederacy conscripted the Lumbee, reducing them to slave status.[209] The Pamunkey were mostly employed by the Union as guides and pilots for federal warships and transports. The Lumbee, who were coerced into Confederate labor service, operated as guerillas for the Union, sabotaging Rebel efforts.[210]

---

[208] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires,* 65.

[209] Ibid., 67-79.

[210] Ibid., 66.

Eastern Cherokee

The Eastern Cherokee were not divided, but supported the Confederacy. Their support did not stem from any of the reasons the Western Cherokee allied with the Confederacy, but came from their loyalty to one individual, William Holland Thomas. Thomas was born in North Carolina and had been adopted by neighboring Cherokee chief Yonaguska when he was twelve. When he was older he studied law and became a self-taught lawyer. He used his position to assist his Cherokee friends, and attempted to convince whites that Cherokees were "civilized." Unlike the Cherokee in Georgia the Eastern Cherokee did not live in a land of gold fields and plantation land, so there were few insisting on their relocation. Due to Thomas's assistance the New Echota Treaty included Article XII, "stipulating that Indians who 'qualified' for state citizenship not only would be exempted from expulsion but also would be entitled to the same federal compensation as those actually removed. The Indians who became the Eastern Band claimed to be North Carolina citizens."[211]

Some of the Eastern Cherokee helped track down "so-called fugitive Cherokee...In return, General Winfield Scott 'made it clear that these Indians were not to be disturbed.'" The Eastern Cherokee "survived by playing the role of 'good Indian.'" Thomas continued to help them, "insisting that they were

---

[211] William McKee Evans, "Native Americans in the Civil War: Three Experiences," in *Civil War Citizens: Race, Ethnicity, and Identity in America's Bloodiest Conflict* ed. by Susannah J. Ural, (New York University Press, 2010), 192-194.

American citizens."[212] In May of 1861, immediately after North Carolina seceded, Thomas mustered two hundred Cherokee as home guards. His contingent of Indian and white mountaineer troops became known as "Thomas's Legion of Indians and Highlanders," and at its height was made up of 2,800 men.[213] The Thomas Legion enforce Confederate conscription acts, seized provisions and hunted down Unionists. The Legion held out until after Lee surrendered at Appomattox.[214]

The Catawba

Unlike the Pumunkey and Lumbee, the Catawba of South Carolina loyally served the Confederacy. As with the Delaware in Kansas the Catawba's choice of sides in the War was based on their precarious existence. Historically tied as military allies, slave catchers and day laborers to the planters, by 1860 the Catawba had become almost totally dependent peoples whose tenuous economic, legal, and political status led them to choose the Confederacy. The Confederate bounty for enlistment, which was up to $50 in 1861, also served as an incentive, as did a history of proving oneself in war representing the highest

---

[212] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires,* 105-106.

[213] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 108.

[214] Evans, "Native Americans in the Civil War: Three Experiences," 197.

manly virtue and being a requirement for political leadership among the Catawba.[215]

Despite the fact that South Carolina had once tried to pay the Catawba to relocate to North Carolina an article full of praise was published when they joined the war effort. On February 9, 1861 the *Keowee Courier* reported:

> Our Ancient Allies- It is the proud boast of the Catawba Indians, in many respects one of the noblest tribes of the aborigines, that they have ever been the friends of the white man. . .We have a striking. . .proof of the same spirit in an offer which reached Gov. Pickens on Wednesday from John Scott, the Chief of the Catawbas remaining in South Carolina. The services of all the fighting men of this glorious remnant are offered to Gov. Pickens. . .An offer of a thousand-fold force from any other quarter would not have been more welcome than this instinctive tribute of a proud and noble race.[216]

Other newspapers, such as the *Mattoon Gazette* from Illinois, reported the news less enthusiastically: "The military services tendered to the State by the Catawba Indians of South Carolina, have been accepted by the Governor."[217] The *National Republican* responded on March 2, 1861, with:

> It may be interesting to know, in this connection, that according to the last census there was a grand total of two hundred Catawbas-men, women, and pappooses. Mills, in his statistics of South Carolina, describes the Catawba tribe as utterly degenerated and degraded, and moreover, "so generally addicted to habits of

---

[215] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 87-92.

[216] "Our Ancient Allies," *Keowee Courier,* February 9, 1861, 4.

[217] "From Charleston," *Mattoon Gazette*, February 1, 1861, 1.

> indolence and intoxication, that they are fast sinking into oblivion."[218]

While only nineteen Catawba fought in the war- there being only about fifty left in the state of South Carolina- they participated in the heaviest fighting of the war as soldiers in the Army on Northern Virginia fighting in the Peninsula Campaign, the Second Battle of Bull Run, Antietam, and in the trenches before Petersburg.[219]

The Ottawa and Ojibwa

The Ottawa and their Ojibwa neighbors enlisted in the Civil War because they hoped by doing so they might be able to readjust their treaties with the federal government. They had already lost much of their ancestral territory and as the war was being fought in 1861 and 1862, American sellers were moving in on prime farmland and forests, some of the best Indian lands.[220] One hundred and fifty Ottawa, Ojibwa, Ottawa-Ojibwa, Delaware, Huron, Oneida and Potawatomi Indians served in Company K of the First Michigan Sharpshooters between 1863 and 1865. The unit led by Lieutenant Garrett A. Gravaraet, a Franco-Ottawa Indian who was personally responsible for recruiting one-third of

---

[218] "News Items," *National Republican,* March 2, 1861, 2.

[219] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 91-94.

[220] Ibid., 133.

the company's original members. The First Michigan Sharpshooters at Spotsylvania, the Battle of the Wilderness, the Crater, through the nine-and-a half month ordeal at Petersburg and through the Appomattox campaign.[221]

The Pequot

As with the Oneida economic conditions served as a major motive in the decisions of Pequot in Connecticut joining the Union war effort. Austin George serves as an example, having been a whaler prior to the war he needed to find another way to earn a living when the Union navy purchased much of the New London whaling fleet and sank it as part of the North Atlantic blockading squadron.[222] By 1864 large bounties were being offered to volunteers, the Town of Ledyard was paying out bounties of up to $150 and the State of Connecticut was paying $600.[223] Unlike the Iroquois who served in integrated regiments, Pequot Austin George served as a member of the Thirteenth Connecticut Colored Infantry. "Colored" regiments were seriously affected by white racism, the troops were paid less than their white counter parts and received worse medical care. The Colored Troops dug ditches at Petersburg, Virginia in May 1864, and during the Battle of the Crater they "suffered more than 40 percent of

---

[221] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 134-143.

[222] Ibid., 149.

[223] Ibid., 150.

the casualties, despite the overwhelming number of white soldiers in the battle."[224] George was shot in his left shoulder during the battle, and the surgeon's report stated: "The injury has impaired the motion of the shoulder joint, unfitting him for full manual labor."[225] His invalid military pension was only $4 per month, and even though his condition continued to worsen he was never able to receive more.[226]

Other

Aside from these larger reasons of land, sovereignty, prominence, loyalty and economics there were of course personal, individual reasons. George Washington Grayson, a Creek of mixed heritage, did not enlist right away seeing no reason to because the Indian Territory enlistments were not going to fight beyond the Mississippi and Indian Territory was not currently under any threat. When Grayson did enlist it was because young men who had already enlisted were insinuating his reason for not already having enlisted was because he was afraid.[227] Grayson is the perfect example of how Native American motives and white American motives for fighting were not so different. Peer pressure was a

---

[224] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 145-156.

[225] Ibid., 157.

[226] Ibid., 160.

