

Oberlin

Digital Commons at Oberlin

Honors Papers

Student Work

1991

The Friends of the Indians and Their Foes: A Reassessment of the Dawes Act Debate

Christopher J. Love
Oberlin College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.oberlin.edu/honors>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Love, Christopher J., "The Friends of the Indians and Their Foes: A Reassessment of the Dawes Act Debate" (1991). *Honors Papers*. 571.

<https://digitalcommons.oberlin.edu/honors/571>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at Digital Commons at Oberlin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Papers by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons at Oberlin. For more information, please contact megan.mitchell@oberlin.edu.

THE FRIENDS OF THE INDIANS AND THEIR FOES:
A Reassessment of the Dawes Act Debate

Christopher J. Love
April 27, 1991

Senior Honors - History
Advisor: Gary Kornblith

Dedicated to my parents, Don and Mary Kay Love

Special thanks to my advisor Gary Kornblith
for his encouragement and patience,
and to Michael Fraser and Melissa Thompson

Contents

I.	Introducion.....	1
II.	Mainstream Reform.....	21
III.	Dissent.....	46
IV.	Conclusion.....	67
V.	Notes.....	71
VI.	Bibliography.....	80

I. Introduction

In the centennial of the passage of the Northwest Ordinance, 1887, the U.S. Congress passed the Dawes Act, continuing the program set up by the earlier document. The Northwest Ordinance had sought to incorporate lands previously uninhabited by whites into the American realm by imposing a Euro-American sense of order onto areas viewed as "wild" and "savage." The document created a program by which the western development of the continent would proceed in a rational manner, and by which lands would be attributed worth and meaning in relation to the developed areas to the east. The Dawes Act proceeded in the tradition of the Northwest Ordinance by incorporating Indian reservations of the West into the economic and political sphere of late nineteenth century America. It proposed to break up the communal lands of Indian tribes and nations into quarter sections for individual farmers. In the process, Indian tribes were dispossessed, and white settlers and corporations were granted the lands that had been ^{guaranteed} guaranteed to the tribes forever. The Dawes Act was one of the last measures in the expansionist heritage of the United States by which the remaining enclaves of Indian lands were subjected to the enveloping grid.

During the 1880s, the Indian Question became more ominous and more urgent in the eyes of concerned Easterners who called themselves the Friends of the Indians. These reformers created the Dawes Act and encouraged its passage. They were supported by mainstream society in an endeavor to incorporate desired tribal lands into the American realm. It was easy for earlier

generations to relegate Indian groups to peripheral and undesirable lands in the infinity of the American West, but by the 1880s, land was becoming scarce and those distant lands once known as the "Great American Desert" were desired by an ever-expanding nation.¹ The Plains had become an integral part of the American landscape and economy, and its Indian reservations were frustrating the drive to link the continent, from East to West, with white American culture. The boundless continent had become finite. No longer could white America soothe its sense of guilt by compensating Indians with lands in the distant West. With the absence of alternative lands, white guilt was replaced with new and broader justifications for the dispossession of the Indians - justifications that could support the possibility of Indian cultural extinction.²

Reservations were anomalous lands in a country of hyper-rational spaces. The lands were held in common; they were not owned by any individual, but by communistic groups that did not subscribe to American ideas of property and ownership. They were held by a racial minority in a country which did not grant power or property to non-whites. They were not held by Christians or yeoman farmers or American citizens, but by a "backward, heathen" people that was keeping lands from their true destiny as part of the homogeneous American landscape. Western "landgrabbers," railroad and mining interests often portrayed Indian tribes as wealthy land monopolists and whites as victims of the reservations' riches.³ In comparison to corporate land holdings in the West, the assertion of Indians as monopolists is a bit absurd, but it reflects a hostility to the notion of a landed

racial minority - an idea that defied the power structure that was being imposed on racial and ethnic minorities within the new social and economic structures of the industrializing nation.

Reservations institutionalized savagery in a civilized nation. Their presence questioned the notion of America, of its people and of its culture. They challenged the idea of Manifest Destiny and of the struggle to tame the wilds of the American continent, a battle which was in its waning moments, waiting for the fateful closing of the frontier which would come officially with the census of 1890.⁴ Few reformers would conceive of any benefit coming from tribal land holdings that did not conform to the traditional forms of individual ownership in the United States. America had too much wrapped up in its vision of a land linked by the logic of the grid to accommodate the threatening presence of the Indian reservations.

In response to the pressure to break up the Indian reservations and to incorporate them into the American realm, many of the Eastern reform groups concerned with the Indian Question worked out a program by which white America's ravenous appetite for land would be satisfied. As far back as Thomas Jefferson, the notion of allotting Indian lands had been considered.⁵ The process of allotment entailed breaking up the communal land holdings of the tribes into individual tracts for each family. No comprehensive policy had ever been established in relation to allotment because removal to the West had always been more expedient. However, with lands becoming scarce, many reformers considered allotment to be the best alternative. The

dubious land status of the Indian tribes would be replaced with the respectability of private ownership, while the excess lands of the tribes would be opened up to white settlers clamoring for land. In the process, the Indians would be acculturated into white American civilization - the savage would metamorphose into the responsible American citizen.

Allotment had been considered in Congress in 1880 and in 1884 under the name of the Coke Bills; however, neither of those bills were ever passed.⁶ During that time, the most powerful Eastern reform groups remained ambivalent toward allotment. Private property was considered an admirable goal for the Indian tribes, but the reformers were wary of imposing allotment onto the tribes in direct conflict with hundreds of treaty agreements that had promised the tribes security and protection for their lands.⁷ In the Coke Bills, there was a safety feature to protect tribes from unwanted allotments. A majority of the tribe had to vote for allotment before it could be implemented. Because few tribes wanted allotment, the safety feature all but negated the usefulness of the proposed legislation. The reformers were also concerned that once the lands had been split up, it would be only a matter of time before the Indians would be dispossessed of their lands due to their ignorance of American society. If allotment were to be implemented, the general concensus among the reformers was that it should be introduced slowly, and only when a particular tribe was ready to compete in American society. Otherwise, allotment could have proved disastrous for the tribes.

Throughout the 1880s, however, the sentiment among the reform community began to change. Westerners were pressuring for

tribal lands, politicians were leaning towards allotment and many reformers were becoming frustrated with the slow pace of change that their programs were affecting on the reservations. Allotment became more and more attractive. Most of the reformers began to support allotment, and even to endorse a coercive measure that would force the tribes to accept allotment whenever the President saw fit.⁸ By 1886, the Dawes Bill for the allotment of land in severalty was proposed in both Houses of Congress. Unlike the earlier ambivalence toward allotment, the most established groups within the reform community put their full support behind the Dawes Bill. Senator Dawes of Massachusetts, the sponsor, was often in attendance at the yearly Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indians which was instrumental in creating the legislation. The Commissioners of Indian Affairs working under the President also had strong ties to the Lake Mohonk Conference and the organizations involved. The Dawes Act was the brain child of Lake Mohonk, of the Indian Rights Association and of the Women's National Indian Association, both of Philadelphia, and of their groups around the nation.⁹ It was supported by missionary organizations that had been involved on the reservations for decades, and it was supported by the Eastern industrial schools set up to train and acculturate Indian boys and girls. Although support for the Dawes Bill was strong, there were important dissenters: most notably the National Indian Defense Association of Washington D.C. in the East; and in the West, the nations of the Five Civilized Tribes of the Indian Territory and various other Indian

tribes who were tolerated and even showcased by the reform groups in the East as long as they supported the reform policies of absorption and acculturation into American society.¹⁰ However, the dissent proved little threat to the passage of the bill, and the Dawes Act became law on February 7, 1887.¹¹

The Dawes Act became the beacon for much of the reform movement as a panacea for a troublesome question that had bothered generations of Americans. After its passage, it was likened to the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence and the Emancipation Proclamation in the self-congratulatory rhetoric produced by the reform groups that had pushed for it.¹² The Indian Question had finally been solved in a single stroke; a problem that had troubled the country since its beginning, solved by Eastern philanthropists. And the reformers hit at the problem which had always been central to the conflict between white Americans and the Indian tribes: land.

The Dawes Act proposed to break up the reservations by granting individual title to each member of the respective tribes, thus creating rugged individual agriculturalists out of the savage, communitarian hunters of the Plains; making ideal American citizens out of the heathens of the wilderness.¹³ Each family head would be granted the title to 160 acres which the promoters of the act promised would secure the land from the threat of white takeover. The United States could not protect the vast land holdings of the tribes, but if the Indians accepted the recognized form of individual ownership by being incorporated into the industrializing American landscape, the benevolence of the American legal system and the vote granted to the Indians as

members of the American democracy would protect them from further degradations.

The rhetoric behind the Dawes Act stressed the altruism of the bill with its foremost purpose to protect the Indians from doom and to grant them the benefits of absorption into American society, in the process securing to them the right to their lands. The real motivations behind the act were not so benevolent. The act was an assault on Indian cultures with the express purpose of destroying tribal governments and social groupings. It undermined tribal religions in order to spread Christianity. Most importantly, it opened up excess lands on the reservations to white development, railroad interests and mining interests.¹⁴ In this effort, such diverse groups as Christian missionaries, politicians from East and West, philanthropists, corporations and other Western land interests that were usually opposed united around a policy that could achieve something everyone wanted to see: the end of the tiresome problem of the Indian.¹⁵

The Dawes Act was one of the last measures in a long history of the taming of the American wilderness, a process of conquering which helped to give meaning to the idea of America. (By the late 1880s, the threat of Indian retaliation had been neutralized, taking the Indian lands in order to incorporate them into the American realm was a powerful symbolic gesture.) At a time of social, cultural and economic turmoil, the expansion of America into the wild Indian reservations supplied a dose of self-assurance to a country racked by the chaos of industrialization

and the social upheaval of post-Civil War America.¹⁶

Dispossessing a disempowered population could be an exhilarating and fulfilling feeling for a country moving into a new era, wondering where the civilization that they had espoused as superior would take them.

A definitive answer to the Indian Question finally had been found in the Dawes Act. The previous resistance of many Indians to the passive approaches to civilizing, such as education and Christianizing, could be countered by the forceful new policy of allotment. The new land policy actively destroyed Indian governments and cultures. It imposed white American ideas of land ownership by coercing the Indians into allotment while claiming to be their saving grace. The Dawes Act became the central document of United States Indian policy for the next fifty years. During that time, Indian tribes and Indian individuals lost sixty percent of their land holdings due to a policy created and pushed by the Friends of the Indians.¹⁷

* * *

An important study of the Dawes Act was published in 1934 by Delos S. Otis entitled The Dawes Act and the Allotment of Indian Lands which examined the passage of the act and the first years of its execution. The report was used in the hearings for the Indian Reorganization Act which became law in 1934, restructuring United States policy towards American Indians by reversing the precedent set by the Dawes Act and restoring tribal sovereignty.¹⁸ Otis's analysis was not always very deep, but it was able to influence U.S. policy toward American Indians. The

study explored the passage of the bill, the motivations behind its passage, and the key players in white America who sponsored the act, especially Eastern reform groups. Unfortunately, the original monograph was not widely known until being republished in 1972, and the analysis of the Dawes Act has rarely surpassed the level of Otis's work in the 1930s. The subsequent scholarship concerning the Dawes Act has followed Otis's conclusions; namely that the policy was a failure, but that those responsible for the legislation were merely "children of their age in their deference to individualism."¹⁹

Otis had mentioned that there was opposition to the Dawes Act, but he did not explore the National Indian Defense Association extensively. Wilcomb Washburn in The Assault on Indian Tribalism and Christine Bolt in American Indian Policy and American Reform have treated the opposition in white America more than other scholars, but for the most part the opposition has been ignored, leaving the arguments of the Dawes Act supporters unchallenged.²⁰ The scholarship has created a justification for the mainstream reformers which constructs certain cultural trends in American society as inescapable currents which predetermined the outcome of the allotment debate and the passage of the Dawes Act. For the most part, the scholarship has disavowed the white opposition to the bill, undermining the validity of those voices as unusual and unreliable people who cannot seriously inform the study of the debate.²¹ Without exception, the objections from American Indians have been ignored, furthering the flawed belief that they were completely passive players in the course of

American history and in the allotment debate.

