

Indigenous Threads: Weaving a New Fabric of American History

R. David Edmunds

University of Texas at Dallas

Throughout most of the twentieth century, American history textbooks, and American history classes generally excluded Native American people from surveys or discussions of the American past. Indeed, if Indians were included at all, they generally were added as footnotes to broad descriptions of westward expansion, or as foils to explain political contests during the Jacksonian period. In either case they were presented primarily as obstacles to the mainstream of American historical development, impediments to be overcome as the American nation achieved its rightful place in the world. Within the past two decades however, newer, more inclusive interpretations of the American past have reassessed the role of Native Americans (and other ethnic groups) and have acknowledged that these people often played a critical role in shaping the growth and character of the American nation. This inclusion remains uneven, and has manifested itself in discussion of some periods of American history more than others, but there are particular eras, topics, or themes in which scholars have continued to ascribe Native Americans an increased role, and this essay will focus upon several of them.

Prior to the mid-1980s most surveys of American history generally ignored the pre-Columbian period. Historians admitted that Native Americans lived on this continent prior to the entrance of the Europeans, but if they mentioned their occupancy, it was only as a passing example to indicate that little cultural development had occurred in the region north of the Rio Grande until after 1492, when the Europeans brought

“civilization” to the New World. Indeed, Native Americans residing in the region which would become the future United States were portrayed as existing in a cultural backwater, removed and isolated from the general historical patterns that had manifested themselves in Eurasia and northern Africa.¹

Recent scholarship has done much to refute such an interpretation. Incorporating archaeological evidence, new ethno-historical analyses of early colonial accounts, and Native American oral traditions, historians now argue that far from being the isolated backwater ignored by previous scholarship, pre-Columbian North America and its inhabitants shared in cultural patterns and developments similar to those found in the Old World. Just as “civilizations” seemed to emerge in the alluvial floodplains besides large rivers in Europe, Asia, or Africa (the Tiber, Tigris, Euphrates, Ganges, or Yangtze), so similar sophisticated societies also emerged along the Mississippi, Ohio, and Illinois river valleys. Early Old World civilizations were characterized by the construction of large monuments or public works, most often associated with religious activity, or as burial sites for political and religious leaders (the pyramids in Egypt, or the temples and monuments of Mesopotamia). Moreover, many of these emerging societies were governed by political leaders who relied heavily upon a consolidation of political and religious power (the Egyptians, or the Israelites), creating classic examples of “a combination of church and state.” And of course these classic Old World societies or “empires” arose, flourished, and eventually declined, leaving a vestige of language, religion and other cultural values to be resurrected and incorporated by succeeding peoples.²

As more recent survey texts of the American experience now point out, similar patterns developed in North America. Between 600 B.C. and 300 A.D. the Adena people flourished in the Ohio Valley, cultivating crops, establishing important ceremonial centers, erecting large burial mounds, and creating sophisticated, complex societies. By about 200 A.D. the Adena people were eclipsed by the Hopewell Culture, which was influenced by the Adena, but emerged separately from them in the central Illinois River Valley. Like the Adena people, the Hopewellians were mound-builders whose beautifully crafted flint and quartz blades, carved stone pipes, ceramic figurines, and artistically fashioned copper implements and jewelry suggest a specialization of labor associated with settled, sophisticated societies. Hopewellian traders carried these commodities over widespread trade networks, stretching from Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, and from the southern Appalachians to as far west as Yellowstone Park. The Hopewell people grew corn, but it does not seem to have been a mainstay of their food supply, and may have been used more for ceremonial purposes than as part of their regular diet. Like the Adena People, the Hopewellians also were a riverine population, spreading their settlements and influence along major river valleys; and like the Adena they also arose, flourished and declined. They emerged in about 300 B.C., but by 550 A.D. their trade networks had collapsed and their influence had deteriorated.³

The Hopewell people were followed by the Mississippian Culture which produced the most sophisticated, complex societies in the pre-Columbian United States. Emerging about 700 A. D., the Mississippians lasted until the European invasion, although they probably were at their peak in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The origins of the Mississippian Cultures seems to be near the juncture of the Arkansas and Mississippi

rivers, but the culture spread across the South and up the Mississippi to Illinois and perhaps southern Wisconsin. Characterized by the construction of large, often four-sided pyramid-shaped mounds, generally associated with ceremonial centers, Mississippian settlements contained larger populations and also served as focal points for politics and trade. Cahokia, the largest of the Mississippian “city-states” was erected across the Mississippi from modern St. Louis and reached its height in approximately 1100 A.D. The central core of Cahokia was surrounded by a wall which stretched for over two miles and which featured defensive towers and bastions. The wall encompassed an area of about four hundred acres, which contained markets, plazas, temples, and over one hundred separate mounds, including Monks Mound, which still is the largest earthen structure north of Mexico. Archaeologists estimate that Cahokia and its suburbs contained a population of approximately 20,000 people in 1100 A.D., which was larger than London at that time, and was ruled by hereditary leaders who buttressed their authority with religious sanctions. Other, smaller Mississippian ceremonial/population centers spread across the South, from Spiro in eastern Oklahoma to Etowah in Georgia. Although these centers remained politically autonomous, they shared certain cultural patterns, particularly their adherence to the “Southern Cult” a cultural-wide religious manifestation. The ability of the Mississippian people to construct large earthen mounds, and their use as burial sites for just a few individuals suggest that the Mississippians lived within a stratified society in which some individuals exercised considerable influence over others.⁴

Any survey of early American history needs to include a discussion of these societies, and to put them in a meaningful context. When compared to the emergence of

“civilization” in Eurasia and northern Africa, it becomes apparent that Native American societies in the eastern United States followed similar, world-wide patterns. While emergent societies in the Old World sprang up beside the Tigris, Euphrates, Nile, or Ganges, the ancient Americans utilized the Ohio, the Mississippi and their tributaries. Many of these societies, in both the Old World and the New, erected great monuments to honor their gods, or as resting places for their dead. The Egyptians raised the Pyramids, and the Sphinx; the Assyrians built temples to Baal and Astarte, or a tomb for Sennacherib. The Adena people built earthen effigy mounds, including an immense earthen serpent, with an egg in its mouth, while people associated with the Oneota culture shaped large effigy mounds near the Aztalan site in southern Wisconsin. Mississippians at Cahokia buried dead leaders, surrounded by luxury goods, in mounds whose construction required the labor of hundreds (perhaps even thousands) of people over extended periods of time. Obviously, Native American “city-states” such as Cahokia did not expand their political realms into empires similar to those of the Old World, but they did dominate local regions and brought neighboring people under their influence, if not their hegemony. And as the walls of Cahokia, and Fort Ancient in Ohio bear testimony, they too were forced to defend their homes and possessions from less settled, American Goths, Gauls, and “barbarians.” American students need to be cognizant of the history of the pre-Columbian period, and aware that the geographic region incorporated within the modern United States had a rich history prior to 1492. American history did not begin with Columbus.⁵

Yet if some Native American societies resembled the early peoples of Eurasia and North Africa, what happened to them? Why do early European accounts describe hunters

and gatherers, or small villages of horticulturists devoid of the complex socio-political patterns manifested by the Mississippians? The answer to this question is multi-faceted.