[227] Baird and Grayson, *A Creek Warrior for the Confederacy*, 59.

powerful factor in combat motivation, as well as the idea of honor, duty and manhood.[228] James McPherson gives an account of a Swedish immigrant who enlisted because the honor of Swedish-Americans was at stake.[229]

Grayson mentions to duty and honor twice in his autobiography. The first occurrence is when he was ordered to find a number of trusty men who would stand watch until sun down to ensure that the retreating men were not overtaken by the enemy. Not able to find anyone willing to stand watch he did so by himself, "I determined that the Creeks should not fall down (fail) on this last call to duty no matter what the cost may be. I knew of one Creek who could and would prevent such a failure being charged up against the courage and manhood of his tribe in time of war."[230] The second occurrence was during a battle and a friend of his told him that he felt relief in spotting him there as well because, "It was a sort of feeling as if the honor of the Creeks in this engagement in which we were victorious had been sufficiently vindicated."[231]

McPherson also points out that a number of me gave as their reason for fighting "our country's independence and [our children's] liberty."[232] This is also

---

[228] James M. McPherson, *For Cause & Comrades Why Men Fought in the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 13.

[229] Ibid., 25.

[230] Baird and Grayson, *A Creek Warrior for the Confederacy*, 85.

[231] Ibid., 103.

[232] McPherson, *For Cause & Comrades Why Men Fought in the Civil War*, 13.

true for a number of Native Americans. While some were economically dependent on one government or another and invested in the outcome of that conflict, most were fighting for their homes and the futures of their children. Some Creek and Cherokee may have been fighting for the right to keep their slaves, but the majority were fighting for the right to keep their homes and their sovereignty, as were the Iroquois and the Ottawa.

The West

The Civil War was not confined to the North and the South, the West played a role as well, and likewise, the Civil War had an impact on the West. It was clear that the West's growing population had to be protected from Confederates and Indians, as "the long, exposed Trans-Mississippi travel routes and the telegraph, mails, and commerce that connected the western population centers, mines, and military commands with the East."[233] Lincoln told Congress "that the West should be made 'secure for the advancing settler' and that western mineral resources should be developed "as rapidly as possible.'" Indian Commissioner William P. Dole supported the placement of "western Indians on a few reservations, out of the way of the whites." John P. Usher, the Interior Secretary, believed the military should hunt down and punish the Indians who resisted placement on reservations. According to historian Alvin Josephy Jr:

---

[233] Josephy, Jr., *The Civil War in the American West*, 231.

> In the harsh atmosphere of the Civil War emergency, the green light was given to an era of stern suppression of the tribes, whose efforts to protect their lands and freedom- and even to avoid starvation and to survive- could be regarded as interfering with the general war effort and giving aid and comfort to the Confederate enemy. In the West, little attempt was made to restrain the aggressiveness and atrocities of the Indian haters among the settlers and volunteer troops. The Indians replied with "depredations" and atrocities of their own, and the wars and violence increased.[234]

When the Civil War began the Dakota Sioux in Minnesota were on the verge of starvation. Cutworms had damaged their corn crops and from December 1861 to April 1862 they were given small amounts of flour and pork. By May 1862 food annuities were not delivered and "all of the tribes were feeling the food pinch." Some began buying food on credit from traders who charged inflated prices. They ran up as much credit as possible. When Little Crow attempted to appeal to traders and storekeepers he was told, "if they are hungry let them eat grass." In response Little Crow led his angry warriors in a war against the Americans, killing over a thousand settlers. Thirty-eight Sioux were executed out of the four hundred who had been charged for murder, "in the largest public hanging in American history."[235]

---

[234] Josephy, Jr., *The Civil War in the American West*, 231.

[235] Calloway, *First Peoples,* 342-343; Josephy, *The Civil War in the American West,* 106-109.

The motives behind the uprising appear to be inconsequential to newspapers reporting on the fate of Little Crow. The *Janesville Daily Gazette* reported:

> Little Crow was picking berries, and was shot. . .Little Crow's son, who is sixteen years of age, fled to Devil's Lake where he was captured. Little Crow was killed on the 3d, and on the 4th, the day a bounty was offered for scalps, some soldiers went out from Hutchinson and scalped him. . .Our people would have preferred to have executed this chief of murderers in a different style, but we have this consideration, that he is at least beyond executive clemency.[236]

On September 25, 1863, the *Semi-Weekly Wisconsin* announced: "The trial of Little Crow's son is progressing at the Fort. The state reward of $75 for each dead Indian, has been increased to $200."[237] When Little Crow's son was eventually released from prison, a lack of understanding regarding the uprising was shown when the *Chicago Tribune* included an article stating, "The prisoners here evidently do not comprehend what they have lost in rebelling against the Government. Only those on the plains, exposed to hunger and every other privation, understand that no more annuities will be allowed them, and that to their own idle hands they must look for wherewithal to support the inner and outer man."[238]

---

[236] "Last Night's Report," *Janesville Daily Gazette*, August 14, 1863, 2.

[237] "Afternoon Report," *Semi-Weekly Wisconsin,* September 25, 1863, 3.

[238] "Visit to Camp M'Clellan," *Chicago Tribune*, October 20, 1865, 3.

The following year further atrocities were carried out against Native Americans in the West. Thousands of settlers who came to Colorado after gold was discovered in 1858 were afraid that an Indian uprising would occur once soldiers went east to fight in the Civil War. On November 29, 1864, a peaceful village of some 550 Southern Cheyenne and Arapaho Indians on Sand Creek, in Union-ruled Colorado were massacred by Colorado cavalrymen, led by Colonel John M. Chivington. Despite the fact that Chief Black Kettle raised an American flag and a white flag the soldiers butchered some 270 men women and children and "desecrated the bodies of the Indian wounded and dead, bashing in the skulls of babies, mutilating and cutting up corpses, and taking scalps, skin, and genital organs as souvenirs." Black Kettle's wife was shot nine times.[239]

At first newspapers like the *Chicago Tribune* reported the massacre as "From the far West- A great victory over hostile Indians" and that "The Indians were about 10,000 strong."[240] Later newspapers such as the *Hartford Courant* reported, "This attack on the defenseless savages was one of the most cruel in history. The Indians claimed to be quiet and at peace, yet the command pitched into a village of lodges, and the most of these victims were women and papooses."[241]

---

[239] Calloway, *First Peoples,* 343-344; Josephy, *The Civil War in the American West,* 230.

[240] "From the Far West. A Great Victory over Hostile Indians," *Chicago Tribune*, December 30, 1864,1.

[241] "Slaughter of Indians," *Hartford Courant*, December 29, 1864, 2.

The Montana Post however, stated:

> Is there any American so barbarously as not to know that every Indian is systematically taught from the cradle or rather the back board to which he is laced when young, that murder is merit; scalps, enviable trophies; plunder legitimate; the abduction of women and their violation, a desirable achievement, and so on through the long catalogue of a "poor Indian's" barbaritics?[242]

The article continues, "We would recommend a handsome trophy be raised to the 3d Colorado; promotion accorded to Col. Chivington, and that all the disposable force of the Republic should be hurled, like an avalanche, upon these base marauders. Mercy is a virtue incomprehensible to a savage: fear he understands."[243] A strange response to an unprovoked massacre, and not long after bounties were being offered for scalps in response to the Sioux uprising.

After the war former Union General William T. Sherman was put in command of the territory between the Mississippi River and the Rockies. His plan was for "the 'strong, vigorous men' mustered out of the military" to substitute 'for the useless Indians the intelligent owners of productive farms and cattle-ranches'" in the far West.[244]

---

[242] "The Poor Indian," *The Montana Post*, February 4, 1865, 2.

[243] Ibid., 2.

[244] Sandweiss, "Still Picture, Moving Stories: Reconstruction Comes to Indian Country", 160.

Conclusion

During the nineteenth century a racial and ethnic hierarchy was part of everyday life in America. There were people who were eventually able to rise higher, and there were others who remained at the bottom. Some of these groups fought in the Civil War to improve their positions, Native Americans fought predominately for survival. The histories that are not told are as important as those that are. Groups and events that were previously left out of the narrative are being reintroduced, but the involvement of Native American soldiers, Hispanic soldiers and Asian and Pacific Islander soldiers, is often left out of the mainstream narrative.

America's treatment of Native Americans would also serve as introduction to certain foreign policy matters. As Americans moved or disposed of Native Americans who they viewed as being in the way of land or resources, they would do the same in the years that followed in places like Hawaii, the Philippines, Latin America, and the Middle East. Places that were controlled by people who were not white, or could be designated primitive and uncivilized, who needed America's help.