The historical scholarship concerning the allotment debate of the 1880s often has shown a strong affinity toward the Eastern reformers who supported the Dawes Act, at the expense of developing the dissenting voices. Many historians have gone to great pains to explain that the group of elite Eastern reformers responsible for the Dawes Act was sincerely concerned for the survival of the American Indians as individuals. Even though the reformers' policies promoted ethnocide, many historians have held that they must not be faulted because they were simply responding to conditions out of their control. As Francis Paul Prucha concluded his book American Indian Policy in Crisis,

The Christian reformers faced the crisis in American Indian policy with honesty and the best of intentions. With singleminded devotion to their cause they brought forth their panaceas - land in severalty, law, education, and efficient administration - and by united effort triumphantly won their way in Congress. With typical reformers' zeal they swept criticism and opposition aside, for they knew that they were supremely right. So much more tragic, then, was their ultimate failure.²²

Not only does Prucha romanticize the reformers and clear them of responsibility for their policies, he all but makes them the victims of history. Not only were American Indians brutalized by historical processes; so too were the noble visions of the reformers. The actors in Prucha's interpretation - American Indians and Protestant reformers alike - become secondary to a deterministic explanation of the trans-continental expansion of America. According to this approach, the cultural chauvinism of the time and their sincere belief in the superiority of American civilization necessarily made the reformers blind to alternative solutions to the Indian Question which would have dealt more

justly with the Indian tribes.

Exploring the opposition to a bill deemed as unjust and morally bankrupt by later generations and which was subsequently abandoned as policy of the U.S. government, does not automatically indict those responsible for its passage. But the instinct to protect the reformers from moral judgment at the price of exploring the opposition detracts from a more critical evaluation. It is easy to protect the honor of the white progressives with whom certain historians may feel an affinity if the other voices in the debate are never explored. For instance, Robert M. Utley in The Indian Frontier of the American West redeemed the supporters of the Dawes Act, stating,

While recognizing the [legislation's] catastrophic consequences, one must also acknowledge the altruistic motives of its framers and promoters. As an article of faith - of Protestant evangelical faith - the reformers genuinely believed that land must not be suffered to lie unused in the approved Anglo-Saxon fashion - a conviction that incidentally supported the notions of land boomers who wasted no altruism on Indians ... Though scarcely a recompense to the victims, the evidence of high-minded motivation is simply too overwhelming to be buried in a later generation's guilt over the hardship and injustice inflicted on the Indians.²³

The desire to see American lands cultivated, shared by the reformers and the land boomers that Utley speaks of, was not incidental; it came from common prejudices and common motivations. The reformers simply had a more complex system of justification to shield their deep hostility to American Indians and to hide their imperialist desire to dispossess the tribes. Utley is right in saying that the explanation serves as little comfort to the victims, but perhaps including their voices in his analysis would accomplish that goal while problematizing the

arguments of the reformers he feels he must defend. It is easy to normalize the responses to the debate from those noble philanthropists of Victorian America when the opposition is ignored. However, it tips the balance of the analysis in a specific direction, furthering the unstated goals of the historians and establishing a false idea of historical inevitability which clouds a deeper analysis of the debate.

* * *

Various arguments have been made that the subjugation of the continent and the desecration of American Indians were part of a process of self-definition for the United States; the Dawes Act being one of the last instances of this process as it pushed to destroy Indian governments and cultures. The act of expansion defined America as white civilization marched across the lands once held by Native Americans.²⁴ William Boelhower has argued that the rationality imposed on the American landscape by the Jeffersonian grid was an attempt to create an artificial sense of political and cultural unity where chaos had prevailed; creating America out of the culture of the map. By ignoring the complexities of the terrain, the program institutionalized with the Northwest Ordinance created America where before there had been wilderness; it extended civilization where before there had been savagery. The expanding nation considered land empty until validated by European geometry.²⁵ Until the reservations were surveyed and incorporated into the American landscape, they too were considered empty since the savagery which they locked in was

worthless. Justifications such as the determinism of American expansion arose to explain the dispossession by the dominant nation of subordinate peoples.²⁶ In the United States, arguments such as Manifest Destiny, Social Darwinism, Anglo-Saxon superiority, and other forms of racialist thinking were used to legitimize the imperialist actions of the American democracy by constructing the conquering of the continent as a pre-ordained program which would see the spread of American culture from coast to coast.²⁷

However deeply the justifications for expansion were ingrained into the minds of nineteenth century white Americans, the artificiality of the elaborate ideological constructs must not be forgotten. It is important to undertake studies such as that of Boelhower who talks of the significance of the revolution of the map culture, or that of Takaki who has argued that the culture of the Market Revolution of the latter nineteenth century merged various ideologies such as Republicanism, individualism and Protestant asceticism into complex justifications for the violence whites vented and institutionalized against American Indians and other racial minorities.²⁸ However, the map culture was not pre-ordained, and the "Iron Cage" mentality did not completely pervade American society. Both Boelhower and Takaki stress the artificiality of the ideologies.²⁹ The ideological systems that their studies describe must be seen as flexible constructs that went through a series of changes. Historical scholarship should not reify ideological constructs that have

been later organized into neat packages for historical consumption.

The American West has suffered more than any other region of the country from romanticized historical scholarship that has transformed its history into mythic tales of grandeur. Until recently, the study of the region was dominated by the analysis of Frederick Jackson Turner's frontier thesis of 1893. The paper which Turner read to the American Historical Society, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," constructed the American West as a series of frontier zones which progressed across the boundless continent, allowing for a regenerative quality he claimed was unique to the American experience. The American character, both individual and national, took its cue from the freshness of the virgin lands which encouraged a constant rebirth through conquest. As Turner stated,

American social development has been continually beginning over again on the frontier. This perennial rebirth, this fluidity of American life, this expansion westward with its new opportunities, its continuous touch with the simplicity of primitive society, furnish the forces dominating American character.³⁰

The ideal American became the picture of virility, taming the wilds and urging the triumph of civilization and democracy. In the process, a spirit of rugged individualism was attributed to the West: a place where a man could be a man, a place where the difference between savagery and civilization was heightened, and a place where the concept of America was to be forged. Turner was able to harness all of the masculine imagery and patriotic rhetoric he could muster into a paper whose own mythic quality

has rivaled that of the West itself. As a result of the power of Turner's "poetic fusion" (see Lamar and Thompson, pp.43-44), the history of the West was impoverished by an analysis which reduced the region to a simplistic battle of man against nature, allowing no room for the serious discussion of experiences that differed from that of Turner's ultra-virile, ruggedly individual American pioneer, if any ever existed.³¹

Although Turner's frontier thesis has been refuted for decades, the influence of his paper remains. Recently, a book was published which glorifies the Frontier process more than Turner did nearly a hundred years ago. In the prologue of Gerald Kreyche's Visions of the American West from 1989, Kreyche states,

The West was a place to ennoble the common man, to strike out on one's own, to go back to the wild and savage for a renewal of vitality, to lead the strenuous life, and to sing the praises of America. Welcome to the American West!³²

Kreyche's highly patriotic, woefully nostalgic, and generally unfactual conclusions of the American West manage to simplify the conditions of the region more than Turner did, while ignoring virtually all of the current scholarship on the West. However, Kreyche's seemingly outdated analysis of the West attests to the fact that Turner's thesis is still being refuted and in cases like that of Kreyche, even glorified; never having been relegated to its proper status as simply a powerful and dramatic example of late nineteenth century historical writing.

"The Significance of the Frontier in American History" has been recognized as a simplistic analysis which glorified American

conquest and racial violence as it denied the complexity and multiplicity of experiences in the American West. Trachtenburg has noted that the self-assurance of the piece masked a deep feeling of uncertainty arising from the unstable social and economic conditions of the time.³³ However, remnants of the Turnerian mindset still plague the study of the American West, and more broadly, the study of the imperialist legacy of the United States. Turner's arguments that American legal and political institutions which he claimed achieved a supreme benevolence through the freedom available from the frontier process, have been widely rejected; however, much of the scholarship dealing with the West still attaches an inevitability to the idea of Manifest Destiny in the spirit of the heroic language of Turner, creating blinders that ignore important components of the true story of the development and conquest of the American continent. Such scholarship has served to keep silent voices from the past that dissented from the policies of the United States and resisted deterministic arguments for expansion. Even the scholarship that has indicted the imperialist legacy of the United States has played its part in supporting a Turnerian mindset by validating the idea that the conquest of lands and of American Indians fit into a grand scheme - albeit deplorable - for the growth of the country.

Much of the scholarship of the 1950s, 60s and into the 70s that dealt with the imperialist past of the United States during the massive development of the nineteenth century took the same arguments that previously had been used to romanticize American

conquest and used them to indict the past policy of the United States and American culture.³⁴ The inversion of the equation represented progress in the analysis, but the same simplistic factors were used. The whites were still the aggressors and the Indians were still the victims; the understandings and sensibilities involved with those concepts had simply shifted. One of the central aspects of these studies was the discussion of the myths and mindsets that had developed in order to justify the dispossession of the American Indians. The naming of the myths involved in the justification of American conquest, such as the myth of the Vanishing American, the myth of the yeoman farmer, and the belief in the American West as societal safety valve, were an important process in the analysis of American expansion.³⁵ However, the myths discussed in these works at times have taken on the aura of fact as the mindsets were constructed as inevitable cultural responses steeped in the conditions of nineteenth century white American society. When studies such as those of Boelhower and Takaki more recently are read simply as monolithic responses emanating from white America, the analysis is stifled because they encourage the idea of a homogeneous and dynamic dominant culture acting upon static and unresponsive disempowered groups.