First, the earliest British and French settlers or explorers arrived on the Middle-Atlantic or Northeastern coasts, far removed from the more complex societies of the Mississippi Valley or the southeast. The tribal people whom these initial Anglo or French observers encountered lived in simpler communities. Although Tidewater Virginia sustained a large population of Native Americans, they were dispersed into relatively small towns and villages, and the colonists at Jamestown significantly underestimated their numbers. British colonists in New England also encountered tribal people who combined hunting, fishing, and gathering with limited horticulture, but growing crops in New England was risky at best, and the indigenous population was not large. Initial Indian-French contacts in the St. Lawrence Valley followed a similar pattern in a region even less hospitable to horticulture. In consequence, British and French observers reported small villages of “primitive” Native American people whom ethnocentric Europeans believed were devoid of many of the cultural patterns necessary for “civilization.”⁶

Ironically, the first major Spanish foray into the Southeast encountered Native American people living within the vestiges of the Mississippian chiefdoms, but the Spanish anticipated Indian societies similar to Mexico, and when Hernando DeSoto failed to “discover” similar “empires,” his reports diminished the complexity and stratification of the societies that he encountered. As a result, American historians, who traditionally reflected an eastern or northeastern perspective, have generally ignored the Spanish reports. Other factors also played a role. By the late fifteenth century, most of the

Mississippian peoples already were in decline, and the Europeans who did encounter people living within this culture met Mississippians whose populations seemed to be diffusing across the South. Moreover, since the first Spanish expeditions failed to find a new “El Dorado,” they turned their attention to occupying locations along the coast of Florida and generally ignored the interior.⁷

By the late sixteenth century, when British and French agents again visited the region, conditions had markedly changed. Regions which once had supported relatively large numbers of Native Americans were now almost devoid of Indians. This decrease in populations was caused by several reasons, including climatic changes, the depletion of the environment, warfare, and outward migration, but the most dramatic factor was disease. The Mississippian populations had been in decline prior to the introduction of Old World pandemics, but since Native American people had no natural immunities to Eurasian or African diseases, they succumbed to these maladies by the hundreds of thousands. Until the 1970s historians assumed that the native population north of Mexico numbered about one and one-half million upon the eve of discovery, but within the past quarter century that figure has been markedly increased. Estimates by modern historical demographers now vary, with some scholars (particularly those who base their figures on contact populations in Florida or California) arguing that the Pre-Columbian population may have approached 15,000,000 to 18,000,000. More conservative estimates place the number at 7,000,000 or 8,000,000, but even the lower figure is five times larger than the previous estimate.⁸

Yet these numbers fell precipitately after the first century of exposure to Old World diseases. Precise figures for this biological holocaust remain unknown, but

colonial historians estimate that in Mexico, where more accurate demographic records were available, the population dropped from 25 million on the eve of the Spanish conquest to 17 million within ten years. A century later only three million Mexican survived.⁹ Obviously, some lives were lost to warfare and starvation, and the concentrated population in Mexico facilitated the spread of these diseases, but the effects of these epidemics were felt across the eastern half of North America. Tribes in Wisconsin and the Great Lakes region unfortunately shared in his downward spiral. Smallpox and other maladies spread west through Huron villages on Lake Huron to Lake Michigan and the Illinois Country, and accompanied by inter-tribal warfare, they took a terrible toll. The Huron population dropped from about 35,000 in 1630 to approximately 24,000 in 1641. By the end of the seventeenth century they numbered less than 3,000. Part of this loss resulted from warfare with the Iroquois, and to dispersion of some members to other tribes, but disease played a major role.¹⁰ The Illinois Confederacy declined from approximately 11,000 in 1680 to just 6,000 twenty years later. By 1736 their population had shrunk to 2,500; in 1800 they numbered only 500.¹¹ Pre-contact figures for the Ho-Chunks or Winnebagos are unknown, but references to them by other tribes suggest that they were a powerful and numerous people. Described as “the masters of this bay, and of a great extent of adjoining country,” in 1634 when they first welcomed Jean Nicolet they must have numbered about 10,000. Within a decade their number had been halved, and by 1655 when Nicolas Perrot arrived in their village at Green Bay he estimated that they numbered less than a thousand.¹² Early population figures for the Menominees are not available, but scholars also believe that they suffered considerably from the introduction of new diseases.¹³

The impact of this population decline in the Great Lakes region and elsewhere is difficult to maximize. Because of the loss of indigenous people, European settlers entered into regions from which much of the population had been removed. It was not a “virgin wilderness.” As Francis Jennings has so succinctly written, “the American land was more like a widow than a virgin.” Consequently, Europeans were able to transpose an essentially European culture on a land now devoid of most of its former population. New European settlers were not forced to blend their introduced cultural patterns with those of a large indigenous population. The effect was profound. Compare the British colonial experience in the United States (or Australia) and the society that resulted from such colonization with British colonial ventures in India, Burma, Malaya, or South Africa, regions in which a large indigenous population remained after the initial colonial period.¹⁴

Those Native Americans who survived played a major role in the colonial history of Wisconsin and the Midwest. Until the second decade of nineteenth century, the primary actors in the history of this region were Native American people. Moreover, as the French penetrated into the western Great Lakes from the St. Lawrence Valley, Wisconsin, and particularly the Green Bay—Fox River—Wisconsin portage, held the key to their political influence in the interior of the continent. Like other Europeans, the French initially were motivated to expand westward by their desire to secure a “Northwest Passage,” a water route to the Pacific. Yet even as this myth was fading, the French became deeply committed to the fur trade and developed ties with the Great Lakes tribes. In addition to securing the friendship of the Indians, from whom they obtained beaver and other pelts, French officials wished to control the waterways that facilitated

shipping, and the portages that connected those streams flowing into the Great Lakes, with those which formed tributaries of the Mississippi. In this instance, the Green Bay region was critical. Not only could voyageurs enter the Fox River, which poured into the southern end of Green Bay, they could ascend the stream, and with minimal effort portage across to the Wisconsin, which then gave them access to the Mississippi and the Illinois Country.¹⁵

Wisconsin held other attractions. During the 1640s and 1650s Iroquois war parties from New York attacked many of the tribes in Upper Canada, Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana, seeking access to the western fur trade, which they hoped to channel to Dutch and British traders. Fleeing the Iroquois, tribes such as the Sauks, Potawatomis, Miamis, Kickapoos, and Hurons fled to Wisconsin where they clustered in the Green Bay-Fox River region. These refugees offered French merchants a ready market for trade goods in exchange for beaver pelts and other furs from tribes located further west. Moreover, many of these refugees readily welcomed the French, since they desired French trade goods, and disliked the Iroquois, who had developed growing ties with the British.¹⁶