CHAPTER THREE

AFTER THE CIVIL WAR

The Oneida's Civil War service made no difference to those who wanted their land. In 1866, Morgan Martin, who had been a strong proponent of removing the Oneida from Wisconsin since the 1830s, became the federal Indian agent in Green Bay. In his annual report the following year he claimed, "that the Oneidas were so acculturated that they had lost their Indian manners and customs." He wrote that, "they were 'almost equal' to those whites in a 'state of advancement' and 'better qualified to enjoy political rights than the freedman, or even the poorer of the white race who mingle with them.'" Martin believed that allotment would serve as a "'cure' for the Oneidas, claiming that it would instill individual initiative, encourage the respect for private property, and allow for the proceeds of land sales to be applied to an increase in the school fund for the Indians."[245]

Prior to this report, in 1866, Chief Cornelius Hill (who opposed the leadership of principal Chief Daniel Bread, who eventually believed that allotment was unavoidable[246]) wrote to President Andrew Johnson, reminding him of "the Oneida military sacrifice in the Civil War" and expressing "the fear that the President had 'forgotten the promises'" he had given them. In 1867, Hill and six

---

[245] Hauptman & McLester III, *Chief Daniel Bread*, 150-151.

[246] Hauptman & McLester III, *Oneida Indians*, 90.

other chiefs wrote to the President again, “insisting that they had the firm intention to live in Wisconsin forever and that they opposed selling any land. . . to anyone. . .In a veiled threat, they suggested that these actions could lead to trouble and violence.”[247]

Nevertheless, in 1870 a bill was sent to Congress proposing the allotment of the Oneida Indian Reservation as well as the removal of the Oneida. While this bill failed it set in motion the passage of the Dawes General Allotment Act of 1887 and the Oneida Indian Reservation lost nearly all of its 65,000 acres in 1892.[248] The service of the Delaware was also ignored. Interior Department officials advocated the immediate removal of the Delaware from the entire state of Kansas; Nine hundred eighty-five Delaware left Kansas between 1867 and 1869 went to live in the Cherokee Nation in Indian Territory, where they had to contend with more powerful Indian nations who co-occupied the same lands. To become full members of the Cherokee Nation with the same rights and immunities the Delaware had to pay the Cherokee Nation.[249]

The Cherokee Nation was the most devastatingly affected by the war. After four years of Civil War fighting, economic displacement, refugee conditions, impoverishment, starvation, as well as epidemics of smallpox and other diseases

---

[247] Hauptman & McLester III, *Chief Daniel Bread*, 155.

[248] Ibid., 83.

[249] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 38.

the Cherokee population in the West declined from 21,000 to 15,000 people.[250] By 1863 nearly seven thousand Cherokee refugees were at Union-held Fort Gibson in Indian Territory. As early as 1863, one-third of married women were widows and one-fourth of the children in the nation were orphans. By the end of the war 300,000 head of cattle had been stolen.[251] Iroquois living in Indian Territory felt they were forced by their location to sign a treaty with the Confederacy they not show any sympathy with the rebellion however, and many left their homes and spent the war as refugees. [252]

The Cherokee were treated as one people, as if they had all supported the Confederacy. Since the Cherokee Nation had signed a treaty with the Confederacy it was insisted that it had forfeited all rights of every kind, character, and description- annuities, lands, and protection- which had been promised and guaranteed to them by the United States.[253] Washington policy makers used this same argument after the war as an excuse for forcing Iroquois land cessions claiming that by making treaties with the Confederacy they had forfeited all of the rights they had previously had under treaties with the United States.[254]

---

[250] Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 42.

[251] Ibid., 42.

[252] Ibid., 85-99.

[253] Confer, *The Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*, 149.

[254] Hauptman, *The Iroquois in the Civil War*, 98.

After the Civil War the schism among the Creeks did not go away. The Creeks who had relocated to the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations were able to come back “to their own country from which they had been absent so long.”[255] According to Grayson, “The work of reconstruction. . . proved to be a most difficult task. Those who had joined and sympathized with the North. . .very naturally entertained a feeling that, as they were victors in war and we coming up from the losing side, they should in the administration of government exercise superior privileges to those accorded the late adherents of the South.”[256] The division that was present during the war remained as a new constitution in 1867 caused the tribe to divide into groups that either supported or opposed the governmental system instituted by the document. The old McIntosh party was joined by fellow tribesmen previously identified with the Upper Towns, and they embraced the new order, calling themselves “constitutionalists.” Other Creeks objected and thought of themselves as “Loyalists.” The Sands Rebellion of 1871 and the Isparhecher Rebellion of 1881 originated from what was virtually the metis versus non-metis division within the tribe that had existed during the Creek’s participation in the Civil War.[257]

---

[255] Baird and Grayson, *A Creek Warrior for the Confederacy*, 117-120.

[256] Ibid., 123-4.

[257] Ibid., 5-6.

In 1866, the North Carolina legislature permitted the Eastern Cherokee to remain in the state, but did not grant them citizenship. Following the 1868 Radical Constitution of North Carolina however, the Eastern Cherokee paid taxes, giving them citizenship under the requirements of the Fourteenth Amendment. They also voted until 1900, when the state Constitution was amended to disfranchise them and African Americans.[258] The Lumbees, however, continued to vote despite "the white supremacist tide that had swept the South."[259]

The Dawes Act, Boarding Schools, Question of Citizenship

Regardless of the side they fought on or their reasons for fighting, things became more complicated for Native Americans following the Civil War. Following the passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments there were questions regarding the legal status of Native Americans. There was increased pressure to "civilize" and assimilate Native Americans, which the federal government believed would be possible by dividing their land into private allotments and having their children sent to boarding schools.

One of the questions that emerged regarding the legal status of Native Americans was whether or not they could vote. In 1876 two Oneida Indians,

---

[258] Evans, "Native Americans in the Civil War: Three Experiences," 198.

[259] Ibid., 207.

Abraham Elm and Louis Doxtator, were arrested when they attempted to vote in a congressional election. Elm, who had been born in Oneida, New York had fought in the Civil War as a member of Company B of the Fifth Vermont Volunteer Infantry.[260] At the time they attempted to vote they lived on the reservation in Lennox, Madison county where they had voted several times before. Following their trial in Rochester, New York, "the judge decided that an Indian residing on a reservation and in charge of an agent is an alien, and therefore has no right to vote."[261]

Upon appeal, the U.S. District Court concluded that Elm was a citizen. Judge Wallace ruled that, in regards to the 14th Amendment

> Indians who maintain their tribal relations, are the subjects of independent governments, and, as such, not in the jurisdiction of the United States, within the meaning of the amendment, because the Indian nations have always been regarded as distinct political communities, between which and our government certain international relations were to be maintained. These relations are established by treaties to the same extent as with foreign powers. They are treated as sovereign communities, possessing and exercising the right of free deliberation and action, but, in consideration of protection, owing a qualified subjection to the United States.[262]

However, Wallace believed that because the New York state legislature had allotted the Oneida Indian Reservation after the majority of the tribe had

---

[260] Hauptman & McLester III, *Oneida Indians*, 249

[261] "A Rather novel case," *The Wheeling Daily Intelligencer*, May 22, 1877, 2.