Although the ideas in Patricia Limerick's The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West are not altogether original in the study of the region, she synthesizes them into an analysis that broadens the scope of the scholarship

dealing with American conquest. Limerick rejects the highly patriotic and simplistic tendency in the study of the West which has served to undermine the experiences of the actual participants; affirming only the experience of the idealized white Westerner, or that of the pathetic Indian victim. Turner mythologized the triumph of white culture, emphasising in his analysis of the West the successive stages of the American frontier marching across the continent. He attached a validity to the artificial concept of the frontier. This abstract idea was made concrete, understood as the line of development that separated civilization from savagery; and then it was made central to the story.³⁶ Limerick proposes ~~is~~ a radical break from the traditional tendency of seeing the history of the West as a process of development with successive frontier zones. As she states, "Deemphasize the frontier and its supposed end, conceive of the West as a place and not a process, and Western American History has a new look."³⁷ Limerick challenges the sanctified march of civilization and the artificiality of the idea of the frontier, calling for a complex analysis which will accomodate the disparate experiences and peripheral voices of the various players, leaving behind a simplistic Turnerian analysis. In the process, she proposes a study which does not need to rely on concepts that artificially tie together the history of the immense region known as THE WEST; but which emphasizes the real experiences of all participants. She has sought to rescue the West from the domain of myth and exceptionalism; linking it to the imperialist past of the United States which is relevant for the whole of American history.

* * *

Not everyone subscribed to the cultural and ideological trends that are described in studies such as those of Boelhower and Takaki. It is important to go back and grant voice to actors outside of white America who have been neglected by the historical profession even when there was readily available evidence of their views. As has been stated by MARHO, the Radical Historians Association,

We live in a society whose past is given to us in images that assert the inevitability of the way things are ... Past efforts to contest prevailing social and political arrangements disappear from dominant versions of our history - when they are not simply labeled as foreign or dismissed as utopian.³⁸

This study, stresses the artificiality of the arguments used to justify the passage of the Dawes Act while highlighting the sense of uncertainty that dominated among the Dawes Act supporters. It focuses on the dissent to a policy that has been widely determined as an inevitable product of white American culture. It explores the resistance that both white Americans and American Indians showed toward a policy they felt was unjust. It is an attempt ~~is~~ to expand the analysis of an important debate by challenging the accepted views of the mainstream reformers and exploring peripheral responses which did not significantly inform the dominant culture of the time, but which are important for a greater understanding of the ideological limits of the contempo-

rary society.

II. Mainstream Reform

February 8, 1889 was celebrated as the second anniversary of Indian Emancipation Day at the Hampton Institute in Virginia, an industrial school set up after the Civil War to train blacks, but which later began training American Indians from the western reservations. Hampton prepared blacks for participation and eventual absorption into American society, creating a place for them in the new social and economic order of post-Civil War America. The industrial training espoused at Hampton also included a strong drive to civilize and uplift the race, while institutionalizing a special educational status for blacks which would create productive and subordinate members of industrial America. The reformers' training of freedmen were soon applied to the various Indian tribes from reservations in the Plains and Western territories. The new program at Hampton was started under the direction of Richard Henry Pratt, a white Easterner who in the 1860s and 70s headed a black regiment which fought against Plains Indians.¹ Pratt brought in Indians from the reservations, most of whom knew no English, and they were placed in a program of civilizing in the Eastern school, far from the barbaric conditions of the West. The celebrations that day marked the second anniversary of the passage of the Dawes Act, the fruit of a debate which had been vigorously supported by the most influential reformers of the time, and which highlighted a reform crusade with messianic hopes of saving the Indian race from its supposed extinction.

On Indian Emancipation Day, the Indian students sat on the stage at Hampton while the black students and white visitors applauded their accomplishments from the audience. The Indian children were the picture of gentility, "the boys in school uniform and the girls neatly dressed," as they showed off their newly-attained civilization. The white audience and the reformist newspaper which reported the event were pleased by the mimickry of white American culture by the showcased students. One Sioux speaker had even been renamed Herbert Welsh in honor of the Eastern philanthropist by the same name who had founded the Indian Rights Association, instrumental in the creation and passage of the Dawes Act. At the end of the meeting, members of all three races stood to sing "My country tis of thee," the scene of which warmed the hearts of reformists and concerned whites across the nation. As the article commented,

...how short is the time since these words were meaningless to two of the races, and how true they have now become to both. How prophetic of all that is good, noble, and Christian for both races, should this national hymn be.²

The three races singing together the greatness of their common land was the picture of racial harmony through subjugation which the white reformers had been working to achieve for years. No longer was Pratt commanding one subordinate race to kill another, now the reformists were training blacks and Indians to live together in harmony, and to accept their position as subordinate members of American industrial society. The reformers could credit themselves for their selfless efforts to better the lot of heathen and down-trodden races.

* * *

After the Civil War, the reform community which eventually went on to sponsor the Dawes Act gained considerable influence in the policy making of the United States, initially through the Grant administration. President Grant had set up the Peace Policy to involve religious groups active in the reform of United States Indian policy in the administration of Indian affairs. The government bureaucracy was widely viewed as corrupt, and by including private religious groups in the administration of Indian policy, Grant hoped to salvage the reputation of the bureaucracy.³ Later the Commissioners of Indian Affairs, part of the bureaucracy instrumental in determining U.S. Indian policy, included strong influences from the private reform sector. The highly respected, morally sound Eastern elite added an assurance to any policy that was passed with their approval to a public wary of the corruption of the agency system. The government and the reformers established a working relationship which benefitted them both. The government used the moral authority of the reformers to encourage support for their policies, while the reformers were boosted into high profile positions in the government bureaucracy and granted nearly unquestioned authority in Indian affairs into following decades.⁴

By the time the Dawes Act was proposed in 1886, the Indian reform movement had divided into two distinct groups. The larger group, whose policies were articulated at the annual Lake Mohonk Conferences, was well-organized, well-respected and powerful. It reflected more closely the attitudes of mainstream society than did their more radicalized adversaries. The dominant reformers

were concentrated mostly in New England, New York and Pennsylvania, with some support from the other Middle Atlantic states and from the Midwest. They included in their ranks various college presidents, former Presidents of the United States, former Commissioners of Indian Affairs, ethnologists and anthropologists, former reservation agents and other former government officials. Their journals reached a wider audience than those of the radical reformers, and they often wrote about the Indian Question for mainstream publications. They were an Eastern elite representing the paternalistic, philanthropic heritage of the East, whose prestige made them very influential in Indian affairs.⁵

The mainstream reformers displayed a hostility to anything foreign to the Eastern elites' conception of proper American values, and their nativism was not shown exclusively to American Indians. Slotkin demonstrates that the reformers tried to break down any community that they deemed as primitive - whether those of blacks, immigrants and workers in the industrialized cities, or of the Indian groups on the reservations. The dominant reform philosophy sought to thrust the individual into the new political and economic system of America on the same level as the white American, assimilating the marginalized groups into the greater society to eradicate their threat to the social order.⁶ Despite the similar hostilities the reformers showed to the threatening peripheral groups, and the similarity of the programs to deal with other marginalized groups, the Indian Question had a special component.

Although the Indian Question vexed generations of Americans, by the 1880s American Indians were a far less threatening group than the immigrants, migrating blacks, and industrial workers perceived as threats to the social order in Eastern and Midwestern cities. In the Indian Question, the Eastern reformers could ignore the problems in their own region by dealing with a highly emotional and moralistic issue, the treatment of the disempowered Indian, in a mythic area of the country, the frontier region of the American West.⁷ In the comfort of the East, the reformers could distance themselves from responsibility for the wrongs done to the American Indians in the anarchic American West. They could indict the policy of the government and of the white Westerners who had gone to steal land away from the Indians, while professing themselves to be the friends and saviors of a race.

Many reformers assumed, as did mainstream society, that the Indians were a vanishing race, yielding to the power of the dominant martial race. The only hope for their survival would arise from conversion to a civilized life within the benevolent institutions of American society.⁸ The reformers and Christian missionaries encouraged education and Christianity on the reservations as part of the acculturation process. Once the Indians had been civilized, they could be granted citizenship, benefitting from the liberty and justice promised to all Americans. According to an article in the magazine The Nineteenth Century, participation in the American democracy would magically transform the Indian into an ideal American citizen,

With the ballot in his hand the Red Man will need no

guardianship, no protection. He may bury his tomahawk. In his presence, political parties will vie with each other in the meekness of their salaams. His welfare, his health, his wife, and all his papooses, will suddenly become objects of tender solicitude. He will be agreeably surprised at his quick metamorphosis from a 'bloody savage' and a 'whooping hyena' into a full-blown gentleman with a presented button-hole posie on his lapel.⁹

The rhetoric of the mainstream reformers masked the darker motivations behind their policies. In the process of civilizing, tribal lands would be broken up, private allotments would replace the communistic tribal system, but more importantly, the excess lands that white America coveted would be freed from their bondage and opened to the worthy American farmer.

Helen Hunt Jackson's A Century of Dishonor: A Sketch of the United States Governments' Dealings with Some of the Indian Tribes of 1881 quickly came to represent the spirit of the reformer crusade to solve the Indian Question in the 1880s. The a highly emotional account of the atrocities committed against the American Indians in the course of the nation's first hundred years was an outpouring of white reformist guilt and redemption. As Hunt explained, the purpose of the book was,

To show our causes for national shame in the matter of our treatment of the Indians. It is a shame which the American nation ought not to lie under, for the American people, as a people, are not at heart unjust.¹⁰

The reformers took Jackson's book as their rallying cry, and vowed that they would start a new era in the history of white-Indian relations which would redeem the country of the shame of its past acts. However, by the time Jackson published her book, the Indian tribes had been virtually disempowered, and the dramatic battles that made for good reading and impassioned debate were over.

U.S. Indian policy was entering a new stage in which harrowing battles would not be fought, but more widespread and more deceptive means of dispossessing Indian tribes and nations would be devised which did not arouse public sentiment. The blatantly imperialistic and militaristic practices of the United States were giving way to more covert policies of dispossession and disempowerment. The reformers were instrumental in establishing the tools by which America would dispossess the Indian tribes and nations in the emerging modern society. In a modification of the old axiom, "There's no good Indian but a dead Indian," Capt. Pratt from Carlisle, representing the reformers' changed attitude to the new circumstances in Indian-white relations, stated, "There is no good Indian but a dead Indian. Let us by education and patient effort kill the Indian in him, and save the man!" Pratt's statement marked a new proposition in Indian affairs by which ethnocide would replace genocide.¹¹

* * *

In 1886, Jonathon Harrison, a journalist for the Boston Herald, toured several Indian reservations in the American West and wrote a book about them published by the Indian Rights Association. This book and other first hand accounts by eastern reformers and ethnologists were popular at places like the Lake Mohonk Conferences. The accounts were usually dismal, describing down-trodden people living in filth - both physical and moral.

Harrison's account followed the basic formula, painting a pathetic picture of pitiable savages. But there was one

reservation he visited in the West which was unlike the others:

In all my journeys of thousands of miles, the first region that I saw which gave me the feeling that I should like to "settle," and live there as a farmer, was the Puyallup Valley, near Puget Sound, in the northern part of Washington Territory. There I saw green grass - long an unfamiliar sight - and rich soil; and there is rain there in the season for it. The agent says his Indians are "real folks," and they look and act as if it were so. Many of them live in good framed houses, which are embosomed in green trees and surrounded by orchards heavily laden with fruit, with grape vines climbing and tumbling and sprawling everywhere.¹²

Harrison's description of this reservation depicts a nearly ideal condition for the Indians in the eyes of eastern reformers. The Indians had settled in sturdy houses for individual families, had cultivated their lands to a state of abundance, and had learned the manners of "real folks." They had rejected their savage ways, imitating the virtues of the hard-working New England farmer or the mythic yeoman farmer of the American frontier who created order out of the chaos of wild America, who subdued nature and transformed their environments into highly rational and abundant places.¹³

The edenic environment that Harrison found in Washington Territory spoke to the desires of the reformers. They hoped that the Dawes Act would be able to replicate the Indian farmers of the Puyallup Valley across the American West, solving the Indian Question with a pastoral fantasy in which the Indians' houses would be "embosomed in green trees and surrounded by orchards heavily laden with fruit, with grape vines climbing and tumbling and sprawling everywhere."