But there were some flies in the French ointment. The French also wished to trade with the Lakota or Sioux, a numerous people who occupied western Wisconsin, but who were at war with tribes in eastern or central Wisconsin. Some of these tribes were reluctant to allow French traders to pass through their villages to sell firearms to the Sioux, or preferred to initiate the commerce themselves, envisioning a lucrative role as middlemen. Of particular importance were the Mesquakies, or Foxes, who lived in central Wisconsin, and had long warred with the Sioux, yet were cut off from the French at Green Bay by Winnebagos, Potawatomis, and other tribes who traded them French

goods, but at inflated prices. The Mesquakies resented both the French and their allies, and they refused to allow French traders to pass through their villages. In turn, the French and the tribes near Green Bay envisioned the Mesquakies as “troublemakers” who disrupted the fur trade. Between 1710 and 1730 warfare flared intermittently between the Mesquakies and the French and their allies, a series of conflicts (the Fox Wars) that left Wisconsin and much of the Great Lakes and upper Mississippi Valley devastated as Mesquakie raids brought the fur trade to a standstill. In response several French armies invaded Wisconsin, attacked the Fox villages, but achieved only limited success. Meanwhile, these events in Wisconsin attracted the attention and response not only of officials in Montreal, but also of the French court in Versailles. The valiant Mesquakies eventually were defeated, but for almost two decades this small tribe in Wisconsin defied the French empire, and almost brought New France to its knees.¹⁷

Although the Mesquakies rose in defiance of New France, almost of the tribes in the region embraced the French cause and during the eighteenth century a close alliance between the two peoples developed. Unlike the British who continued to settle along the eastern seaboard, but who usurped Native American land and turned it into a “New England,” relatively few French initially entered the Great Lakes region. Moreover, the French had little desire for Indian land, but they needed Indian people to supply pelts for the fur trade; they had no desire to markedly change Native Americans into Europeans. There was a place for Indians in the French scheme of things.

Within Wisconsin and the Great Lakes region many Native Americans developed a close relationship with French fur traders and their employees. Tribal people grew dependent upon French trade goods, but French traders learned tribal languages, lived

within the tribal villages, and intermarried with tribal women. These unions produced significant numbers of “métis” (people of mixed lineage) who often served as intermediaries between tribal communities and French officials. Historian Richard White has described this relationship as a “middle ground,” a way of life where “the boundaries of the Algonquian and French worlds melted at the edges and merged. Although identifiable Frenchmen and identifiable Indians obviously continued to exist, whether a practice or way of doing things was French or Indian was, after a time, not so clear.” Within this “middle ground,” Frenchmen, Indian people, and métis continued their amicable relationship, all with identities that could, upon occasion, be very malleable.¹⁸

Recent scholarship illustrates that the economics of this “middle ground” were heavily cultivated by Native American or métis women. Although their husbands trapped and collected the pelts, the women regularly participated in preparing the pelts and bartering the fur. Moreover, Native American women married to French traders also served as intermediaries between their husbands and members of their extended kinship groups, assisting their husbands as they traveled from village to village. Other women, particularly métis, managed trading posts, supervised employees and assisted with balancing accounts. Susan Sleeper Smith has illustrated that Potawatomi women in southwestern Michigan and Illinois women near St. Louis raised large fields of corn and other crops, not only to feed not only their own families, but also for sale to traders throughout the region. In addition, Lucy Murphy has shown that Ho-Chunk (Winnebago), Sauk, and Mesquakie women in northern Illinois, southern Wisconsin, and eastern Iowa mined extensive deposits of lead ore which was traded to other tribes, or sold to create

French or Spanish traders. Scholarship focusing on the roles of Native American women in this region is just emerging, but it offers considerable promise.¹⁹

Tribes from Wisconsin and neighboring regions also assisted the French against the British. Outnumbered by the British colonists, French officials in Canada relied heavily upon western warriors for military support. During the first two thirds of the eighteenth century Potawatomis, Ojibwes, Ottawas, Sauks, Miamis, Menominees, and Winnebagos repeatedly rallied to the French cause and journeyed to the east where they joined the French expeditions that attacked the British frontier. Warriors from Wisconsin accompanied the army led by the Marquis de Montcalm as it descended Lake Champlain to besiege Fort William Henry, and they raided British settlements in New York and Pennsylvania. Sauks from Wisconsin and Illinois joined with Ojibwes to attack Fort Michilimackinac during Pontiac's Revolt, although most of the other Wisconsin tribes remained neutral in this contest. During the American Revolution the Wisconsin tribes wavered in their allegiance to both the British and the Americans, supporting whichever side seemed to have the upper hand. In contrast, most tribes in Michigan, northern Indiana, and Ohio held steadfast to the Redcoats and carried the war to American settlements in Kentucky. Indeed, the resolute opposition of Shawnee, Mingo, Wyandot, and Miami warriors kept the Kentuckians on the defensive during most of the conflict and prevented American settlement from advancing north of the Ohio River.²⁰

This Indian success against the Americans, particularly in the Ohio Valley, had a profound effect upon American history during the Early National period. From the Native American perspective, they had *won*, not lost the Revolutionary War in the Old Northwest, and following the Peace of Paris they were loathe to relinquish lands that the

Americans claimed in Ohio. The Americans needed the Ohio lands, both as a source of revenue, and to reimburse revolutionary war soldiers who had not been paid during the latter years of the conflict. American agents attempted to persuade or bribe Indians who occupied Ohio to give up their claims to the region, but the tribes refused. The few leaders who agreed to such land cessions either did not represent their tribes, or were from tribes outside Ohio. Meanwhile, the British continued to occupy Detroit, and British agents encouraged the Native American resistance. American attempts to settle southern Ohio met with fierce resistance, and the few settlements established north of the Ohio River remained tenuous.²¹

Angered by the Indian response, American military expeditions invaded the region, but initially were defeated. In 1790 warriors from many tribes joined together near modern Fort Wayne to twice ambush a column of troops led by Josiah Harmar, inflicting heavy casualties. One year later (November 1791) a multi-tribal war party led by Miami chief Little Turtle devastated another expedition commanded by Arthur St. Clair, killing at least 650 Americans and capturing most of the Americans supplies and ammunition. This second battle was the most disastrous military defeat ever suffered by the United States in all their campaigns against Indians; over half of the standing army of the United States was killed or died from wounds received during this single encounter. Indian morale soared and the British proposed that the United States give up its claims to much of the region north of the Ohio so that the tribes could establish a separate autonomous country (closely allied to the British, however).²²

The Americans refused. They believed that the tribes' refusal to surrender lands in Ohio posed a serious threat to the future stability of the United States, and federal

officials authorized Anthony Wayne to rebuild the army and seize control of the disputed regions. In 1794 Wayne marched north from Cincinnati, while the British built a new post, Fort Miamis, near modern Toledo, Ohio. Yet by 1794 Native American unity had dissolved and the tribes were divided over what policy to pursue toward the Long Knives. Little Turtle now counseled peace, but other warriors decided to meet Wayne's troops at Fallen Timbers, in the lower Maumee Valley. In the resulting battle the Americans gained the upper hand, and when the British at Fort Miamis refused to assist the retreating warriors, the tribesmen knew their fate was sealed. In 1795 Indian leaders signed the Treaty of Greenville, which ceded most of Ohio to the Americans, and white settlement flooded into the Old Northwest. Yet this post-war period is important. In the decade following the American Revolution tribal people in the Great Lakes region seriously threatened the future of the United States, and concerns over "Indian affairs" often dominated the agenda of the federal government's priorities.²³