[262] Lawresorce.org. United States V. Elm, accessed February 20, 2017, https://law.resource.org/pub/us/case/reporter/F.Cas/0025.f.cas/0025.f.cas.1006.pdf

relocated to Wisconsin, and as such “these Indians were no longer culturally, linguistically, or socially set apart from the surrounding non-Indian population, and that a distinct Oneida community no longer existed in New York.”[263] Furthermore, “because Indians in this state are subject to taxation, he is a citizen, within the meaning of the fourteenth amendment. This conclusion is sanctioned not only by the language of the fourteenth amendment, but is fortified by other legislation by congress concerning citizenship.”[264]

In 1884 there was another court case regarding the legality of Native Americans voting. In this case John Elk, a Winnebago Indian, left the reservation he was born on and moved to Omaha, Nebraska. He claimed U.S. Citizenship and attempted to register to vote but was denied by Charles Wilkins. In the Supreme Court Case *Elk v. Wilkins,* it was stated that

> Though the plaintiff alleges that he "had fully and completely surrendered himself to the jurisdiction of the United States," he does not allege that the United States accepted his surrender, or that he has ever been naturalized, or taxed, or in any way recognized or treated as a citizen, by the State or by the United States. Nor is it contended by his counsel that there is any statute or treaty that makes him a citizen.[265]

---

[263] Hauptman & McLester III, *Oneida Indians*, 249.

[264] Lawresorce.org. United States V. Elm, accessed February 20, 2017, https://law.resource.org/pub/us/case/reporter/F.Cas/0025.f.cas/0025.f.cas.1006.pdf.

[265] Justia. US Supreme Court. Elk V. Wilkins, accessed February 20, 2017, https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/112/94/case.html.

Therefore, a Native American could not put off their "alien and dependent condition" at will and "without the action or assent of the United States."[266] The legal complications involved in deciding who gets to vote is indicative of Anderson's argument that the nation "is an imagined political community" and that it is "limited because even the largest of them. . . has finite, if elastic boundaries."[267] These boundaries include laws which separate people into groups who belong and groups who do not. Despite Abraham Elm's Civil War service his membership in imagined community was questioned.

> They were never deemed citizens of the United States, except under explicit provisions of treaty or statute to that effect, either declaring a certain tribe, or such members of it as chose to remain behind on the removal of the tribe westward, to be citizens, or authorizing individuals of particular tribes to become citizens on application to a court of the United States for naturalization, and satisfactory proof of fitness for civilized life.[268]

The question of citizenship became more complicated following the passage of the Dawes Allotment Act in 1887. The intention was for Indians to own land as private property, that the only way they could ever be civilized was to dissolve their tribal organizations and no longer own land communally. Allotments of 160 acres would be assigned to the head of a family, with younger

---

[266] Justia. US Supreme Court. Elk V. Wilkins, accessed February 20, 2017, https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/112/94/case.html.

[267] Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6-7.

[268] Justia. US Supreme Court. Elk V. Wilkins, accessed February 20, 2017, https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/112/94/case.html.

people and orphans receiving fewer acres. To prevent the land from being sold however, the government would hold title to it for twenty-five years. The land that was “surplus” could be sold. Also, citizenship would be granted to all Indians who were allottees and became “civilized” by abandoning their tribal ways.[269]

Indian heirs were permitted to sell inherited land without the consent of the secretary of the interior in 1902, and four years later Congress passed the Burke Act, which declared that Native Americans who had been deemed “‘competent’ to manage their own affairs” by the secretary of the interior permission “could be granted patents in fee simple, which meant they no longer had to wait twenty-five years before they could sell their allotments.” The Commissioner of Indian Affairs established “competency commissions” in 1913, which issued fee patents to Indians judged competent to sell their land.” [270]

With the Dawes Act also came Boarding Schools. A former Union cavalry officer, Richard Henry Pratt, believed that segregating Indians on reservations was wrong and that by sending Native American children off their reservations to boarding schools would “force the Indian to bridge the gap from ‘barbarism’ and ‘savagery’ to civilization.”[271] These policies were favored by reform groups such as the Indian Rights Association, the Women’s National Indian Association, and

---

[269] Calloway, *First Peoples*, 420.

[270] Ibid., 421.

[271] Hauptman & McLester III*, Oneida Indians*, 40

the Lake Mohonk Conferences of Friends of the Indian, all of which believed it was possible to “kill the Indian but save the man.”[272]

Pratt established the first boarding school in 1879 at Carlisle, Pennsylvania. The school incorporated academic and industrial training. Of the almost 10,700 students who attended 758 graduated, 118 of which were Oneidas.[273] One Oneida student, Dennison Wheelock, was greatly influenced by Pratt during his time at Carlisle. Wheelock believed that Native Americans were capable of becoming productive, tax-paying U.S. citizens, who should have full participation in American society, and who did not need the paternalistic reformers, BIA, or the Dawes Act. Wheelock also spoke against learning native languages even though he spoke the Oneida language. At sixteen he stated these languages had, “no use in the world, and should not be kept any longer.”[274]

World War I and Citizenship

The question of citizenship came up again when the United States entered World War I. Following the Civil War, the army continued to employ Indian soldiers as scouts, trackers, interpreters, and advisers. According to historian Thomas Britten:

---

[272] Hauptman & McLester III*, Oneida Indians*, 40

[273] Ibid., 53

[274] Ibid., 120.

> Native Americans chose to enlist as scouts for several reasons. As in colonial times, weaker tribes saw alliances with whites as essential to their survival vis-à-vis stronger tribes. Thus the Pawnees could readily be recruited to fight the Sioux, their traditional tribal foe. Another reason was their understanding that more could be obtained through alliance with the Anglos than through resistance. Indian scouts not only earned the pay of cavalrymen but also received food rations, clothing, and ammunition. Combined with annuity payments, such earnings often allowed their families to enjoy a better standard of living than that of other tribal members.[275]

On June 5, 1917, the first call was made for all men between the ages twenty-one and thirty-one to register for the draft. This applied to Native Americans possessing citizenship as well. This presented a series of problems, the foremost being how to determine the citizenship status of Native American registrants. Other problems included being able to notify the Native Americans who lived on remote reservations and how to communicate with those who did not speak English.[276]

There were many Native Americans who did not know if they were citizens, and many who believed if they were citizens in regards to registering for the draft then they should be enfranchised. Guidelines were eventually drawn up to aid in determining a Native American's citizenship status. The guidelines were:

> Indians whose trust or restrictive fee patents were dated prior to May 8, 1906, were considered citizens as provided in the Dawes Act of 1887; Indians whose trust or restrictive fee patents were

---

[275] Thomas A. Britten, *American Indians in World War I: At War and at Home* (Albuquerque, New University of New Mexico Press, 1999), 10-11.

[276] Ibid., 50.

> dated after May 8, 1906, and who had received patents in fee for their allotments were citizens by virtue of the competency clause in the Burke Act; every Indian born within the territorial limits of the United States who had voluntarily lived apart from his people and had adopted the habits of "civilized life" were considered a citizen; minor children of parents who had become citizens upon allotment, and children born to Indian citizens were also considered American citizens.[277]

When registration boards were unable to determine someone's citizenship status they were instructed to declare that person a non-citizen, preferring the possibility of mislabeling someone than drafting someone who was not a citizen. There were, however, noncitizen Indians who wanted to enlist and were eventually permitted to do so. [278] One such individual, Francis Nelson, an Ogala Sioux from the Pine Ridge Reservation, wrote to Secretary of War Baker in February 1918, requesting permission to enlist stating he was willing to "fight for his country and to die. . .I think lots of our country for I was born here in America and being a Real American I will fight and die for it." (The fact that the Sioux have a long history of proving themselves strong warriors in battle may also have played a part in this letter.)[279]

As there were similarities between Native Americans who fought in the Civil War and other racial and ethnic groups, so too were there similarities during

---

[277] Britten, *American Indians in World War I*, 54.

[278] Ibid., 55-8.

[279] Ibid., 65.

World War I. The claims that war was for self-determination and democracy while Native Americans did not have those rights was not lost on Dr. Carlos Montezuma, a Yavapai physician and reform activist, who believed Indians should only fight if they want to and that the U.S. should not force any to fight if they did not want to. [280] Several tribal leaders also resented the draft, believing it violated past treaties and encroached on tribal rights.[281]

While the Eastern Cherokee, who lived in the mountains of the Qualla Boundary Reservation in North Carolina, occasionally voted in local elections, their citizenship status was unclear. Nearly twenty-three hundred of them were disinterested in the war. Some questioned whether the Eastern Cherokee had an obligation to register for the draft, while others claimed they were exempted because they could not speak English. After Superintendent James Henderson convinced them that they were citizens over one hundred registered for the draft, almost seventy of which served in the war, and half of those had been drafted.[282]

Indian boarding schools served as an important source for recruiting Native Americans. While attending these schools most of the students were subjected “to a regimented lifestyle complete with uniforms, military drill, and strict discipline.” With their emphasis on patriotism, and encouragement from

---

[280] Britten, *American Indians in World War I*, 61-2.