Accounts such as those of Harrison were used as evidence to justify the Dawes Act and the crisis that would ensue among the Indians as their reservations and nations were ripped apart by

allotment. The greater good that would come from this "Arcadia realized for the Indian" would pardon any temporary horrors the Indians would have to endure.¹⁴ By using imagery that spoke to the nostalgic, patriotic visions of hearty pioneers, the reformers could ignore the forces at work against the Indians, and accept the fallacy that the emerging corporate-industrial nation was developed by the individualistic American farmer. The reformers were clinging to old dreams in which land ownership was available for everyone, and in which private ownership would insure the political rights and moral strength of the individual, in this case Indian upon their own allotted lands.

The reformers' rhetoric was injected with a strong dose of Anglo-Saxonism. America was seen as the last great development in a history of progressively improving Anglo-Saxon political institutions.¹⁵ It was within these institutions of justice and freedom that the promise of the Indians' future would be realized. The admission into American citizenry, as had been argued with blacks, would solve all of the problems that beset the unfortunate race. The reformers felt that it was a great honor to consider the Indians eligible for citizenship in the freest country in the world, and whatever problems that might arise would be well worth the trouble.¹⁶

The reformers deplored the anomolous status of the Indians in American society. The United States had never been able to successfully define the Indian in American society, and from generation to generation, the status and rights of the tribes and nations would change. At certain times, the Indian groups were

considered dependent domestic nations; at others, they were considered wards of the government. One magazine pondered the bewildering status of the Indian, stating,

Not an alien, nor a denizen, nor a subject, the Federal law is mystified in defining the [Indian's] legal status, and suspiciously regards him as a sort of unclassified heteroclite, but still under the Federal jurisdiction ... the Indian is a perpetual sojourner upon lands which are his, but whose right to that land is subordinate to the Government's desire to purchase.¹⁷

The Indians' position both inside and outside of American society puzzled and irritated the individualistic sentiments of the reformers. The tribe or the dependent nation was repugnant to America. The individual was the political and social unit upon which America was built, and the reformers showed a deep hostility to the idea that any person in the United States would be treated differently than any other and remain an "unclassified heteroclite."¹⁸

* * *

The reformers sitting in their retreat in upstate New York constructed the West as the antithesis of the civilized areas of the continent which already had been tamed for several generations. As President Gates of Rutgers, an active Mohonker, described the superiority of Eastern society,

The power of law is best discerned by the thoughtful in the silent steady reign of law that characterizes and conditions the society in which we live here at the East.¹⁹

Unlike the refined East, the West was an immoral, lawless place which questioned the goodness of the established order. The West was chaos, and it threatened the moral standing of the nation.

The Eastern reformers spent more time critiquing the base

elements of white civilization on the frontier in their analysis than they did condemning Indian cultures. They felt the inhabitants were of a different breed: "the scum and dregs" and the "immorally foul" of the white race.²⁰ It was from these people that the Indians were learning their vices. As primitives, the Indians still possessed many inherently honorable characteristics according to the racialist thinking of the time; but in contact with the worst of white civilization, they lost all of their natural virtue and picked up all of the vices of the white race. The reformers argued that the reservations were fencing in the barbarism of the Indian cultures by not allowing the tribes contact with any sector of American society except the morally corrupt on the fringes of civilization. The Indians were not educated, they were not Christianized; they were simply left to decay on the reservations far from the benefits of the civilized East.²¹

The Indians needed to enjoy the benefits of civilization, and the reformers would show them the way. They spoke of the superiority of Euro-American civilization, and they fully believed it was their duty to spread Christianity over the continent. However, the Euro-American civilization that the Indians would be forced to enter if the Dawes Act succeeded was not the stable, Christian, civilized East, but the chaotic, immoral, savage West. What the Indians actually needed, which the reformers recognized, was safety from whites who degraded the good name of the nation by stealing and murdering - those "unrestrained and unrestrainable settlers."²² Although the

Easterners tried to distance themselves from the base sections of white society, the West could not be divorced from the rest of white American culture. Any time the reformers sided with the Indians and constructed them as the victims, they were condemning their own culture and questioning their own right to dispossess the Indians of their tribal holdings in the name of civilization. Any time they claimed white cultural superiority, the fact that whites were committing barbarous acts against the Indians undermined their arguments.

The reformers' glorification of American expansionism was tempered by criticisms of the United States - its history and its current policies - and by criticisms of the general moral degeneracy of American society. The foreign influences which evoked the strong nativism of the Eastern elite were not the only component of the reformers concern; anti-Western sentiment was also very strong. In a speech at the 1886 Lake Mohonk Conference, a Philadelphia reformer explained that the "two deadly foes to Indian civilization" were from white America: the Indian hater and the land-grabber and speculator. In a damning tirade, he depicted them as,

The more than savage, the satanic, hate of the fiends in human shape, whose thirst for adventure and blood allures them to the wild life on the border, and the equally satanic avarice, whose selfish clutch tolerates no bar of humanity, nor morality between it and the gratification of cupidity.²³

The reformers centered their policy on the superiority of American culture and of Western civilization in general, and on the need to kill the Indian in the Indian. However, their assessments of the Indian Question included numerous examples of the moral decay of their own society. The reformers' did not have

undying faith in their civilization. One Mohonker felt ambivalent towards American society because, "the greed and hunger and thirst of the white man for the Indian's land is almost equal to his `hunger and thirst for righteousness.'"²⁴ The reformers were preaching the benevolence of a civilization that they themselves feared was in moral decline.

Sometimes the Easterners were reminded that the very same process of dispossession that was being acted out in the West had occurred in their own section of the country. To indict the Westerners with such vehemence was hypocritical and unjust.²⁵ The reformers quickly defended the early history of the United States, clearing the country of guilt with justifications such as that of Herbert Welsh of the Indian Rights Association, "The nation was too busy with material development and with questions of another nature to afford the luxury of a conscience."²⁶ If morality were a luxury and the East could expand without a conscience, so too could the West dispossess the Indians without remorse. When the criticism of any act of conquest started, it began to challenge the whole development of the United States. The Century of Dishonor started with the early republic, not simply when the Plains and western territories were being developed. Therefore, the indictment of imperialist actions and policies in the 1880s had their foundations in the East where the West had once been.

When the reformers spoke of the benefits of civilization, they were talking of an ideal that was far from reality. When they indicted U.S. policy, and when they indicted the culture

that was responsible for it, the contradictions between the ideal of a Christian, homogenous, democratic nation and the reality of a poly-ethnic, imperialist, capitalist society became strikingly clear. One Mohonker had no trouble recognizing the base desires of the nation in its expansion across the continent:

I take it that the greed of the Anglo-Saxon, and of the white man generally, is so strong that these reservations will be disintegrated just as fast as it is possible to overcome all restrictions.²⁷

The analysis of the Indian Question became quite confused as the reformers felt that the problem surely arose from the savagery of the Indians, but all they could do was point out the weaknesses of their own culture. Occasionally, the distance the Easterners so frantically constructed between themselves and the Westerners was undermined by a far-reaching critique of American industrial society that seeped into their debate. They were reminded that it was not the West that was perpetrating the atrocities against the Indians, it was the entire expansionist heritage of the United States, "guided by hatred, by inhumanity and party spirit," that was to blame.²⁸ Their analysis brought up many contradictions which in the end could not be resolved.

Within the same arguments that glorified the benevolence of American political and legal institutions and which asserted their ability to civilize the Indians and to grant them political power, the reformers also criticized the corruption and the inefficiency of a government that had dealt so poorly with the Indian Question in the past. The reformers undermined their arguments by calling into question the goodness of the very institutions they deemed so perfect. One Mohonker related a

celebration in Philadelphia marking the centennial of the Constitution in which Indian boys from Carlisle marched in a position of honor, "with their slates under their arms." The speaker expressed an ambivalence towards the festivities:

It seemed to me on one side there was a kind of mockery in bringing these Indians to participate in a celebration in commemoration of a Constitution under which they had suffered such grievous wrongs, and under which they had enjoyed no protection. But, on the other hand, I regarded the fact that they were placed in this position of honor as emblematic of the truth that we had come at last to recognize that we owe them a great obligation, and that they have their place under our Constitution, and are entitled to the protection of their rights under it.²⁹

The conflicting sentiments of the reformers saw a struggle between their Anglo-Saxonist belief in the benevolence of American institutions and their reformist ideals of creating a just Indian policy. The speaker undermined the sanctity of a document revered as the basis of American democratic society, but then asserted that the Constitution would promise the Indians a happy future in the United States. Even though the legacy of the Constitution had done nothing but heap injustice upon the Indians, there was still an unexplained superiority to the document which would assure them a prosperous future.

The allotment debate explored issues that were threatening to the national identity of a country supposedly founded upon unprecedented virtue, and issues that were threatening to a construction of civilization that constantly asserted its superiority in order to justify a legacy of expansionism. Often in the analysis, the insecurity that the reformers felt concerning their culture and concerning civilization in general can be sensed. At times the very civilization that the

Easterners were preaching as superior seemed to them to be an artificial construction, a "veneer of civilized manners" that if challenged thoroughly might crumble.³⁰ The reformers undermined the sanctity of civilization at times by stressing its artificiality: "Take away our supports of civilization and we would be in the same position as the Indian."³¹ Despite all of the self-assurance with which the reformers spoke of their culture, there was a definite undercurrent of uneasiness.

When the reformers assessed the Indians' ability to be civilized, the qualifications for the honor were often very arbitrary. Often the type of dress the Indians wore, and whether it successfully mimicked white culture were used as good determining factors as to the civilization of the parties in question. A speaker at a meeting in New York "to awaken public feeling to the rights of the Indian asserted that Indians have humanity and can be civilized. This was proven to him "by a friend of mine, from the fact that all the women were fond of dress and all the men regarded ill-paid work as belonging to women."³² At times, the reformers recognized that it would take more than a simple change of clothes and some sexist beliefs to destroy the Indian cultures, but they wanted to believe that the process was that simple. They wanted to believe that a heroic action by the Congress of the United States would solve the Indian Question. In turn, their reductionist rhetoric produced a simplistic solution to the Indian Question, the Dawes Act.