Tribal people under Tecumseh, and the Creeks in Alabama rose again during the War of 1812, but British support remained half-hearted, and following the war white settlement spread across the Gulf Plains, and also into the Old Northwest. For decades, Indian agents had promised tribal people that if they would accept the government's Indian policies they could be "civilized" and integrated into American society, but events transpiring during the second quarter of the 19th century proved such promises were false. Indian agents had urged tribes people to adopt American patterns of agriculture and become small yeoman farmers. Indian men should labor in the fields while women should tend the home, raise children, and care for domestic animals such as poultry, or dairy cattle. Tribal people also were urged to accept Christianity, become fluent in

English, dress in American or European clothing, and settle on small individual farms scattered within their former territories. Both federal Indian agents and missionaries assured Native Americans that if they would adhere to these policies they would be accepted by white Americans.²⁴

The hypocrisy of such promises soon became evident. South of the Ohio, many members of the Five Southern or “Civilized” Tribes attempted to follow the government’s advice. Among the Cherokees, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Creeks, and to a lesser degree the Seminoles, a socio-economic elite emerged who adopted the lifestyle of the white settlers and planters who settled around them. The Cherokees were particularly adept at utilizing certain white cultural patterns for their own purposes. By 1828,

the 15,000 Cherokees living east of the Mississippi owned large herds of hogs, almost 8000 horses, and over 22,000 cattle. They raised extensive crops of corn and cotton, and operated 52 blacksmith shops, 31 gristmills, 14 sawmills, 9 saltpeter works, and 18 ferries. Most families, both traditional and those who embraced change, owned plows, spinning wheels, and looms, and most tribes people dressed entirely in clothing made of either hand-woven cloth or dry goods.

A Cherokee planter elite owned and managed plantations, where African-American slaves supplied the labor. The tribe had adopted a formal government with an elected chief, a bicameral legislature modeled after that of the United States, and a formal judicial system. Many members of the nation were literate in either or both Cherokee and English, and the tribe published its own newspaper, written in both languages. Not all Cherokees subscribed to these new cultural patterns, but the planter-elite provided role models toward which many Cherokees aspired. To a lesser degree, similar patterns of cultural change could also be found among the Creeks, Choctaws and Chickasaws.²⁵

North of the Ohio the tribes also were undergoing cultural change. The “Middle Ground” that had developed under the old French regime continued to proliferate, and by the 1820s many Ojibwe, Potawatomi, Ottawa, Ho-Chunk (Winnebago), and Miami métis had risen to positions of prominence within their tribes, and also in the economy of the Great Lakes region. Although some of these métis dabbled in agriculture, many more remained active in the trade, managing commercial networks that stretched from Detroit to St. Louis. Just as the Five Southern Tribes adopted cultural patters from those whites with whom they were most familiar, the Great Lakes tribes people continued to model themselves after the creole French, many of whom also preferred to seek their fortune in trade, rather than agriculture. Many of the métis merchants were sophisticated men people spoke both French and English, in addition to several tribal languages, and their account books not only illustrate their literacy, but also their ability to manage multiple business holdings. For example, Jean Baptists Richardville, a Miami métis, controlled the portage between the Maumee and Wabash rivers in Indiana, and built trading posts and warehouse along the route. He conducted trade from Detroit through St. Louis and lived like a frontier gentleman. In 1816, when Indiana entered the union, he was reputed to be the wealthiest man in the state. Yet since he and other métis refused to become small yeomen farmers, they were described by Indian agents as “recalcitrant” and “uncivilized.”²⁶

Far more important than any cultural changes, the tribes both north and south of the Ohio River continued to occupy lands desired by white Americans. In the South, the tribes held potential cotton lands, (and in 1828 gold was discovered on Cherokee lands in Georgia), while the Midwestern tribes retained fertile farm lands in western Ohio,

Indiana, Illinois, and in southern Michigan and Wisconsin. In response, settlers in these regions clamored for the Indians' removal. In 1828 Andrew Jackson was elected to the presidency, and two years later the Indian Removal Bill passed Congress. Through pressure, fraud, and bribery, Indian agents convinced tribal representatives (but not always the legitimate leadership of the tribes) to relinquish much of their remaining land-base east of the Mississippi and to be removed across the Mississippi. Most tribes eschewed military resistance, although the Seminoles fought stubbornly to remain in Florida. When hungry Sauks and Mesquakies attempted to return to Illinois in 1832, their arrival touched off the Black Hawk War, in which federal troops and state militias forcing the Sauks and Mesquakies back into Iowa, while the Indians were trying to retreat back there on their own accord.²⁷

The Cherokee legal resistance to the removal process resulted in two court cases, *Cherokee Nation vs. Georgia*, and *Worcester vs. Georgia*, which are landmark cases in both federal and Indian law. Yet in almost all cases the tribes who occupied valuable lands were forced west. The circumstances surrounding their removal often were brutal. The Cherokee "Trail of Tears" is the most infamous of these cases (approximately 4000 Cherokees, or one in five members of the tribe who participated in this process died in the detention camps or en route to the West. The Choctaws and Creeks also suffered horrible hardships.²⁸

In the North, Potawatomi and Miami emigrants endured the worst suffering, but Ho-Chunks (Winnebagos) displaced from Wisconsin were bounced from temporary reservations in Iowa, to Minnesota, to South Dakota, before finally receiving a permanent reservation in eastern Nebraska. Meanwhile, those tribes (Menominees, Oneidas,

Stockbridges, Potawatomis, Ojibwes, Ottawas , and “Non-treaty Winnebagos”) who remained in Wisconsin and Michigan found their land-bases much reduced and were generally forced to relocate from areas holding good farmland to less productive, northern regions of these states.²⁹

The removal of Native American people during this period illustrates the hypocrisy of federal Indian policy, but it also established two other patterns that would affect both tribal people and non-Indians in the decades to come. First, since the 1830's, much of this country's Native American Indian population have consistently been removed from areas that were considered to be valuable by non-Indians, to regions which non-Indians have assessed as having little, or less value. In Wisconsin and the Midwest, tribes have been removed or forced from fertile farmlands to more northern regions. In the South, only the Eastern Cherokees, isolated in the Great Smoky Mountains, a small community of Choctaws in the pine barrens of Mississippi, or the Seminoles in the Everglades have been able to retain their lands. Many of the northern plains tribes, or the Navajo and Apache people of the southwest retained large tracts of lands, but these lands originally were considered as useless for agriculture by whites familiar with these regions. Tribal people were assigned to these regions because non-Indians did not want them. Those tribes who held valuable lands have had their homelands taken. Within the past quarter-century, as the demand for natural resources has increased, some western and business interests have clamored to “open up” the remaining tribal lands “for development.” Undoubtedly, as shortages of oil or western water increase, these demands will accelerate. The fight for western water has just begun. Those people who

believe that Native Americans no longer will play a role in American history obviously do not live in the arid West.³⁰