[281] Ibid., 63.

[282] Ibid., 67.

"enthusiastic school administrators", boarding schools became "automatic recruiting stations."[283] While the records are incomplete, 1,352 out of a total 6,598 Native American veterans recorded by Joseph K. Dixon, the Office of Indian Affairs, and the U.S. Army's Historical Section, "were documented as having attended a federal boarding school."[284]

The Society of American Indians (SAI) supported the war effort, viewing it as an opportunity for Native Americans to win respect and appreciation. By the war's end "the Indian will have proved himself a man as other men and able to cooperate in any activity America may demand."[285] SAI leader and noted Seneca anthropologist Arthur C. Parker wrote, "the Indian fights because he loves his freedom. . .his country, his liberties, his ideals, and his manhood are assailed by the brutal hypocrisy of Prussianism." [286] The lure of excitement and adventure, as well as economic and employment opportunities enticed Native Americans to enlist. Britten states that:

> The habitual unemployment and lack of opportunities that characterized many of the country's Indian reservations. . .A comparison of salaries provides compelling evidence why many Native Americans selected military service over reservation employment. A Native American employed either privately or by the government in 1916 earned an annual average income of $91.66. A year later the average earnings increased slightly to $100.55. A

---

[283] Britten, *American Indians in World War I*, 65-66; Susan Applegate Krouse, *North American Indians in the Great War* (University of Nebraska, 2007), 24-25.

[284] Krouse, *North American Indians in the Great War*, 24-25.

[285] Britten, *American Indians in World War I,* 61.

[286] Ibid., 64.

> first-year sailor in the United States Navy, meanwhile, could expect to earn at least $200.00 a year, and the average pay for enlisted men was $528.00. . .In addition, after four years of military service, veterans had the opportunity of joining a reserve unit and receiving a retainer pay of $50.00 annually. Thus, military service offered young Native American men a chance for economic mobility and a more stable financial future.[287]

As was the case for many, not just Native Americans, and not just in regards to World War I, money was an important incentive.

The Onondaga, by themselves, (emphasizing that they still considered themselves to be an independent nation) declared war on Germany at the end of July, 1918, "for the imprisonment of 17 members of the tribe at the outbreak of the war in 1914."[288] The Indians, employed as part of a "Wild West" show, were mistaken for Russian or Serbian spies.[289] They "were insulted and beaten by the Germans and Austrians and were finally imprisoned for their own protection."[290] The language that some newspapers used regarding this is telling of a dismissive and paternalistic attitude. According to *The Kingston Daily Freeman*:

> Onondagas on the war path. The Onondaga tribe of Iroquois Indians is the 24th "nation" to declare war on Germans. Americans and Germans alike may be amused on the reception of the news but the Onondagas are quite serious: for they claim the sovereignty of a separate nation under a treaty signed by George Washington

---

[287] Britten, *American Indians in World War I,* 62.

[288] "Onondagas to Declare War on Huns, Who Made 17 Indians Prisoners," *El Paso Herald*, Aug 1, 1918, 1.

[289] Britten, *American Indians in World War I,* 62.

[290] "Onondagas to Declare War on Huns, Who Made 17 Indians Prisoners," *El Paso Herald*, Aug 1, 1918, 1.

> when he was President. Ever since the Onondaga tribe has considered itself an independent ally of the United States and our government has 'good humoredly' acquiesced.[291]

Similar language was used when the Goshute/Gosiute resisted the draft. *The Des Moines Register* reported, "Nevada squaws go on warpath in effort to resist draft law. Would burn the Goshute Agency when seven are taken by US officers."[292] Similarly, at a later date the *Chicago Daily Tribune* reported, "Utah Indians reported to have gone on the warpath. . .For the third time in less than eighteen months Goshute Indians on the Ibapah reservation near Deep Creek, Utah have gone on the warpath."[293]

Prior to and during World War I newspapers praised Oneida Indians, and felt the need to point out when they wanted to fight, when they enlisted and when they were killed. Before the U.S entered World War I the *Green Bay Press-Gazette* reported on June 26, 1916:

> Oneida Indians are desirous of entering militia company; would volunteer. . .A.A. Elm, an Oneida Indian, declared that 10 of the men on the reservation were anxious to join some militia company for service in Mexico. He asked Senator Tim Burke Saturday afternoon whether the men could join here. Mr. Elm was told that there were vacancies in the Appleton and Oconto companies, and the 10 Oneidas would be welcomed there. Elm said that his men would join as soon as possible. Many men from the reservation

---

[291] "Onondagas on the War Path," *The Kingston Daily Freeman*, Aug 14, 1918, 4.

[292] "Nevada Squaws Go on Warpath in Effort to Resist Draft Law," *The Des Moines Register,* Feb 22, 1918, 3.

[293] "Utah Indians Reported to Have Gone on Warpath," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, Oct 7, 1918, 6.

> enlisted in the Civil War, and did valiant service for the flag in the conflict.[294]

On April 4, 1917 The *Green Bay Press-Gazette* reported: "Oneida Indians would organize Redskin Regiment. If there is to be any fighting by the United States army, Oneida Indians want to get into the Fray. . .Jonas Wheelock captain of the Carlisle football team several years, and Jonas Metoxin, famous gridiron hero, are leaders in the movement to organize a troop of Oneidas."[295] According to the *Green Bay-Press Gazette* on June 21, 1917, *"*Oneida Indian is Carlisle graduate killed at front. Ernest W. Kick, a full blooded Oneida Indian, whose home was in the reservation near this city, was the first Carlisle school graduate to fall while serving against the Germans in France, it was learned here today."[296] On August 27, 1917 *The York Daily* recounted, "Oneida Indian accepted…Derfus Shenandore, an Oneida Indian, working in the plant of the Acme Wagon works at Emigsville, announced his willingness to take up arms against the Kaiser."[297] The fact that people believed these numerous stories were news worthy is indicative of a desire to show that there was some sort of unity in America during this time.

---

[294] "Oneida Indians are Desirous of Entering Militia Company; Would Volunteer," *Green Bay Press-Gazette*, Jun 26, 1916, 12.

[295] "Oneida Indians Would Organize Redskin Regiment," *Green Bay Press-Gazette*, April 4, 1917, 1.

[296] *"*Oneida Indian is Carlisle Graduate Killed at Front," *Green Bay Press-Gazette*, Jun 21, 1917, 1.

[297] "Oneida Indian Accepted," *The York Daily*, Aug 22, 1917, 2.

At this same time however, the Federal Competency Commission came to Oneida. By 1917 the reservation which had once been 65,400 acres had lost over 50,000. A group of activists, referred to as the Indian Party, was the most vocal in opposing the conversion of trust lands to fee patents.[298] (The end of trust restrictions meant the Oneida lands would become subject to tax burdens they could not afford, which would result in foreclosures and selling of property.[299]) This group was led by Paul Doxtator, who was a Civil War veteran as was his brother George and his father Cornelius. There was a general feeling among the party that the whites were trying to beat them out of their property while their "young men were preparing to go overseas to fight the Germans."[300] In 1918 Paul wrote to President Wilson, attempting to appeal to the President's sense of patriotism he wrote "that the Doxtators had fought on the American side at Bunker Hill in the American Revolution, had been killed at the Battle of Chippawa in the War of 1812, had served in the Civil War. And were now overseas fighting in World War I." Paul's "son John was then a doughboy in the American Expeditionary Force." His appeal fell on deaf ears once again.[301]

---

[298] Hauptman & McLester III, *Oneida Indians*, 200.

[299] Ibid., 6-7.

[300] Ibid., 211.