* * *

The reformers' favorite imagery of the Indians depicted them as effeminate and childlike while in the state of savagery, waiting for citizenship to bring them manhood and personality. It is ironic that a few years earlier, the Indians were often seen as a dangerous threat to the welfare of white America; but since they had been pacified, they were passive creatures who needed to be shown to manhood. As one speaker remarked at Lake Mohonk, "The child must become a man; the Indian must become an American; the heathen must be new created a Christian."³³ The progression was clear; the Indians were at an earlier stage of development and had to be shown the manly life of the individual, Christian farmer - a real American. The tribal way of life had always been regarded as lazy and puerile, and the reservation was keeping the Indians at this artificial level where they had stagnated. The future held no hope for the Indians; they were living for the glory of the past which had come and gone.³⁴ Now they had to give into their destiny, shed the childish fancies of their tribal lives, and accept the responsibility of the "stern battle of life with the Aryan races."³⁵

The reformers staged an all-out assault on the tribal way of life because it did not reflect the enlightened American ideals of family, individualism, and Christianity. By breaking down the tribes with the Dawes Act, the reformers promised that,

... under its provisions, [the Indian] steps out of his undifferentiated, impersonal tribal relation into one of individualized, responsible citizenship, under the Constitution and laws of the Republic.³⁶

It is ironic that at a time when the ordinary American was being disempowered and large corporations were amassing extensive

powers - the reformers were concerned that the tribal system, a small-scale social network, supposedly dehumanized the Indians.

It was not simply the legacy of past wrongs that was working against the Indians; the reformers also showed little faith in the institutions in which they were placing the Indians' welfare after they shed their status as wards of the state. The reformers tried to paint the future of the Indians in glowing terms, but they realized that the Dawes Act could do nothing about greed and prejudice. They acknowledged that the Indians' entrance into American society would make them vulnerable to the same factions of American society that they had indicted as savage and un-Christian. However, the role of the depraved Westerner quickly metamorphosed into the role of the enlightened pioneer who, alongside his Indian brother, would be a civilizing influence, teaching the Indian the secrets of farming and the benevolence of American institutions. The reformers hoped that a successful way of teaching the Indians the benefits of civilization after allotment would be to surround them with Christian citizens. The Indian's Friend, a periodical published by the Women's National Indian Association, noted that some good citizens were,

... planting among their red brothers model Christian homes with the purpose of making [them] centers of civilization, object lessons of instruction and inspiration, and beacon-lights of hope to those more needy than themselves.³⁷
The reformers knew that they could never set up enough "object lessons of instruction and inspiration" to offset the masses of "degenerate" whites that were pouring into the West, but that did not keep them from thrusting Indians into the mainstream of white society with little or no protection.

If the Dawes Act were as concerned with the welfare of the Indians as it claimed, there would have been more safety measures to assure that the Indians could hold onto their lands and that they would be supplied with vehicles of justice that other Americans possessed. However, any special conditions or legislation would run counter to the spirit of American individualism. In truth, the reformers were more interested in getting lands free from the Indians than in preserving their rights. As one reformer warned Lake Mohonk after the passage of the act,

Even as his friends and the champions of his cause, it may be said that we have been more concerned about his property than to secure for him that elevation of character and intelligence which would enable him to take care of himself.³⁸

Although the Dawes Act was seen as a panacea which would solve the Indian Question, the reformers realized that they had complicated the situation. Unless carefully watched, the legislation would do more harm than good.

The reformers had called for a radical change in the status of the Indians in American society, and for a radical change in the status of their lands, but they had neglected the basic framework of democratic institutions. There were insufficient courts and schools in the allotted areas, and corrupt and coercive political practices. The same government bureaucracy the reformers had scorned was in charge of the land distribution. One Mohonker explained that,

There has been a manifest deterioration in the entire Indian service, as all testify who know the facts. It is utterly impossible to purify or make efficient such a service as this, when its management falls into the hands of those who have purposes other than and alien to its purity and suc-

cess.³⁹

Those with impure purposes would be the ones distributing the Indian lands.

All of the insecurities, inconsistencies, and ambivalences of the reformers' arguments can be seen in an article in the magazine Our Day from 1890 written by Susette Tibbles, an assimilated Omaha married to a white minister.⁴⁰ The article provides an unusual perspective by recounting the effects of allotment on Tibbles's reservation, illustrating the sense of cultural crisis that arose in the tribe while clinging to the usual reformist rhetoric. Tibbles began the article by asserting the wisdom of the Dawes Act as the Indian's "first step to white man's civilization," but then proceeded to discredit the early stages of allotment.

The tone of the article is at times tragic, as she explained that the Indians had no reason to trust the whites after a history of lies and deception, but were forced to submit. In one instance, she noted a sense of crisis among the Omaha, "To many of the Indians everything seems to be going to pieces all at once." Although she tried to portray herself as a disinterested observer, discussing her people as if she were an outsider, at times she slipped into the first person, reflecting, "Our people were no longer a distinct and independent nation and could never be such again." Tibbles herself felt the sadness of the situation, but she was also able to gain a bit of distance and to see the rest of the Indians as separate from herself. She accommodated the white readers and trivialized the tragedy she was trying to illustrate, explaining that the white reader might find the

story "rather comic."

Tibbles was very pessimistic about the legal security that the Dawes Act would provide for the Omahas. She explained that although the Indians were being granted citizenship, there was no law to protect them - no sheriff, no courts, no justice of the peace; "in short, none of the machinery which is considered necessary in every white community for enforcing the statutes" (p. 466). Although the Omahas had been granted the vote, she told of various cases of voting corruption by the white political parties vying for the Indians' votes which virtually negated the power of the franchise. She then predicted that although the Dawes Act promised to secure the Indians' lands from white encroachment once they had been allotted, the "avaricious white man" would find ways to dispossess them. In short, "The Indians, who may lose their lands, and it looks as if most of them were going to do so, may be worse off than they were before they became citizens." So much for the benevolence of American legal institutions and the promises of the Dawes Act.

Despite the crisis that Tibbles described within the tribe, and the failure of allotment to achieve its goals, somehow she was able to retain faith in the process advocated by her Eastern friends. She urged further legislation to deal with the new problems that arose from an act deemed the definitive solution to the Indian Question. Even though she predicted the Indians would be dispossessed of their lands and be prey to countless deprivations by the white society that surrounded them, she insisted, in the perverse fashion of the reformers, that the Dawes Act "was the first step toward a better condition of af-

fairs for the Indian."

* * *

The mainstream reformers conceded that the United States had treated the Indians deplorably and that the moral strength of the nation was at question. They were motivated by a nationalistic desire to redeem the reputation of a country founded on noble principles and which represented the best of civilization. Their goal was to create a new policy that would end the Century of Dishonor, starting a new era of justice for the Indian with millennialist hopes of realizing the full moral stature of a truly Christian nation. By proving that Indians could be civilized despite the depredations heaped upon them by the past actions of the United States, the mainstream reformers would prove the worth of a Christian, civilized culture, and they would establish themselves as the moral authorities of America. They would defeat savagery, defeat heathenism, defeat government corruption and defeat selfish greed in order to help lead America back on its path to greatness.

The reformers set up a moral challenge, tagging themselves as the saviours not only of a lowly race, but also of a nation which had lost its moral sense. They would redeem their country of its past wrongs in a "century of repentent honor and justice," as they granted the Indian "citizenship in heaven [as they] bec[a]me worthy and useful citizen[s] of the United States."⁴¹ Jackson's book set the mood which dominated. The white, Protestant, Eastern reformers established themselves as moral authori-

ties. Most outsiders were seen as inferior, whether barbarous landgrabbers or corrupt politicians or heathen Indians. They were on a mission to restore goodness to a society that had sunk into a "moral miasma."⁴² They were trying to save the reputation of the United States in the eyes of the world and to spread the word - of their religion and of the political and economic institutions that had put them in their positions of power.

In the closing statements of the Lake Mohonk Conference of 1887, after a successful year in which the Dawes Act was passed and allotment had started, a speaker stated of the conference,

No man can come here and sit as I have done and listen to all that has been said without going away and thinking better of his country, of his countrymen, and thinking better of human nature.⁴³

The redemptive qualities of the Dawes Act became justifications for the continued imperialism of the United States, not in the name of national expansion, but in the name of spreading Christianity, civilization and the benevolence of American political and legal institutions. The reformers' arguments were conservative justifications to solidify a traditional social and racial hierarchy and an emerging economic order at a time of widespread chaos. As Jackson herself pondered in the patriotic fantasies of any good member of an expansionist nation, "What a lure to-day would such another new continent prove!"⁴⁴

* * *

The reformers faced a turning point in the history of white-Indian affairs in the United States. The Indian reservations were threatened by land-hungry whites hoping to dispossess the Indians of their lands. In places like the Indian

Territory, whites were ignoring the law and settling on tribal lands as the Federal Government did nothing to remedy the situation except to issue idle threats to the offending whites. The reformers of the 1880s were up against a bigger challenge than any other generation of Americans because they did not have the option of pushing the Indian tribes to the West in order to postpone dealing with the Indian Question. They knew that the pressure of history was on their shoulders, and that they would be judged by their actions in a time of crisis. Unlike earlier generations of Americans, they had to decide whether Indian cultures would survive, whether the Indians would finally be forcibly assimilated into white American society, or whether there was some compromise.

The frustration that the reformers felt at their inability to break down the tribal lifestyle and their inability to convert the Indians to a Christian way of life in a democratic nation resulted in a coercive measure that forced the Indians into the program that the reformers envisioned for them, while wresting their lands from them. The allotment debate became a conservative measure that did none of the things it promised to do except to achieve the imperialist goal of dispossessing the Indians. The benefits of American civilization that the reformers promised the Indians did not arrive on time because the reformers made no provisions for legal institutions to protect the rights of the Indians, or for schools to educate them. Behind all of the rhetoric and all of the justifications, the Dawes Act was a policy designed to destroy tribal self-

determination, to end the special welfare status of the Indians and to incorporate coveted Indian holdings into the American realm.

For the most part, the scholarship that has dealt with the reform movement of the late nineteenth century has reinforced the very arguments that the reformers themselves used to justify dispossession. Simply because the Mohonk platforms closely resembled mainstream notions of Indians and the Indian Question, historians have been quick to claim that the reformers were responding to their times. According to the historiography, the reformers were trapped in a narrow range of responses to the Indian Question, and they chose the most enlightened. Not only has the scholarship ignored the dissenting views outside of the tight-knit reform community, it has also ignored the arguments raised by more radical reformers against the dominant position. Without considering the dissenting arguments to which the mainstream reformers responded and ultimately rejected, the analysis of the Indian reform movement is greatly impoverished.

III. Dissent

Despite the widespread support for the Dawes Act which easily passed both Houses of Congress, there was significant dissent by renegade reformers and by American Indians. The dissenters predicted the disruption on the reservations that arose as a result of allotment, and they called the government and the supporters to task for the glaring contradictions in the legislation. The dissenting reformers, who called themselves the True Friends of the Indians, were outnumbered and not nearly as well-organized as the supporters of the legislation, nor were they in accord with large sections of the American public.¹ The dissent from American Indians came mainly from the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory whose views were periodically available to Congress through delegations that the Indian nations sent to Washington, and even in such periodicals as the New York Times. Their voices were usually ignored, however, unless used as examples of the ability of the Indian to be civilized. The dissent included radical critiques of U.S. Indian policy and of American conceptions of land ownership, creating a coherent and consistent response to the allotment debate with tribal self-determination at the center. The Indian nations were motivated by a need for self-preservation; the reformers were motivated by a sentiment common to the entire reform community: to redeem America of its shame and to create a just Indian policy. The dissenting reformers could not sway public opinion nor stop the Dawes Act, but their policies matched their philosophy and re-

mained consistent with the redemption sought by Helen Hunt Jackson.