The other, often overlooked pattern established during the removal period was the significant role that many of those Indian people who were transplanted across the Mississippi played in introducing cultural changes into the West. Many of those tribes, which were removed to Oklahoma or Kansas, contained at least a cadre of relatively well-educated, sophisticated leaders, who did much to “transform” the West. Most Americans probably would position “Indians: and “pioneers” on opposite ends of a cultural spectrum, but on the Middle Border, they very often were the same. These new emigrants arrived in a region often characterized by its “coarseness” and their settlements became “islands of civilization” in a region not known for its gentility. The literacy rate of the Cherokee Nation remained higher than that of the white south through the antebellum period. After a period of adjustment, the Cherokees prospered. When most frontier whites married into the Cherokee or Choctaw Nations in Indians Territory, they were, in socio-economic terms, often “marrying up.” Near modern Topeka, Kansas, Potawatomi emigrants from southern Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana opened stores, maintained ferries, and provided services to gold-seekers en route to Colorado. Tribal businessmen long experienced in the fur trade at Milwaukee or Green Bay, or Chicago prospered in Kansas. The recent emergence of tribal businesses and entrepreneurial activity, which has blossomed in the past two decades, has many historical precedents.³¹

In the two decades following the Civil War, the western tribes fought to defend their homelands, and the history of this warfare has long attracted the attention of the American public. Fabled in popular histories, fiction, motion pictures, and television, this

often heroic struggle features Native American leaders such as Crazy Horse, Sitting Bull, Chief Joseph, Cochise, and Geronimo, and information on these events are readily available.³² The warfare was followed by the “Reservation Period,” (approximately 1880 through the 1920s), when Native American populations dropped to their lowest point (237,196 in 1900), and by the continued isolation of tribal people on reservations or in small rural communities.³³ During the 1930s, as part of the New Deal, Congress passed the Wheeler Howard Act, federal Indian policies changed, and tribal communities were strengthened. Yet some of the reforms of the New Deal period were overwhelmed by World War II, and Native Americans (both men and women) enlisted in record numbers. Other Indian people left reservation communities to work in defense jobs in urban areas. In both cases, World War II marked a turning point for many Native Americans, since it provided their first extended exposure to the non-Indian world, and it initiated the movement of many tribal people into urban regions.³⁴

This process was accelerated by federal Indian policies in the 1950’s. Following World War II, federal officials made a final concerted effort to force Native Americans into the American mainstream. Federal officials championed a two part policy designed to disperse the remaining tribal communities. Congress passed a resolution championing “termination,” a process in which the remaining reservation communities would be allotted and dissolved. Meanwhile, Indian agents urged “relocation,” a concurrent policy which encouraged reservation people to move, with federal assistance, into major urban areas. Federal officials assumed that once they were “relocated” into cities, Indian people rapidly would be assimilated, and vanish into the American mainstream.³⁵

Many tribal people in Wisconsin were relocated to cities such as Milwaukee, Chicago, or Minneapolis, but among the Wisconsin tribes, the Menominees bore the brunt of termination. Not surprisingly, state and local interests immediately urged federal officials to “terminate” those reservations, which held valuable natural resources, and the Menominee reservation remained rich in timber. Succumbing to pressure by both Congress and local business interests, in the mid-1950s the Menominees accepted termination, particularly when federal officials assured them that they would receive a large per capita cash payment (already due to them) only if they were terminated. The evidence suggests that many Menominees opposed termination, and even those who voted for the policy were confused and had been misled about what such a decision would entail. Yet a preliminary vote was taken, those Menominees in attendance voted for termination, and after several years of negotiations, in 1961 the Menominees were terminated. The former Menominee reservation became a county in Wisconsin.³⁶

Prior to termination, the Menominees had been a relatively prosperous people who had financed much of their tribal services through proceeds from a tribal lumber mill. But following termination the tribe’s financial status rapidly deteriorated as Menominee Enterprises Incorporated (MEI), a racially mixed (Menominee and non-Indian) corporation established to oversee tribal funds and business enterprises, seemed incapable of managing these undertakings. Moreover, many rank-and-file Menominees who previously had worked in the tribe’s lumber mill now found themselves unemployed and impoverished. MEI’s decision to construct a lake and sell lakefront lots to non-Indians crystallized those Menominees who opposed the organization, and in 1970 they formed Determination of Rights and Unity for Menominee Shareholders (DRUMS),

which challenged MEI, eventually gained control of the corporation, and then lobbied Congress for the restoration of the Menominee reservation. Now convinced that termination had been a mistake, in 1973 Richard Nixon signed the Menominee Restoration Act, which restored federal recognition to the Menominee tribes and reestablished their reservation.³⁷

Ada Deer and other Menominee activists led the drive for Menominee restoration, and many of these individuals then held positions on the Menominee Restoration Committee, which oversaw the restoration process. Although almost all Menominees initially were grateful for the activists' leadership, some believed that they were denied access to the restoration process, and in 1975 a group proclaiming itself the Menominee Warriors Society occupied the Alexian Brothers' novitiate in Gresham, Wisconsin as a protest against the new tribal government. Yet the Menominees weathered these political storms, and again have taken their place among the tribal governments that function across the United States.³⁸

The urbanization of the Native American population, which began during World War II, was accelerated by the policy of relocation. Even after the government officially abandoned the policy during the 1960s, the migration of Indian people to the cities continued. In 2000 slightly over half of the Native American population in the U.S. lived in urban areas, and demographers predict that this percentage will increase. Urbanization has had a profound impact on Native American life. Adrift in the cities, many Native American people still retained their ties back to the old tribal communities, but they also found they often had more in common with other urban-dwelling Indians than with the people on the reservations. For over two centuries Native American leaders such as

Pontiac, Little Turtle, and Tecumseh worked unsuccessfully to create pan-tribal political organizations, but the urbanization of Indian people in the twentieth century has probably encouraged pan-tribal political organization far more than all the chiefs of the past. It is no coincidence that the American Indian Movement (AIM) of the late 1960s emerged in urban centers such as Minneapolis, San Francisco, and Denver, cities with significant Native American populations. Urban Indians retained many of their tribal ties, but they banded together to confront problems facing all Indian peoples in an urban environment.³⁹

Urbanization also has shaped Native American identity. Unquestionably, in the pre-Columbian period, Indian people identified themselves as members of kinship groups, or as members of particular tribes. Since the only human beings whom tribal people encountered were other Native Americans, it seems doubtful if tribal people would have formulated any term for any human being that attempted to differentiate either themselves, or anyone else by “race.” Obviously, the term “Indian” was coined by Europeans to categorize the people whom they encountered in the Western Hemisphere from other Europeans, Africans, and East Asians, although the very terms itself suggests that they initially believed Native Americans were from the Indian sub-continent.

Regardless of initial mistakes, the term became an accepted “racial” category among Europeans, and by the seventeenth century those Native Americans in frequent contact with Europeans began to adopt the term and to use it or other similar broad categorical nomenclature to differentiate indigenous people from European and African emigrants.