[301] Ibid., 219-220.

The exact number of Native Americans who fought in World War I is not known for certain, but it is estimated that over twelve thousand served in the U.S. military, even though many of them "were not U.S. citizens at the time and did not enjoy the benefits of enfranchisement."[302] One attempt to document Indian military service was made by Joseph K. Dixon. Dixon was an advocate for Native American rights and believed that his efforts to gather information from Native American veterans in the form of questionnaires, interviews, letters and photographs would help them to finally attain U.S. citizenship. Advocates like Dixon believed citizenship to be the greatest hope for Native Americans, because once they were enfranchised they would have "a greater say in their own individual affairs. . . Indian people themselves were increasingly calling for enfranchisement, and their participation in World War I was one way they chose to demonstrate their eagerness to defend their country and their ability to take control of their own affairs, without government supervision."[303]Dixon gathered information on 2,846 Native American servicemen between 1917 and 1926, and his set of records (housed at the William Hammond Mathers Museum of Indiana University), "is the only one that provides an Indian viewpoint on their experiences during World War I and immediately thereafter. . .These records. . . offer a rare opportunity to hear directly from Indian veterans themselves

---

[302] Krouse, *North American Indians in the Great War*, 5.

[303] Ibid., 7.

regarding their experiences in the war and their frustrations with the U.S. government."[304]

As was the case during the Civil War, for some Native Americans military service was a way to maintain "the longstanding warrior traditions that are integral to many tribes." Private Simon Cusick, a Tuscarora, listed his ancestors' military service when giving an account of his experiences. He had ancestors who fought in the Revolutionary War, and was related to Cornelius Cusick, "who 'was made Captain during the Civil War and during the Spanish War. . .was made Colonel in the United States Army.' Cusick connected himself to his lineage of warriors by adding, 'and myself served in the World War 1915-1918.'"[305]

James Hawk, a Sioux from Pine Ridge, South Dakota, told Dixon, "I wanted to see the old thing through. My grandfather was a chief and was in the Custer battle and at the battle of Wounded Knee, but I wanted to be in any battle that would wound the Germans."[306] Another Sioux, Fred Fast Horse from Rosebud Reservation, had a similar answer, "When they drafted me, I wanted to go because my people were fighters. My father was a chief and fought Custer, and I wanted to go and fight the Germans because they would come over here

---

[304] Krouse, *North American Indians in the Great War*, 6.

[305] Ibid., 21.

[306] Ibid., 22.

and destroy our free Government." (Fast Horse was drafted even though he was not a citizen).[307]

Some Native Americans who enlisted felt a desire to demonstrate loyalty to the U.S. Charles Sorrell, a Shoshone, stated, "We wanted to do our share in the big fight, and we tried to do it."[308] Ollie Kinney, a Mohawk, explained why he enlisted even though he was forty-one, "I went in the war because of the pressure upon my soul to help my country. I was too old to go into the ranks, but I pressed my case until they gave me a place where I could do something."[309]

Many Native American veterans "hoped that their service would bring about greater justice for Indian people."[310] Sam Thundercloud, a Winnebago, stated, "I am fighting for the rights of a country that had not done right by my people." Franklin Torres, an Apache, told Dixon, "I went into this war because I wanted to win liberty for my country, even though they would not give liberty to my people." John Whirlwind Horse, an Oglala Sioux, commented during his interview: "I was told that I was a ward of the Government, that I had no rights and that I must go and fight. I said, 'all right. If I have no rights, this county must have its rights, and I will go fight for the rights of a country that will not give me

---

[307] Krouse, *North American Indians in the Great War*, 23.

[308] Ibid., 18.

[309] Ibid., 19.

[310] Ibid., 17.

my rights.'" Chauncey Powless, an Oneida, declared, "I went in to do my share, and that share was to end the war and give liberty to all people, especially my people." (Neither Torres, Whirlwind Horse, or Powless were citizens when they were drafted. Prisoners of war also served in the war. Dixon documented two Apaches who had been drafted or enlisted even though they were identified as prisoners of war.[311]) Felix Renville, a Sissiton Sioux, declared, "The Nation ought now to recognize our valor as fighters and make us one of the people."[312]

Perhaps the most telling account comes from Leander Frank One Stand, a Miami, who stated:

> I think it benefited our people. The war was carried on for the benefit of humanity. I was glad that I was in it and did my bit. While I wear the scars of a wound and while I wear one wound stripe, I would gladly carry more wound scars and wear more wound stripes than the one I have had they needed to do the business. The war will help my people because the country will feel that we staked all to help win freedom, and now we are counting on the country to give us that freedom. They must and they will see to it that we are fairly dealt with.[313]

Unfortunately, One Stand's hopes and the hopes of many Native American veterans, were unfulfilled. The war had given them the opportunity to be warriors, but "winning their freedom would prove much more elusive for most Indian

---

[311] Krouse, *North American Indians in the Great War,* 158.

[312] Ibid., 33-34.

[313] Ibid., 34.

veterans."[314] According to Britten, when they returned home, the Native American veterans

> received the praise and admiration of a grateful nation. Provost Marshal General Enoch H. Crowder commended Native Americans for demonstrating their "traditional aptitude" for a military career and for "nobly showing their zeal for the great cause." Former Army Chief of Staff Hugh L. Scott added that Indian soldiers "played a higher part in the war on the side of patriotism than the ordinary white man" and that "we may indeed all be proud of our red race and its record in the World War." …In the years following World War I, the federal government awarded several Indian tribes with American flags and certificates of appreciation.[315]

Despite this praise and appreciation, many Native American veterans "returned home to reservations plagued with persistent problems such as high unemployment and illiteracy, and with few prospects for upward mobility." Many were disillusioned, their "return to government indifference, disenfranchisement, and reservation squalor, in many respects, paralleled that of black veterans who returned to discrimination, poverty, and Jim Crow."[316]

Their sacrifices in the war did result in their being allowed to petition for U.S. citizenship following November 6, 1919.[317] However, the measure restricted citizenship to veterans "and required Native Americans to go through a tedious,

---

[314] Krouse, *North American Indians in the Great War,* 34.

[315] Britten, *American Indians in World War I,* 159-160.

[316] Ibid., 162.

[317] Krouse, *North American Indians in the Great War*, 154.

bureaucratic process to gain certificates of citizenship." The Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 extended citizenship to all American Indians "quickly and painlessly."[318] This act, however, did not fully enfranchise Native Americans. As John Collier (who was with the American Indian Defense Association) noted, the act gave "the Indians no privileges save, where State Laws permit, the ballot." Individual states would decide whether or not to give Native Americans the right to vote, and some states would deny them this right until the 1960s.

The 1924 act also did nothing to abolish the control the government had over Indian land and assets held in trust. General citizenship did not grant Native Americans "true equality and access to the political process." In 1925 Dixon wrote to the U.S. attorney general, noting the limitations that placed on Native Americans he questioned how

> Indians who were now citizens could continue to be considered under the guardianship of the United States, how they could continue to be prohibited from choosing their own political leaders, and how they could be forbidden to practice their own religious ceremonies. He concluded his letter by stating, "At present there can be little doubt that the curtailment of the privileges and rights of Indian citizens is in direct violation of the Constitution." Despite his protests, and those of many others, American citizenship for Indians remained an elusive and limited privilege.[319]

---

[318] Britten, *American Indians in World War I,* 180.

[319] Krouse, *North American Indians in the Great War,* 164.