The importance of the dissenters lies not in their numbers, nor in calculating the likelihood that the allotment debate could have resulted differently. The significance of exploring the dissent of the renegade reformers and of the Indians who opposed allotment lies in problematizing the assumption, in the debates of the time and in the scholarship since, that the desecration of American Indian cultures was an inevitable product of the emerging industrial-corporate society of late nineteenth-century America. The goal of this chapter is to widen the analysis of the allotment debate and the reform movement of the 1880s to include not only the dominant views of the Eastern reformers at places like Lake Mohonk, New York, but also to include the views of dissenting voices such as American Indians in more peripheral places like Tahlequah, Cherokee Nation, Indian Territory.

* * *

In the East, the dissent to the Dawes Act was concentrated mainly in the National Indian Defense Association (N.I.D.A.) based in Washington. The group had been on friendly terms with the other reform groups like the Indian Rights Association until the 1885 Lake Mohonk Conference, when most reformers accepted the platform by which allotment would be forced upon the Indians. The N.I.D.A. rejected the coercive Lake Mohonk platform, supporting instead self-determination for the Indian tribes and nations. Relations quickly soured between the two factions.² Heated debates appeared in the various reform journals between

the Dawes Act supporters and the N.I.D.A., with name-calling and indictments flying freely. In one instance, the Council Fire, the journal of the N.I.D.A., protested the platform of the 1886 Mohonk Conference, stating of the mainstream reformers,

It is to be deplored that a body of professed philanthropists should have adopted and published a series of resolutions so entirely in harmony with the sentiments of those who openly denounce the Indians as incorrigible savages, who have no rights save such as the white man may choose to grant, and who denominate as sentimental cranks those who demand that the Government shall stand by the treaty rights of the Indians.³

Similarly self-righteous accusations appeared often in the journals and speeches of both sets of reformers as they jockeyed for the moral highground on the Indian Question.

The N.I.D.A. had always been on the cutting edge of the Indian reform movement, and their policy changed little over the course of the 1880s, when other reform groups were buckling under the pressure for development in the West and the pressure from the nation to deal more "practically" with the Indian Question. Anyone who supported the continuation of the reservation and the self-determination of the tribes was accused of sentimentalism - a name all sought to avoid. The term "sentimentalist" was used to chastise anyone who did not agree with the policies of the dominant reform groups, or who questioned the mighty march of civilization across the continent. Sentimentalism was a worse accusation than Indian hater, because the Indian hater supported the advancement of civilization; the sentimentalists were perceived as romantics who wanted to preserve a few Indian reservations at the expense of American expansion. The N.I.D.A. ignored the accusations, and it held to its belief in tribal

self-determination despite the condemnation from its former allies.⁴ But the dissenters suffered from their unpopular position, and their journal the Council Fire folded in 1889 due to a lack of support.⁵

The N.I.D.A. disregarded arguments that called for the allotment of reservations for the benefit of whites. They did not construct the sophisticated justifications for the dispossession of the Indian tribes and nations that dominated the supporters' discussions. Nor did they feel that historical processes were justifications for the devastations of the Indians:

There is a progress in wrong as well as a progress in right. Good and wise men oppose the kind of progress which crushes justice and humanity beneath the wheels of its car.⁶

The N.I.D.A. challenged the deterministic arguments for the extension of white America into the realm of the Indian reservations.

The N.I.D.A. did not transcend all of the common nineteenth century beliefs that plagued the arguments of the supporters of the Dawes Act. They still believed in the superiority of white American civilization, they retained hope that the Indians would eventually be incorporated fully into American society, and they supported the missionary presence on the reservations.⁷ As in the celebration of Indian Emancipation Day in 1889 at Hampton, the N.I.D.A. also used the powerful image of Indian boys and girls, this time from Carlisle, who sang "America" at an organization meeting in 1886. Although the N.I.D.A. used the acculturated Indian students in the same condescending and self-serving way that the Hampton celebration exploited them three years

later, asserting that the showcased students who sang "in excellent time and good voice" were the hope of a downtrodden race, the N.I.D.A. was not interested in the subjugation of the Indians. Despite their cultural chauvinism, the N.I.D.A. was interested in providing a forum for the Indian tribes. Directly following the singing of "America," the N.I.D.A. heard two speeches by Indians - one Chickasaw and one Seminole - in which both speakers asserted the rights of their tribes to retain their land over any authority the United States might claim. They indicted the hypocrisy of the United States policy toward treaty agreements, questioned the right of the U.S. to legislate for the Indian tribes and nations, and called for solidarity among all Indians to fight against the threat to their lands and to their tribal autonomy. If the Indians did not fight for their own rights, the Chickasaw G.W. Harkins warned,

between the greed of the selfish for the land of the Indians and the plans of the ignorant and visionary theorists, we Indians are likely to be ground to dust between the upper and nether mill stones.⁸

The other reform groups never would have tolerated rebellious and insolent talk from their wards. They were only comfortable with determining the fate of the Indians, not seeing them or hearing them. Whereas Indian delegations frequently visited the N.I.D.A. headquarters in Washington, and were given space in the Council Fire, only an occasional Suzette Tibbles was ever seen at a Lake Mohonk conference, and only if she celebrated the policies of the government and of the reformers.

Despite their chauvinistic beliefs, the N.I.D.A. members were able to gain a distance from the mainstream white response to the Indian Question. They placed their notions of American

cultural superiority in the background, emphasizing the importance of tribal self-determination and of the protection of tribal lands at all costs. In a speech opposing a bill sponsored by Dawes to allot the lands of the Sioux Reservation in 1886, Dr. Sutherland of the N.I.D.A. challenged the deceptive and paternalistic legislation that was leading to dispossession. He called instead for Indian empowerment:

Put a stop to all measures seeking to get [the Indians'] lands away from them. Fulfill the agreements we have already made; pay to these Indians their just claims, and wait till they intimate their desire to treat with us. We have always been making proposals to them; now let the policy be changed. Let them have a chance to make proposals to us!"⁹

The N.I.D.A. felt that if and when the separate Indian tribes decided to enter into American society, the choice should be theirs, not that of the President of the United States ignorant of the situation of the Indians in the West.¹⁰

The dissenting reformers were much more critical of the policies of the United States concerning Indian affairs and concerning the emerging industrial society than were the more mainstream reformers. In the pages of the Council Fire, there were radical commentaries on American society which reflected the core of the dissenters philosophy. In a letter sent to the journal, a member of the N.I.D.A. used the intolerant and murderous practices of white Americans to indict a country professed to be enlightened,

If there is a God in Heaven, and I believe there is, the nation which permits its evil-disposed citizens to trample upon the sacred rights of humanity and to murder the Chinese and aborigines with impunity, without raising a hand to restrain or punish the wrong-doer, the nation which thus shirks its solemn duty, to the great detriment of mankind,

whether a republic or empire, is destined, sooner or later, to go under, as a warning to others who come after, that it always pays to be kind and merciful, and just and generous, and never pays to be harsh and cruel nor rigorous and oppressive.¹¹

While the moralism and doom of this letter is extreme, the criticism of American hostility to its racial minorities represents an important insight. The N.I.D.A. realized that the Indian Question was not an isolated problem; it was a complex situation which was linked to the imperialist legacy of the United States and to a deep hostility towards non-whites.

The N.I.D.A. accepted the communistic land holding of the Indians as a viable alternative to the American ideal of individual ownership.¹² They rejected the notion of the mainstream reformers that only under the system of private ownership could the Indians survive. The Council Fire heard and printed the arguments of various tribes who felt that only through communal ownership would the Indians make progress and retain their lands. One such speech included in the journal in 1886 came from a Seneca Indian protesting the proposed allotment of the his reservation in New York State:

The Seneca Nation of New York Indians are rapidly improving in their social condition. Agriculture flourishes, the houses and farms of the Indians are constantly improving, the people are contented and prosperous, and there are no paupers to be a burden on the community ... This condition of independence and prosperity is largely due to the system by which the lands are owned in common, and are permanently inalienable. Under this system, no Indian, however improvident and thoughtless, can be deprived of a resort to the soil for his support and that of his family. There is always land for him to cultivate free of tax, rent, or purchase price.¹³

Not only did they accept communal ownership as a superior system for the Indians, the N.I.D.A. considered the opinions of the Indians themselves concerning their fate as far superior to the

opinions of uninformed politicians and philanthropists. In an article about Dawes reprinted by the Council Fire from the Democratic Blade of Valentine, Nebraska, concerning Dawes's Sioux Bill, the editorial reasoned,

The Indians on the Sioux Reservation have carefully considered the Dawes bill and give it their unqualified condemnation. They are intelligent enough to know their rights, and to know that a large number of the tribe could not take land and live on it. As they are the interested parties, should they not be consulted? Perhaps they know as much about the Indian question as Senators who live in Massachusetts.¹⁴

The N.I.D.A. granted Indians a forum that was denied them by the mainstream reformers and by the society at large.

* * *

The N.I.D.A. aligned itself with many of the Indian nations in the Indian Territory, most notably the Five Civilized Tribes: the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek and Seminole. These nations had all formed their own governments on their lands, and were considered semi-autonomous nations within the United States. These nations had developed representative governments, political parties, and comfortable living conditions. They were celebrated by many whites as proof that the Indian could be redeemed from the savage state. Before Oklahoma was organized into a territory, there was even talk of admitting the Indian Territory as a state that would retain its Indian majority under the name of the Cherokee Sequoya.

The N.I.D.A. courted the Indian nations before and after the passage of the Dawes Act, and it was well-respected in the Indian Territory. In the autumn of 1886, Dr. Bland, the editor of the Council Fire, toured the Indian Territory to spread the word of

the N.I.D.A. in its attempt to defeat the Dawes Act and to defend the Indians against the increasing threats to their lands and to their governments. The Indian nations were very receptive to the advances of the N.I.D.A. In an article that appeared in the Indian Chieftain of Vinita, Cherokee Nation, concerning Dr. Bland's visit, the author exclaimed that the N.I.D.A. was "in perfect accord" with the Indians of the territory, in contrast to the policies of the mainstream reformers, who were discredited in the article for,

an arrogance of superior wisdom to claim the ability to dictate to others in matters as problematic as to what is best for the Indian, or the right, because of advanced civilization and enlightenment.¹⁵

The N.I.D.A. agreed with the Indian newspaper that only the Indians themselves had the right to make important decisions or "grievous mistakes" that would affect their futures; it was not the realm of over-zealous reformers.