Since that time, both Native Americans and non-Indians have defined Indian or Native American identity in different ways, and these definitions have continued to

evolve throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Traditionally, “being Indian” meant that one was a member of a particular clan, and that everyone within the multi-clan tribal society recognized each other’s clan membership. Since tribal societies were relatively small demographic groups contained within a given geographic region, most people knew each other, or their relatives. Clan membership was hereditary, but could also be extended to captives, or other people whom the clan might adopt. If one were a member of a tribal clan, then one was a member of the “tribe.” Since it was assumed that all Native Americans were tribal people, “being Indian” had relatively little to do with “race.” One might be born of parents from another tribe, or might even be of European lineage, but if the Potawatomis accepted you, you were Potawatomi.⁴⁰

The emergence of large numbers of métis, or individuals of mixed ancestry caused confusion for Indian agents in the nineteenth century, but since many of these people (many of whom were only one-fourth or one-eighth Native American by lineage) were accepted within the tribal communities, the agents included them as “Indians” although they often derogatively referred to them as “half-breeds,” “quarter-breeds,” etc., and erroneously suggested in their official reports that these individuals were only peripheral members of the tribal communities. In actuality, people of mixed lineage exercised considerable influence in many tribal communities, but because they were well educated and often opposed federal policies, they incurred the resentment of the agents. During the removal period, when tribes were removed to the west, many of these individuals were listed on the removal rosters by their “blood-quantum,” the first widespread delineation of tribal people found in official government records.⁴¹

In the late nineteenth century the association of Native American identity with lineage was considerably strengthened. In 1887 Congress passed the Dawes Act, which provided for the division of many reservations into individual 160-acre allotments, which were distributed to tribe members, with the surplus land to be sold to white settlers. But if each “Indian” was to receive 160 acres, just who should be included? In Oklahoma, eastern Kansas and other locations where large numbers of people of mixed lineage resided, federal agents feared that the tribes would include too many people, and the amount of farmland available for white settlement would be limited. In consequence, the tribes were required to conduct a census, and federal agents tried to ascertain the blood-quantum of individual Native Americans. Yet many tribes had no written birth records, so the agents arbitrarily assigned a blood-quantum “by appearance,” a method that was haphazard at best. Since that time federal agents have allowed each tribe to set its own parameters for tribal membership, with most tribes demanding that all tribe members be at least one-quarter or one-half blood quantum, with an enrolled parent. Yet some tribes such as the western Cherokees, the Choctaws, Chickasaws, or the Citizen Potawatomis require only direct descent from the original allotment tribal, and have no blood-quantum. Ironically, the reliance upon blood quantum for tribal enrollment and membership is a regulation first fostered upon the tribes by the federal government, but now embraced by tribal governments.⁴²

This issue of Native American identity will continue to plague tribal governments in the twenty-first century. As more Native Americans move into urban areas, they continued to intermarry with non-Indians at an increased rate. In 1980 over half of all Native Americans already were married to non-Indians. By 2000, over 60% of urban

Native American women had married non-Indians. As late as 1980, about 87% of the Native American population possessed a blood-quantum of at least 50%, but if current trends continue, Cherokee demographer Russell Thornton predicts that by 2080, that percentage will shrink from 87% to 8%. As the number of people of mixed lineage continues to grow, many tribes will be forced to revise their blood-quantum regulations, or they will legislate themselves out of existence.⁴³

Yet many scholars and some Native Americans argue that blood-quantum is less important in ascertaining tribal or Indian identity than an adherence to certain cultural values that remain at the core of the tribal community. Indeed, in some tribes people of limited biological descent have adhered to traditional cultural patterns more than some “full-bloods.” In these cases, cultural affinity would seem to transcend blood-quantum. As one of my Cherokee friends in Oklahoma has asked, “Is a Saudi who is born, raised, and dies in Anchorage Alaska really an Arab?” But if Native American identity is to be defined by cultural criteria, just which criteria should be used? Moreover, since all of the reservation communities currently are being inundated with electronic media from the outside world, Native American cultures, like all cultures will continue to evolve.⁴⁴

Added to this dilemma are new definitions of Native American sovereignty that have enabled a few communities to prosper through entrepreneurial activities, including (but not limited to) gaming. Since the federal census now allows individuals to declare their ethnic background, the number of Native Americans in the United States seems to have skyrocketed. Many of these individuals undoubtedly are people of Native American descent, who for a variety of reasons previously did not identify as Indians. But others are opportunists, seeking to “jump on the buckskin bandwagon” and share in what they

envision as lucrative tribal per capita payments. As most Native Americans know, those tribes who are reaping large profits from gaming and other ventures are “few and far between,” and tribal enrollment agents have been zealous in guarding tribal rolls from such interlopers.⁴⁵ Yet census reports indicate that the number of Native Americans in the United States (including people of mixed lineage) has doubled since 1990, and now exceeds four million. Obviously new methods of ethnic identification on the 2000 census form accounts for some of this increase, but others may be individuals of mixed-lineage who identify as Native Americans, but who are not eligible for tribal enrollment.⁴⁶

The reservation communities will continue. For most tribal people, reservations or tribal centers continue to serve as “home.” They remain “wellsprings” of tribal values for many urban Native Americans, who return on a regular basis, and renew their sense of tribal identity, attend ceremonials or social events, and visit with friends and relatives. Some individuals living in urban areas recently have claimed to be “urban Indians,” people who have no particular tribal affiliation, but who have developed ties with other Native Americans also residing in urban environments. Sociologists refer to this phenomenon as “Indianess on the supratribal level,” an ethnicity that may not completely replace tribal identities, but that “encompasses and supplements them.” Yet these people have not been well-received by most members of tribal communities, or by other Native Americans across the United States. Perhaps they may gain such recognition in the future, but at the present the possibilities of their acceptance remains very problematic.⁴⁷

Undoubtedly, both tribal cultures and Native American identities have evolved throughout the past three centuries. Like other cultures and identities, neither of these

Native American realms have ever been “fixed in stone.” They will continue to change in the years ahead.

American history has always been a multi-hued tapestry. Historians traditionally have interwoven many strands of European origin to create a broader fabric of the American past. More recently, as the demographics of the United States has evolved, scholars have enhanced the weave with ribbons from Africa and Mexico. But if the fabric is to be complete, it also needs threads woven in Native America. American Indian history stands alone, but it also forms part of the greater American tapestry. That fabric is enhanced by the inclusion of indigenous threads.

¹For example, Samuel Morrison’s *The Oxford History of the American People* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965) which was heralded as “the most comprehensive single-volume survey of American history in print” devotes only 16 of 1122 pages to surveying the Pre-Columbian period.

²For examples of modern American history textbooks which now incorporate information about the Pre-Columbian period, see John Mack Faragher, Mari Jo Buhle, Daniel Citron, and Susan Armitage, *Out of Many: A History of the American People* (Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 2003); and Paul Boyer, Clifford Clark, Joseph Kett, Neal Salisbury, Harvey Sitkoff, and Nancy Woloch *Enduring Visions: A History of the American People* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 2000).

³Bradley T. Lepper, *People of the Mounds: Ohio’s Hopewell Culture* (Washington, PA: Eastern National Park and Monument Association, 1999), passim. Also see Lynda Noreen Shaffer, *Native Americans Before 1492: The Moundbuilding Centers of the Eastern Woodlands* (Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 1992), passim. For popular, illustrated accounts of the mound-building cultures, see David Hurst Thomas, *Exploring Native North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); David Hurst Thomas et al., *The Native Americans: An Illustrated History* (Atlanta: Turner Publishing Co., 1993); Jules Billard, ed., *The World of the American Indian* (Washington: National Geographic Society, 1974); Michael Coe, Dean Snow, and Elizabeth Benson, *Atlas of Ancient History* (New York: Facts on File Pubs., 1986); Gene Stuart,

America's Ancient Cities (Washington: National Geographic Society, 1988); and Brian Fagan, *Ancient North America: The Archaeology of a Continent* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1995).