CONCLUSION

The military historian Bell Wiley described the contributions of Native American military service to the Confederacy during the Civil War as "'admittedly insignificant and marked by large-scale defection.' While recognizing Indian gallantry in combat for the Union, Wiley insisted that the Indians 'were often slovenly in dress, careless of equipment, neglectful of camp duties and indifferent to prescribed routine.'"[320] While mainstream historical narratives often ignore or downplay Native American involvement as American allies in American Wars, Native Americans never forgot. Before their involvement in the Civil War the Oneida of Wisconsin celebrated the 4th of July. An article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette also shows how they retained their experiences in the Civil War:

> A member of the scientific staff of the Heye Museum was recently visiting the Menomini Indians in Wisconsin and was amazed at the number of veterans of the Civil War he found among them. There is one chapter of the Grand Army of the Republic which has a membership almost exclusively Indian, and these old soldiers were able to tell most interesting stories of the war from their own peculiar point of view.[321]

Laurence Hauptman and L. Gordon McLester III also cited three stories about the Civil War, which had been collected by the Works Progress Administration (WPA), in *The Oneida Indians in the Age of Allotment, 1860-1920*. These stories

---

[320] Hauptman, ed. *A Seneca Indian in the Union Army: The Civil War Letters of Sergeant Isaac Newton Parker, 1861-1865,* 19.

[321] Frederic J Haskin, "Studying the Indian," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, August 9, 1916, 4.

show the effect that the war had on the Oneida, even if their sacrifices were not part of the mainstream historical narrative.

While the United States showed appreciation to Native Americans for their service in World War I, and even though they were granted citizenship in 1924, Native Americans still did not have equal rights, and they were still denied the right to vote in a number of states. Native Americans became stereotypes and movie characters while they were still living in poverty and exclusion. Native Americans have continued to fight in Euro-American wars, and despite the fact that (approximately) 25,000 fought in World War II, 41,000 fought in Vietnam, and 24,000 fought in Operation Desert Storm, the U.S. continued to make laws infringing on their lands and rights.[322] Since the earliest European arrivals, when Native Americans allied with the European settlers, they did so if they believed they could gain something by it, even if it was just to maintain the status quo. Even before some Native Americans fought for reasons of inclusion and citizenship the majority fought for their land and survival, and these things continued to be threatened.

Following World War, I a research team investigated the conditions of Indian Reservations, and produced the “Meriam Report” in 1928. This report “affirmed that Indians on reservations were poverty stricken, were receiving poor education and health care, and that the B.I.A. was ignoring these conditions.” In

---

[322] Devon A. Mihesuah, *American Indians: Stereotypes & Realities*, (Atlanta, GA: Clarity International, 2004), 55.

response to these severe problems the Indian Reorganization Act (I.R.A.) was passed in 1934. The I.R.A. "ended allotment, established a school fund, re-established tribal governments and allowed Indians to adopt tribal constitutions drafted by the B.I.A. that permitted tribes to make some of their own decisions." These policies did not last long, and in the 1950s, "the Federal Government attempted to terminate the reservations, seeking to relieve itself of responsibility for Indians by casting them adrift." Also behind this policy was the fact that "tribal lands contained coal, timber, gas, and other mineral resources."[323] The Menominees in Wisconsin "went from prosperity to near destitution" when federal funding was cut off, and over 35,000 Native Americans were forced to relocate to urban areas "even though many were totally unprepared for city life. Hundreds of Indians did not know how to use the telephone, how to fill out job applications, or how to manage money." Termination stopped in the late 1970s.[324]

Turning to the present, *Poverty Rates for Selected Detailed Race and Hispanic Groups by State and Place: 2007-2011 American Community Survey Briefs* states that American Indians and Alaska Natives have the highest national poverty rates at 27.0 percent.[325] This number is almost identical to the 27.2

---

[323] Mihesuah, *American Indians: Stereotypes & Realities,* 80.

[324] Ibid., 81.

[325] Suzanne Macartney, Alemayehu Bishaw, and Kayla Fontenot, *Poverty Rates for Selected Detailed Race and Hispanic Groups by State and Place: 2007-2011 American Community Survey Briefs*, (2013): 2, accessed December 1, 2016, from http://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/acsbr11-17.pdf.

percent of Native American families that lived below the poverty line in 1989.[326] Associated with this poverty is a much higher percentage of death from tuberculosis, alcohol, diabetes, unintentional injuries, homicide, and suicide than all other United States ethnic and racial groups.[327]

Whether Native Americans are part of the United States, their own separate nations, or both they suffer disproportionately. In over five hundred years Native Americans have been the victims of genocide and cultural genocide. They have been the victims of well-intentioned policies, all well as malevolent ones. Military service did not win them anything, and from Orientalism to *The Lone Ranger*, John Wayne movies, and *Frontierland* at Disneyland, they are still the victims of stereotypes, the effects of which Devon A. Mihesuah gives in *American Indians: Stereotypes & Realities*:

> Racial intolerance often prevents Indians from enjoying the same socio-economic opportunities as other people do, making it difficult for them to integrate into mainstream society. Negative stereotypes of Indians encourage discrimination at work, in the marketplace, and in social settings. The stereotypes that Indians are perpetually dependent upon the government and that only a few "smart ones" are professionals, also leads to frustration for many Indians wanting to secure jobs or purchase homes.[328]

---

[326] Elizabeth Zahrt Geib, "Do Reservation Native Americans Vote with Their Feet?: A Re-Examination of Native American Migration, 1985-1990", *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, vol. 60, no. 4 (Oct 2001): 815-827.

[327] According to Indian Health Services reports, as cited by Indian County Poverty Facts, http://4allourrelations.org/tribescasinos/indian-country-poverty-facts/

[328] Mihesuah, *American Indians: Stereotypes & Realities*, 113.

For some groups, like the Irish, military service helped them to assimilate and receive the benefits of inclusion into mainstream society. As William Burton states, “Standing on a pedestal in a park or square in hundreds of northern towns is a statue of a Civil War soldier. These statues memorialize a generic warrior, an anonymous patriot, *the soldier*, not a Scot, or Swede, or German, or Irishman, but a Union volunteer.”[329] Following the Civil War, Congress passed the Fourteenth Amendment, which included naturalized citizens “as part of ‘the people’” of United States. In accordance with this, “nativist measures targeting naturalized citizens became unconstitutional.”[330] The Fourteenth Amendment was intended to apply to African Americans as well, but the racist and segregationist laws of the post-Reconstruction era made their right of citizenship almost meaningless.

Similar to African Americans, Asians and Pacific Islanders, “earned their claims to equality through the blood they shed on the nation’s battlefields during the Civil War. Hawaiians, Chinese, Filipinos, South Asians, Mexicans, and Puerto Ricans served in the African American U.S. Colored Troops (USCT), and a few served in white units.” Twenty islanders from Guam served, some in the Union Navy, as well as seaman from Tahiti and Hawaii. According to Okihiro, around “fifty-five Filipinos and nearly eighty South Asians (from India, Pakistan, and Sri

---

[329] Burton, *Melting Pot Soldiers: The Union’s Ethnic Regiments*, 233.

[330] Samito, *Becoming American under Fire*, 185-6.

Lanka)", and others from Indonesia, Turkey, Japan, Malasia, Myanmar, Persia, Samoa, Singapore and Tonga, as well as roughly "seventy-four Chinese served both the Union and Confederate causes." One, John Tommy, died after losing both his arms and legs during the battle of Gettysburg.[331] Like Native Americans however, Asians and Pacific Islanders did not win the rights of citizenship by service in the Civil War.

Continuous military service did not improve conditions for either African Americans or Native Americans, and as time has passed, it has become apparent that the color-line was not confined to being the problem of the twentieth century. Henslin describes the upward mobility of African Americans as being linked to leaving their roots behind, and entering a new world with different values. As such, "social mobility often brings not just more contact with whites but also a sense of deprivation. As whites become a primary reference group, racism, mostly subtle, lurks beneath the surface. . .Awareness that one is still perceived as different, as "the other," engenders frustration, dissatisfaction, and ultimately, cynicism."[332]

Henslin also describes the experiences of African Americans as being similar to those of Latino/as, because they are either immigrants who have to learn a new culture and language, or because they are continually viewed as "the

---

[331] Okihiro, *American History Unbound,* 88-9.

[332] Henslin*, Essentials of Sociology*, 214.

other". Some face conflicting cultures and withdraw, while others go the opposite direction and cut ties to their past in hopes of being accepted. Even when they do this however, they are often still viewed as "the other." Those who are conflicted are so because they "want to be a part of life in the United States without betraying their past."[333] These problems that non-white individuals face in their efforts to rise up in American society are further proof that there are "cracks in the melting pot."[334]

---

[333] Henslin*, Essentials of Sociology,* 76.