The Five Civilized Tribes were grateful for the overtures of the N.I.D.A. after the paternalism and disrespect from missionaries, government agents and mainstream reformers. In one instance of anger at the overbearing nature of the Dawes Act, the Indian Chieftain blasted the self-serving motivations of the "rampageous" author of the bill. As the article explained, Dawes's bill would senselessly and insensitively disrupt the social relations of the tribes, lead to the extinction of Indian cultures, and result in "anarchy and a regular pandemonium" as the whites raced to dispossess the Indians of their lands. The paper blamed Dawes for a total disregard for the humanity of the tribes that would be forced to live under the dictates of his

legislation. The article condemned the unqualified, paternalistic assertions of the supporters, while it accused Dawes of "a mania for notoriety" which made him blind to the real needs of the tribes and nations. The hatred and disgust of the paper towards Dawes was not veiled, culminating in the severe statement that, "This proposed outrage on humanity and common decency is more brutish than would be the scalping of the head that so deliberately concocted it."¹⁶ Needless to say, the nations in the Indian Territory regarded the author of the bill as other than their friend.

The Council Fire included militant and indicting material from American Indians which would have been much too threatening to the sensibilities of the mainstream reformers. The N.I.D.A. regularly considered the views of Indians, whether of their own members or of visiting delegations. In a biographical sketch of the legendary Seneca Chief Brant reprinted in the journal from a Canadian paper, the chief was asked to give his view of Western civilization:

In the government you call civilized the happiness of the people is constantly sacrificed to the splendor of empire. Hence your codes of criminal and civil law have had their origin; hence your dungeons and prisons ... The palaces and prisons among you form a dreadful contrast. Go to the former places and you will see perhaps a deformed piece of earth assuming airs that become none but the Great Spirit above ... Cease then to call yourselves Christians, lest you publish to the world your hypocrisy. Cease, too, to call other nations savage, when you are tenfold more the children of cruelty than they.¹⁷

This type of anti-imperialist speech by an American Indian the dissenting reformers considered and respected. They were less defensive than the other reformers upon hearing such accusations, and their policies reflected their willingness to critique

radically their own society.

The Five Civilized Tribes, along with other tribes mostly in the Indian Territory, were exempted from the Dawes Act because of their strong objections to the bill and because they had developed democratic governments and were well on their way to civilization. One of the glaring contradictions of the legislation was that the tribes perceived as more advanced that resided in the Indian Territory were able to retain their communal land system and their tribal governments. The supporters of the bill asserted that the Dawes Act would only be applied to tribes that had reached a level of civilization sufficient to handle the responsibility of allotment and private ownership, like the Five Civilized Tribes. According to the logic of the debate, the reservations of the Five Civilized Tribes should have been the first to be allotted, because theoretically they could have competed with whites in the larger society without being dispossessed. Dr. Sunderland, the president of the N.I.D.A. challenged the supporters of the bill on the contradiction in excluding the more advanced Indians, asking,

Why are the five nations and other tribes ... excepted from the application of these provisions? They are, beyond all question, the best prepared for taking their lands in severalty and for the ordeal of citizenship. Why should the bill be made to apply alone to all those Indians who are least prepared for a change so sudden and radical?¹⁸

The supporters considered the objections to the bill by the Indian nations of the Indian Territory who sent their own delegations to Washington to sit in on Congress, and they excluded them in order to avoid controversy.¹⁹

As Leonard Carlson argues in his economic analysis of the Dawes Act, the mainstream reformers' assurances that land would

not be allotted until each tribe was ready to compete and survive in white society were empty promises. In his study, Carlson sets up two models by which he analyses the Dawes Act. The first, the "guardianship model," follows the arguments of the mainstream reformers who promised that the lands of the Indian tribes would be protected from white encroachment, and that their lands would only be allotted once the tribe had been prepared for civilization. The second, the "demand for allotment model," ignores the particulars of each tribes' ability to handle allotment, basing the decision solely on outside economic pressures.²⁰ As Carlson shows, the Dawes Act was administered according to the second model. Whenever a reservation became valuable to the white population, the reservation was more likely to be allotted. The condition of the tribes mattered little in the equation as geography became the determining factor in the allotment process. The closer a reservation was to white development, the bigger the threat of allotment. The guardianship model was used as a justification by the mainstream reformers to celebrate the wisdom and fairness of the Dawes Act. However, the decision to allot came from outside the reservations, undermining any tribal voice and ignoring the criteria that the supporters had outlined to regulate the administration of the legislation.

Opponents of the Dawes Act often brought up the fact that if the purpose of the act was to encourage farming, as the supporters claimed, the example of the Five Civilized Tribes posed a strong challenge to their case. The Five Civilized Tribes had developed farming to a considerable extent, not through individu-

al allotments, but through communal ownership. The tribes retained their title to the lands, and the members of the tribes could use as much land as was needed for personal farming. The communal system of land ownership was a viable alternative. If the title was left in the tribe, the lands would be far more secure than if they were dispersed and distributed among individual members. The difficult transition period from savagery to civilization that many of the reformers claimed was the fate of the Indians would be avoided if Indian policy followed the model of the Five Civilized Tribes.²¹

As Carlson argues the supporters of the bill completely ignored the fact that farming was already very much present on Indian reservations at the time of the Dawes Act. Farming was on the increase, not just among the Five Civilized Tribes, but all over the country. Many tribes easily incorporated agriculture into their cultures and into their tribes when allowed to determine their own terms.²² Instead of being content with the growth of agriculture, the supporters wished to destroy the tribes and their cultures and to dispossess them. The measure that they chose to endorse created widespread devastation on the reservations. Whereas the communal system of land ownership was easily compatible with the tribal social systems, allotment was repugnant to Indian tribes eager to retain the autonomy of their cultures and governments.

Those dissenting from the Dawes Act also challenged government land policies in the West that permitted vast sections of land monopolized by railroads, land corporations and mining interests. The opposition realized the fallacy of a homesteading

tradition which claimed that the continent would be developed by individual farmers on their own tracts. Only ten percent of the lands in the West were ever developed by homesteading. The rest was monopolized by powerful corporations, making speculation the driving force in the market.²³ The Council Fire questioned the justifications for allotment, asking,

Is it a crime for an Indian tribe to hold more land than its people can use at once, but all of which will be needed for its increasing population? Then why not declare it a crime for corporations to own and hold for speculation large bodies of land, and why allow foreigners to buy up and hold vast estates in this country? Indeed, why not say that it is an outrage on those who have no homes for a rich farmer to own more land than he can cultivate or to hold land for his children and grandchildren. There is no scarcity of public land open to people at nominal price; then why this clamor for the Indians' lands?²⁴

The opposition realized the weaknesses of an argument which charged that the tribal land title created an anomolous land status which could not be accomodated in the American legal system. Those pushing for the Dawes Act found it intolerable that Indian reservations were monopolizing vast tracts of land in the West and impoverishing poor white citizens who wanted their own land to cultivate. However, the corporations, which held considerably more land than the reservations, were keeping land from the deserving hands of the individualistic American farmer. The American system had no trouble accomodating them.

* * *

Numerous threats to the existence of the Five Civilized Tribes politicized the Indian Territory during the second half of the 1880s. Allotment was not the only pressure that the tribes felt. There were also important questions of citizenship being

discussed, bills that proposed that the American judicial system be extended into the Indian Territory, as well as numerous bills that sought to create a territory out of the uncultivated lands in the western part of what is now Oklahoma. Also, important agreements were made between the U.S. government and railroad companies who were allowed to build through the lands of the Five Civilized Tribes without tribal consent. The nations of the territory were worried by the encroachment of white settlers. They felt the seriousness of the situation and had little faith in the protection promised them by the American government. There was often a pessimism, even before the passage of the Dawes Act, which considered the possibility that American civilization would have its way:

From present indications it does seem that the allotment of lands in severalty is going to be forced on the Indians whether or no. It seems too that we are going to be forced to it on terms **not** our own; that we are going to be forced to take so much per head and then forced to sell the remainder to United States citizens at a certain price, all because we have more land than we need, they say.²⁵

Despite the anxiety of the Indians, they did not reserve themselves to the fact that allotment was inevitable. They fought against allotment, forming confederations and sending delegations to Washington to protest the bill. Originally, the Dawes Act proposed that all reservations be subject to allotment, including the lands of the Five Civilized Tribes. Before the passage of the bill, and before they had been excluded from it, the Five Civilized Tribes entered into a compact to work together to resist the dispossession of their lands, either through allotment or the granting of lands to railroads. As the compact read,

In order ... to prevent any future removal, and to transmit to our posterity an unimpaired title to the lands guaranteed to our respective nations by the United States, we hereby solemnly pledge ourselves to each other that no nation party to this compact shall, without the consent of all the other parties, cede or in any manner alienate to the United States any part of their present territory.²⁶

The United States had declared the Indians its wards, but the Indians of the Indian Territory knew that unless they fought the policies of the United States government, there was little hope for their future.

During the late 1880s, the political activity in the Cherokee Nation was extremely intense as political parties sprung up and jockeyed for control. Perhaps the Cherokee Nation resembled all too well the political intrigues of the Gilded Age. In one episode in 1887, the editor of the Cherokee Advocate, killed the editor of another newspaper, the Tahlequah Telephone, run by an opposing political party. The killing was the result of a political dispute with charges of voting fraud in the election of the Chief in which the opposition won. The controversy was on its way to the National Council to be resolved, but as the New York Times predicted, the killing "will, it is feared, result this week in a civil war in the Cherokee Nation."²⁷

Despite the disruption caused by the threats to the Cherokee lands and to their cultural existence, the basic objectives of of the Cherokee political parties were in accord. There were simply differences in the manner in which those objectives were achieved. In an editorial by the Indian Chieftain discussing the political situation in the Cherokee Nation, the paper remarked,

Every citizen of this nation, native or adopted, is alike

opposed to any change in government, in the present tenure of lands, and to the introduction of any cause that may disturb existing relations. All are seemingly satisfied as far as that goes, and believe that their individual conditions would not be bettered by a change. As said, the grounds for political differences are indeed scarce.²⁸ The differences arose from internal conflicts, but the parties - the ruling National party and the opposition Downing and New Independent parties - had strikingly similar platforms. They all stressed the importance of the preservation of the Cherokee land base and of the Cherokee government. The platform of the Downing Party, in relation to the retention of tribal lands, stated,

We oppose the sale of our lands and their settlement by any but Indians. Investments in land we consider safer and better than any. By natural increase and adoption our nation is rapidly multiplying and the country may be needed for our future growth.²⁹

The New Independent Party reacted to the threat to Cherokee lands in somewhat stronger terms, but to the same effect:

We are opposed to selling one foot of our Cherokee soil for white settlement, for in less than one year the country would be settled up with white settlers who would be calling on congress to establish a territorial government or state which would embrace not only the entire Cherokee nation, but the present Indian Territory.³⁰

The political parties in the Cherokee Nation, although fiercely competitive, produced a common response to the threat to their lands - a response which appeared in other nations across the Indian Territory.

The Five Civilized Tribes fought against the Dawes Act because they knew that there was a tide of dispossession running through the nation. Perhaps that piece of legislation did not affect them directly, but there were many other schemes to open up the Indian Territory to white settlers that would affect them. The Dawes Act was seen as the start of a dangerous trend of dispossession in the United States, as expressed in an editorial

in the Indian Chieftain,

It seems to be the beginning of a policy to break up Indian reservations and the holding of lands in common. Tribal relations, as a consequence, must end likewise, and individual dependence and independence become the manner of support ... The experiment of allotment in severalty among the Indians is for those least prepared for it. The reason for this must necessarily be the long settled policy of the government [not] to permit, nor to recognize, any more Indian nationalities.³¹

If they did not fight for the other Indians, most of whom did not understand the American political and legal systems as intimately as they did, it would not only mean the end of the reservations in other parts of the American Territory, it would also quickly mean the end of the Indian Territory.