⁴David Hurst Thomas, *Exploring Native North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 106-113, 152-163; Shaffer, *Native Americans Before 1492*, 78; Jon Muller and Jeanette Stephens, "Mississippian Socio-Cultural Adaptation," in Thomas E. Emerson and R. Barry Lewis, eds., *Cahokia and the Hinterlands: Middle Mississippian Cultures of the Midwest* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 309; Biloine Whiting Young and Melvin Fowler, *Cahokia: The Great Native American Metropolis* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 274-309.

⁵R. David Edmunds, "A German Chocolate Cake, With White Coconut Icing: Ohio and the Native American World," in Geoffrey Parker, Richard Sisson, and William Russell Coil, eds., *Ohio and the World, 1753-2053: Essays Toward a New History of Ohio* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2005), 23-42.

⁶Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1975), chaps. 1-4.

⁷See Charles Hudson and Carmen Chavez Tesser, *The Forgotten Centuries: Indians and Americans in the American South, 1521-1704* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994), passim; Charles Hudson, *Knights of Spain, Warriors of the Sun: Hernando de Soto and the South's Ancient Chiefdoms* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997); Marvin T. Smith, *Coosa: The Rise and Fall of a Southeastern Mississippian Chiefdom* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000).

⁸Russell Thornton, in *American Indian Holocaust and Survival: A Population History Since 1492* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), provides a survey of pre-Columbian population estimates. Also see Henry E. Dobyns, *Their Number Become Thinned: Native American Population Dynamics in Eastern North America* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983).

⁹Alfred W. Crosby, Jr., *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492* (Westport, Ct: Greenwood Press, 1971), 53, 35-63 passim. Also see David E. Stannard, *American Holocaust: The Conquest of the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 85-86.

¹⁰W. Vernon Kinietz, *The Indians of the Western Great Lakes, 1615-1760* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965), 3-4.

¹¹Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival*, 88.

¹²Nancy Oestreich Lurie, “Winnebago,” Bruce E. Trigger, ed., *Northeast*, Vol. 15 in *Handbook of North American Indians*,₂ edited by William C. Sturtevant (15 – vols.; Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1978 -), 691. Also see Emma Hunt Blair Blair, ed., *The Indian Tribes of the Upper Mississippi Valley and Region of the Great Lakes* (2 vols.; Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996 reprint), Vol. 1, 293.

¹³Louise S. Spindler, “Menominee,” in Trigger , *Northeast: Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 15, 708.

¹⁴Jennings, *The Invasion of America*, 30, 15-31 passim.

¹⁵Robert Bieder, *Native Communities in Wisconsin, 1600-1960* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), chap. 3. Louise Phelps Kellogg’s classic *The French Regime in Wisconsin and the Old Northwest* (New York: Cooper Square, 1968 reprint) contains interpretations and language which are now outdated, but the volume focuses upon the Wisconsin and contains detailed information on the state’s early history.

¹⁶See George T. Hunt, *The Wars of the Iroquois* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967 reprint), passim.

¹⁷R. David Edmunds and Joseph L. Peyser, *The Fox Wars: The Mesquakie Challenge to New France* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993), passim.

¹⁸Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 50 and passim.

¹⁹Susan Sleeper Smith, *Indian Women and French Men: Rethinking Cultural Encounter in the Western Great Lakes* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001), passim; Lucy Eldersveld Murphy, *A Gathering of Rivers: Indians, Metis, and Mining in the Western Great Lakes, 1737-1832* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), passim. Also see Rebecca Kugel, “Gender, Work Roles, and Contending Re-definitions of the Great Lakes Métis, 1820-1842,” in R. David Edmunds, *Enduring Nations: Essays on Native Americans in the Great Lakes Region* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, in press); Lucy Eldersveld Murphy, “‘Their Women Quite Industrious Miners:’ Native American Lead Mining in the Upper Mississippi Valley, 1788-1832,” in *Ibid.* Also see R. David Edmunds, “George Winter: Mirror of Acculturation,” in *Indians and a Changing Frontier: The Art of George Winter* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1993), 23-39.

²⁰For a broad survey of the Potawatomi and other northwestern tribes' participation in this warfare see R. David Edmunds, *The Potawatomis: Keepers of the Fire* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978), 3-115 passim. Also see Michael N. McConnell, *A Country Between: The Upper Ohio Valley and Its Peoples, 1724-1774* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992); Gregory Dowd, *War Under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indian Nations, and the British Empire* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 2002); Colin G. Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country: Crisis and Diversity in Native American Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); and Bieder, *Native Communities in Wisconsin*, chap. 4.

²¹Reginald Horsman, *Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1967), passim.

²²Francis Paul Prucha, *The Sword of the Republic* (Toronto: Macmillan Co., 1969), 15-27.

²³An excellent discussion of these events can be found in John Sugden's *Blue Jacket: Warrior of the Shawnees* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000). Wiley Sword's *President Washington's Indian War* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985), contains a detailed account of these events from an American military perspective. Also see Reginald Horsman, *Matthew Elliott, British Indian Agent* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1964); and Colin Calloway, *Crown and Calumet: British Indian Relations, 1783-1815* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987) for insights and analyses of British influence in these events.

²⁴For the role of Tecumseh and Native Americans during the War of 1812, see R. David Edmunds, *Tecumseh and the Quest for Indian Leadership* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1984). For American Indian policy in this period see Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians* (2 vols.; Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984) Vol. 1. 29-1178, passim.

²⁵R. David Edmunds, Frederick Hoxie, and Neal Salisbury, *The People: A History of Native America* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin and Co., forthcoming 2006), chap. 9. Also see Theda Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society, 1540-1866* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1979); Theda Perdue, *Cherokee Women: Gender and Cultural Change, 1700-1835* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998); William McLoughlin, *Cherokee Renaissance in the New Republic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986); Michael Green, *The Politics of Indian Removal* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska

Press, 1982); Richard White, *The Roots of Dependency* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983); and James Taylor Carson, *Searching for the Bright Path: the Mississippi Choctaws from Prehistory to Removal* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999).

²⁶R. David Edmunds, "'Unacquainted With the Laws of the Civilized World:' American Attitudes Toward the Métis Communities in the Old Northwest," in Jacqueline Peterson and Jennifer S. H. Brown, eds., *The New Peoples: Being and Becoming M'étis in North America* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1985), 185-194; also see Bradley J. Birzer, "Jean Baptiste Richardville: Miami Métis," in Edmunds, *Enduring Nations*.

²⁷The best analysis of Jacksonian Indian policy is still Ronald Satz, *American Indian Policy in the Jacksonian Era* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1975). Francis Paul Prucha presents an interesting defense of Jackson's Indian policies in "Andrew Jackson's Indian Policy: A Reassessment," *Journal of American History* 56 (December, 1969), 527-539. Also see John Mahon's *History of the Second Seminole Indian War* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1961); and Roger Nichols, *Black Hawk and the Warrior's Path* (Arlington Heights: Harlan Davidson, 1992). Ellen M. Whitney's multi-volume edition of *The Black Hawk War, 1831-1832* contains over 1000 letters, documents, lists of participants, etc. which focus on this contest. See Whitney, *The Black Hawk War*, Vols. 35-38 of the *Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library* (Springfield: Illinois State Historical Library, 1975-1978).