[334] Ishizuka, *Serve the People: Making Asian America in the Long Sixties*, 17.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Newspapers

The Appleton Motor

The Bay City Press

Chicago Daily Tribune

Chicago Tribune

The Des Moines Register

El Paso Herald

Green Bay Press-Gazette

Hartford Courant

Janesville Daily Gazette

Keowee Courier

Mattoon Gazette

The Montana Post

Natchez Daily Courier

National Republican

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

Semi-Weekly Wisconsin

The Wheeling Daily Intelligencer

Wilmington Journal

The York Daily

Books

Baird, W. David and G. W. Grayson. *A Creek Warrior for the Confederacy: The Autobiography of Chief G.W. Grayson*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988.

Burnett, John G. “The Cherokee Removal Through the Eyes of a Private Soldier.” In *Voices of a People’s History of the United States* edited by Howard Zinn and Anthony Arnove, 142-145. New York, NY: Seven Stories Press, 2009.

Douglass, Frederick. “Address to the New England Convention (May 31, 1849).” In *Voices of a People’s History of the United States* edited by Howard Zinn and Anthony Arnove, 158-159. New York, NY: Seven Stories Press, 2009.

Douglass, Lewis H. “Lewis H. Douglass on Black Opposition to Mckinley (November 17, 1899).” In *Voices of a People’s History of the United States,* edited by Howard Zinn and Anthony Arnove, 243. New York, NY: Seven Stories Press. 2009.

Hauptman Laurence M. *A Seneca Indian in the Union Army: The Civil War Letters of Sergeant Isaac Newton Parker, 1861-1865.* Shippensburg, PA: Burd Street Press, 1995.

Ross, John and Gary Moulton. *The Papers of John Ross, Volume II 1840-1866.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985.

“Tecumseh’s Speech to the Osages (Winter 1811-12).” In *Voices of a People’s History of the United States* edited by Howard Zinn and Anthony Arnove, 134-135. New York: Seven Stories Press, 2009.

Websites

Case Text Inc. The Cherokee Nation V. The State of Georgia. Accessed February 20, 2017. https://casetext.com/case/the-cherokee-nation-v-the-state-of-georgia

De Crèvecoeur, J. Hector. *Letters from an American Farmer*. Accessed February 20, 2017. http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/letter_03.asp.

Indian County Poverty Facts. Accessed December 1, 2016. http://4allourrelations.org/tribescasinos/indian-country-poverty-facts/

Justia. US Supreme Court. Elk V. Wilkins. Accessed February 20, 2017. https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/112/94/case.html

Lawresorce.org. United States V. Elm. Accessed February 20, 2017. https://law.resource.org/pub/us/case/reporter/F.Cas/0025.f.cas/0025.f.cas.1006.pdf.

Poverty Rates for Selected Detailed Race and Hispanic Groups by State and Place: 2007-2011 American Community Survey Briefs, (2013): 2, retrieved December 1, 2016, from http://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/acsbr11-17.pdf

Re-member. Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. Accessed February 20, 2017. http://www.re-member.org/pine-ridge-reservation.aspx

The Treaty of Greenville 1795. Accessed February 20, 2017. http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/greenvil.asp

Secondary Sources

Books

Anbinder, Tyler. *Nativism and Slavery: The Northern Know Nothings and the Politics of the 1850s.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006.

Brinkley, Alan. *The Unfinished Nation Volume 1: To 1877.* 6th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2010.

Britten, Thomas A. *American Indians in World War I: At Home and at War.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.

Burton, William L. *Melting Pot Soldiers: The Union's Ethnic Regiments*. Fordham University Press, 1998.

Calloway, Colin. *First Peoples: A Documentary Survey of American Indian History.* 4th ed. New York: Bedford/St. Martins, 2012.

Confer, Clarissa W. *The Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007.

Coryell, Janet L. and Nora Faires. *A History of Women in America*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2012.

Debo, Angie. *The Road to Disappearance: A History of the Creek Indians*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979.

Evans, William McKee. “Native Americans in the Civil War: Three Experiences.” In *Civil War Citizens: Race, Ethnicity, and Identity in America’s Bloodiest Conflict* edited by Susannah J. Ural, 187-212. New York University Press, 2010.

Foner, Eric, ed. *Voices of Freedom: A Documentary History*, Vol.1, 3rd Ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2011.

Harris, J. William. *Plain Folk and Gentry in a Slave Society: White Liberty and Black Slavery in Augusta’s Hinterlands.* Louisiana: Wesleyan University Press, 1985.

Hauptman, Lawrence M. *Between Two Fires: American Indians in the Civil War*. New York: Free Press, 1996.

Hauptman, Laurence M. *The Iroquois in the Civil War: From Battlefield to Reservation*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1992.

Hauptman, Laurence M. and L. Gordon McLester III. *Chief Daniel Bread and the Oneida Nation of Indians of Wisconsin*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002.

Hauptman, Lawrence M. and L. Gordon McLester III. *The Oneida Indians in the Age of Allotment, 1860-1920*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006.

Henslin, James M. *Essentials of Sociology: A Down-to-Earth Approach.* 8th ed. Pearson, 2009.

Hine, Darlene Clark, William C. Hine, and Stanley Harrold. *African Americans: A Concise History.* 4th ed. New Jersey: Pearson, 2012.

Hobsbawn, E. J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality.* Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Ignatiev, Noel. *How the Irish Became White*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Ishizuka, Karen L. *Serve the People: Making Asian America in the Long Sixties*. New York: Verso, 2016.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Barbarian Virtues*: *The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2000.

———. *Special Sorrows: The Diasporic Imagination, of Irish, Polish, and Jewish Immigrants in the United States*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995.

———. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Johansson, M. Jane, ed. *Albert C. Ellithorpe, The First Indian Home Guards, and the Civil War on the Trans-Mississippi Frontier*. Louisiana State University Press, 2016.

Josephy, Jr., Alvin M. *The Civil War in the American West.* New York: Vintage Civil War Library, 1991.

Kelman, Ari. *A Misplaced Massacre.* Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Krouse, Susan Applegate. *North American Indians in the Great War.* University of Nebraska, 2007.

McPherson, James M. *For Cause & Comrades Why Men Fought in the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Mihesuah, Devon A. *American Indians: Stereotypes & Realities*. Atlanta, GA: Clarity International, 2004.

Miller, Donald L. *City of the Century: The Epic of Chicago and the Making of America*. New York, NY: Touchstone, 1997.

Morgan, Edmund S. *American Slavery, American Freedom*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1975.

Morris, James M. *America's Armed Forces: A History*. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1996.

Ngai, Mae M. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Okihiro, Gary Y. *American History Unbound: Asians and Pacific Islanders.* University of California Press, 2015.

Perdue, Theda and Michael D. Green. *The Cherokee Nation and the Trail of Tears*. New York: Penguin Books, 2007.

Roediger, David R. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. London: Verso, 2007.

Samito, Christian G. *Becoming American Under Fire: Irish Americans, African Americans, and the Politics of Citizenship During the Civil War Era.* New York: Cornell University Press, 2009.

Sandweiss, Martha A. "Still Picture, Moving Stories: Reconstruction Comes to Indian Country." In *Civil War Wests: Testing the Limits of the United States* edited by Adam Arenson and Andrew R. Graybill, 158-178. Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2015.

Taylor, Alan. *American Colonies: The Settling of North America.* New York: Penguin Books, 2001.

Wallace, Mike. *Mickey Mouse History and Other Essays on American Memory*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996.

Young, Warren L. *Minorities and the Military: A Cross-National Study in World Perspective*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1982.

Articles

Geib, Elizabeth Zahrt. "Do Reservation Native Americans Vote with Their Feet?: A Re-Examination of Native American Migration, 1985-1990", *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, vol. 60, no. 4 (Oct 2001): 815-827.