²⁸Satz, *American Indian Policy*, Chaps. 2,3,4. Also see Grant Forman, *Indian Removal* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1932), which is an "old standard" on the removal of the southern Indians, but still contains some valuable information. Also see Thurman Wilkins, *Cherokee Tragedy* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1970), which presents a defense of those Cherokees who cooperated with the government. Theda Perdue and Michael D. Green, eds., *The Cherokee Removal: A Brief History With Documents* (Boston: Bedford Books-St. Martin's Press, 1995) includes a brief history of Cherokee Removal, and an excellent collections of documents which focus upon these events. For the Creek loss of lands and removal, see Mary Young, *Redskins, Ruffleshirts, and Rednecks: Indian Allotments in Alabama and Mississippi* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1961), and Green, *The Politics of Indian Removal*; for Choctaw removal see Arthur DeRosier, *The Removal of the Choctaw Indians* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1970).

²⁹ Edmunds, Hoxie, and Salisbury, *The People*, chap. 9; Robert E. Bieder, *Native American Communities in Wisconsin, 1600-1900* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), chaps. 6-7. Also see Grant Forman, *Last Trek of the Indians* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932).

³⁰For a broad discussion of the exploitation of resources on Native American lands, see Donald L. Fixico, *The Invasion of Indian Country in the Twentieth Century* (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 1998).

³¹Edmunds, Hoxie, and Salisbury, *The People*, chap. 10; William McLoughlin, *After the Trail of Tears: the Cherokee Struggle for Sovereignty, 1839-1880* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993) passim; Devon Mihesuah, *Cultivating the Rosebuds: The Education of Women at the Cherokee Female Seminary* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), passim. Also see R. David Edmunds, "Indians as Pioneers: Potawatomis on the Kansas Frontier," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 65 (Winter, 1987-1988): 340-353.

³²The literature focusing upon Indian-White warfare in the west is far too voluminous to be enumerated. Perhaps two of the best surveys are Robert M. Utley, *Frontiersmen in Blue: the United States Army and the Indian, 1848-1865* (New York: Macmillan Pub. Co., 1967); and Utley, *Frontier Regulars: the United States Army and the Indian, 1866-1890* (New York: Macmillan Pub. Co., 1973).

³³Studies which focus upon Wisconsin or Great Lakes tribes during the last half of the 19th century and the first third of the 20th century include Patricia Ourada, *The Menominee Indians: A History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979); Brian C. Hosmer, *American Indians in the Marketplace: Persistence and Innovation Among the Menominees and Metlakatlangs, 1870-1920* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1999); Edmund J. Danziger, *The Chippewas of Lake Superior* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978); Melissa Meyer, *The White Earth Tragedy: Ethnicity and Dispossession at a Minnesota Anishinabe Reservation* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994); Rebecca Kugel, *To Be the Main Leader of Our People: A History of Minnesota Ojibwe Politics, 1825-1890* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1998); Brenda Child, *Boarding School Seasons* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998); Bieder, *Native American Communities in Wisconsin*, 151-199.

³⁴For a good analysis of the Wheeler-Howard Act and the Indian New Deal, see Kenneth Philp, *John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform, 1920-1954* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1978); and Lawrence Kelly, *The Assault on Assimilation: John Collier and the Origins of Indian Policy Reform* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1978). Indian participation in World War II is discussed

in Allison Bernstein's *American Indians in World War II* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991); and Kenneth Townsend, *World War II and the American Indian* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000).

³⁵By far the best discussion of "relocation" and "termination" can be found in Donald Fixico, *Termination and Relocation: Federal Indian Policy, 1945-1960* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986).

³⁶There are several excellent volumes on Menominee history. See David R. M. Beck, *Siege and Survival: A History of the Menominee Indians, 1634-1856* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002); Hosmer, *American Indians in the Marketplace*; and Ourada, *The Menominee Indians*.

³⁷Nicholas C. Peroff, *Menominee Drums: Tribal Termination and Restoration, 1954-1974* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982) provides an excellent account of this process. Also see Deborah Shames, ed., *Freedom From Reservation: The Menominee Struggle to Save Their Land and People* (Madison: National Committee to Save the Menominee People and Forests, 1972), which contains a series of documents and commentary focusing upon this struggle.

³⁸Bieder, *Native American Communities*, 4-6.

³⁹Donald L. Fixico, *The Urban Indian Experience in America* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000); also see Troy Johnson, Duane Champagne, and Joanne Nagel, "American Indian Activism and Transformation: Lessons from Alcatraz," in Johnson, Champagne, and Nagel, eds., *American Indian Activism: Alcatraz to the Longest Walk* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 1-44.

⁴⁰R. David Edmunds, "On Being Indian: Cultural Change in Historical Perspective." Manuscript is in the author's possession.

⁴¹For examples of removal rolls containing blood quantum assessments, see "A roll of Ottawa, Chippeway, and Potawatomi Emigrated Indians . . . under the Direction of Isaac L. Berry," 1838, National Archives, Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, (M234), Roll 752, 189; "Muster Roll of a Band of Pottawatomie Indians Delivered at the Osage River Agency, October 6, 1840, *Ibid.*, Roll 642, 234-236.

⁴²See "A census of the Cherokee nation of Indians, 1896." A copy of this census can be found in the National Archives Depository of the Federal Records Center, in Fort Worth Texas. Also see "Census of

Indians at the Quapaw Agency on June 30, 1913, taken by Ira C. Deaver, Superintendent.” This census can be found in the Seneca-Cayuga Tribal Archives, Seneca-Cayuga Tribe, Miami Oklahoma.. The author would like to thank Meg Hacker, Director of Archival Operations at the National Archives and Record Administration, -Southwest (Fort Worth) for her assistance in checking tribal census records.

⁴³Thornton, *American Indian Holocaust and Survival*, 236-237. Also see Thornton, “Health Disease, and Demography,” in Philip Deloria, and Neal Salisbury, eds., *A Companion to American Indian History* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), 76-80.

⁴⁴R. David Edmunds, “Moving With the Seasons, Not Fixed in Stone: The Evolution of Native American Identify,” in Albert Hurtado and Donald Pisani, eds., *New Perspectives on Native American History: The Mankiller Lectures* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, accepted for publication).

⁴⁵*Ibid.*

⁴⁶Stella U. Ogunwole, “The Native American Indian and Alaska Native Population: 2000.” This pamphlet was published by the U.S. Census Bureau, and released in February 2002.

⁴⁷Edmunds, “Moving With the Seasons.”; Alexandra Harmon, “Wanted: More Histories of Indian Identity,” in Deloria and Salisbury, *Companion to American Indian History*, 249-265; Joane Nagel, *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 137-140; Susan Joy Harjo, “Why Native Identity Matters: A Cautionary Tale,” *Indian Country Today*, 10 February 2005.