The Five Civilized Tribes hoped that other tribes could benefit from the semi-autonomous status that they enjoyed, with the land title in the name of the tribe as a whole. In a speech by Colonel G.W. Hawkins, a Chickasaw, he expressed at a N.I.D.A. meeting in 1886,

We are Indians. We feel for these. We desire their good. We want the United States to apply to other Indians the same policy that has tended to our elevation. Give them patents, in fee simple, to their lands as tribes, and establish schools among them.

After the other Indians had been allowed to administer their own affairs and improve themselves, Harkins optimistically envisioned that,

We will apply for admission as a State, not as a Territory, so that we may control our land and our moneyed interests and our domestic affairs as other States do. Surely this is not an unreasonable request for an Indian to make on behalf of his long suffering people.³²

The hopeful visions of Harkins for an Indian state were never realized, nor were other tribes granted the patent to their lands in common. The beginning of the end had arrived, and within

twenty-five years, the lands of the Five Civilized Tribes too would be tragically diminished through allotment, incorporated into the state of Oklahoma.

Many tribes apart from the Five Civilized Tribes also opposed the possibility of allotment and hoped that the same land title that had been granted to the Five Civilized Tribes could be granted to them. In the months leading up to and directly following the passage of the Dawes Act, various other tribes protested the prospect of allotment. In the year prior to the passage of the Dawes Act, the Council Fire printed the objections to the Dawes Act of the Seneca, the Sioux, the Osages, the Peorias, and the Sac and Fox, as well as a report from the Mohonker Alice Fletcher describing the disastrous effects of allotment on the Omaha reservation.³³ In a letter sent to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States by the Peoria Indians, the tribal council urged that the severalty bill be defeated, explaining,

We ... earnestly protest against the passage of any bills that will lead to allotment of our lands in severalty ... at the present session of congress ... or against any legislation by congress that will directly or implicitly impair or destroy any right, tribal or individual, that your government has by solemn treaties, pledged its honor to guarantee unto us.³⁴

Despite the protest that arose from the tribes themselves, the mainstream reformers and policy makers claimed that Indians everywhere were begging for allotment.

Shortly after the passage of the Dawes Act in February 1887, the N.I.D.A. decided to fight the law in court, claiming that it was unconstitutional. The organization solicited support from the Indian Territory, and there was a general willingness to help

the N.I.D.A. fight the legislation. In a committee report written in response to the President's signing the bill into law, the N.I.D.A. charged,

Said act is not only opposed to the principles of common law, but a flagrant violation of the Constitution of the United States ... The government proposes by this law to take the property of the several tribes without their consent and without compensation ... This is as clearly a usurpation of power, a disregard of constitutional limitations as it would be to take the property of any land syndicate and divide that among the members and families of said body. With this additional aggravation, that in the case of the Indians, it is exercising its power over a people beyond its jurisdiction, except within the limits named by express treaty stipulations.³⁵

The N.I.D.A. planned to pressure the new Congress to overturn the legislation, and if all else failed, they planned to take their case into the courts, hopeful of a Supreme Court decision in their favor. However, the support for the bill was too strong, and the effort to overturn it was woefully unsuccessful.

* * *

Certain white reformers and American Indians alike fought against the pressure to allot reservations, making sophisticated connections between the Dawes Act and the imperialist trends in American society. They critiqued the white supremecist culture which deemed it necessary to dispossess a disempowered population. The white reformers opposing allotment shared the cultural chauvinism of the Mohonk reformers; both groups were part of an elite reform tradition in the East which had taken on the plight of the Indian as their project. However, the N.I.D.A. was more open to radical critique and included American Indians in their considerations. These renegade reformers recognized the

calls for self-determination that came from the Five Civilized Tribes and from other tribes around the nation. The N.I.D.A.'s insight into the allotment debate was unusual, but the renegade reformers were as much children of their age as were their mainstream rivals. A short-lived alliance between a white, Eastern reform group and Indian nations of the West formed, and although it was ultimately unsuccessful, it was an important development in the reform movement of the late nineteenth century.

IV. Conclusion

In the 1880s, corporations gained vast amounts of power and influenced government policy in the West. Western states and territories were fighting for greater autonomy, resentful of the outside control that the federal government and Eastern society were imposing on them. Railroads brought unprecedented numbers of settlers and commerce into the regions surrounding the Indian reservations. The Indian Question was becoming increasingly burdensome to the expansionist drives of the dominant American society, and numerous forces tended toward Indian dispossession. If the well-respected reformers of Lake Mohonk did not support the Dawes Act, in all likelihood, allotment still would have been instituted; the legislation simply would not have carried the same moral weight that it held and still holds as a result of the reformers' support.

Much of the scholarship that indicts the imperialist heritage of the United States and the dispossession of American Indians exonerates the mainstream reformers because of their "high-minded motivations." The Mohonk reformers did support the Dawes Act, and they were instrumental in its passage. Any analysis of the reform movement should take them to task for the policies that they supported. There should be no special cases and no unwarranted sympathies simply because a historian relates more to the experiences of the elite reformers than to those of the lower class land-grabbers. Studies like those of Utley and of Prucha ignore the radical critiques of U.S. Indian policy

pursued by the N.I.D.A. and by the Five Civilized Tribes which challenged the accepted views of the mainstream reformers. They have furthered the flawed notion that the reformers were locked into their response to allotment, with no hope of encouraging a more just Indian policy.

Prucha and Utley have followed the general trends in the study of the American West, using deterministic arguments to account for Indian dispossession. The expansionist heritage of the United States has been indicted often, but many historians have inverted the judgment of earlier scholarship which celebrated expansion, condemning it as racist and imperialist. They have neglected deeper interpretation which could expand the analysis. Recent scholarship like Ronald Takaki's Iron Cages has unwittingly reinforced these notions by knitting together various prejudices and ideologies in late nineteenth century society into an explanation for the imperialist, white-supremacist power structure that arose in Industrial America. Takaki has used deterministic arguments to explain American expansion, and he has constructed monolithic attitudes that were not completely pervasive. The "iron cage" mentality did filter down into mainstream society, but by constructing it as a monolithic response from white society, Takaki makes irrelevant voices that did fight against expansion and racial intolerance.

It is necessary to place the supporters' arguments along side those of their dissenters to appreciate the full scope of the debate. Because the allotment debate was framed in moral terms, and because the supporters constantly worried over their position, it is all the more necessary to explore the dissenting

views in order to appreciate the moral climate the reformers faced. The N.I.D.A. was able not only to gain an insight into the allotment debate that evaded most white Americans, recognizing the destruction that would ensue on the reservations, it also argued for tribal self-determination and granted space in its publication for the militant views of American Indians. Although the N.I.D.A. still hoped one day that the Indians would be assimilated into American society, they rejected the usual overbearing paternalism of reform and the coercive measures of the United States in order to encourage Indian empowerment and tribal self-determination.

The views of the Indians themselves provide an essential component of the debate which historians have ignored. The Five Civilized Tribes and others around the continent did not passively watch as their lands were dispossessed. They fought against the legislation, and they fought against the railroads and the land corporations, all for their own survival. They participated in the allotment debate through their publications and through hearings in Washington, D.C. Although their arguments were rarely validated by white society, their voices were heard in the debate and did elicit responses - occasionally compassionate, but more often hostile. To ignore the views from the reservations not only invalidates peripheral views that are essential to a full understanding of the debate; it silences American Indians in the discussion of American expansionism and ignores the implications of their views for American history in general. It keeps them locked in the role of perpetual, silent

victim.

Although the Dawes Act was likely and, perhaps, inevitable, the response from the reform community was not. Within the same group arose two very distinct groups: supporters of allotment and dissenters. Over the allotment debate, the traditional alliance between the Mohonk reformers and the N.I.D.A. gave way to an unlikely alliance between the renegade reformers and the Five Civilized Tribes. The scholarship that either indicts the monolithic "iron cage" mentality of white America or celebrates the noble motivations of the Friends of the Indians trapped in their cultural chauvinism cannot incorporate the problematic position of the dissenters, either white or Indian. By including the dissenting voices, this analysis attempts to further the scholarship dealing with the Indian reform movement as it challenges the wisdom of seeing historical trends as inevitable cultural responses.

NOTES

Abbreviations

- CA: Cherokee Advocate; Tahlequah, Indian Territory: Cherokee Nation, 1886-1887
- CF: Council Fire; Philadelphia: Dr. Bland, 1884-1889
- IC: Indian Chieftain; Vinita, Indian Territory: Chieftain Publishing Co., 1886-87.
- NYDT: New York Daily Tribune
- NYT: New York Times

I. Introduction

1. Smith, Henry Nash, Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1978) describes that when settlement moved west into the Plains, the myth of the desert was replaced by the myth of the garden of the world, pp. 177-183.
2. Hoxie, Frederick, E., A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920 (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1984) discusses a sense of turning point, especially preface. Also see Prucha, Francis Paul, American Indian Policy in Crisis: The Christian Reformers and the Indian, 1865-1900 (Norman: Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1976) p. 152; and Lake Mohonk Conference Proceeding; Philadelphia: The Indian Rights Association, 1884, p.4
3. Limerick, Patricia Nelson, The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West (New York: W.W. Norton, 1987) discusses how some Westerners took on the role of "injured innocents" in relation to the landed Indian tribes, p.46. Slotkin, Richard, The Fatal Environment: The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialization (New York: Atheneum, 1985) shows that American Indians could represent anything from lazy savages to "aristocrats" and land monopolists, p. 342. For contemporary examples, see Sumner, W.G., "The Indians in 1887;" in Forum, May 1887, pp. 257-258; and "The Indian Problem: Commissioner Atkins Further Gives his Views on the Allotment of Lands," in IC, November 25, 1886.
4. Lamar and Thompson, p. 207.
5. For a summary of the history of the allotment debate after the Civil War, see Carlson, Leonard A., Indians, Bureaucrats, and Land: The Dawes Act and the Decline of Indian Farming (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981), pp. 4-9. For a discussion of Jeffer-

sons campaign to create "red Lockeans," see Takaki, Ronald, Iron Cages: Race and Culture in 19th Century America (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1990), pp. 55-65. Also see Washburn, Wilcomb E., Red Man's Land / White Man's Law: A Study of the Past and Present Status of the American Indian (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), p. 65; and Drinnon, Richard, Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire Building; New York: Schocken Books, 1990, p. 75.

6. "Senate Debate on Bill to Provide Land in Severalty (1881)" the Coke Bill, printed in Washburn Documentary, pp. 1686-1724, 1725-1758, 1759-1799, 1800-1826.

7. For reform response, see Mohonk 1884, pp. 7-16. Also Prucha Crisis talks about Dawes's ambivalence to allotment in the early 1880s.

8. For this change in philosophy, see Washburn, Wilcomb E., The Assault on Indian Tribalism: The General Allotment Law (Dawes Act) of 1887 (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1975), p. 24.

9. See Hagan, William T., The Indian Rights Association: The Herbert Welsh Years, 1882-1904 (Tucson: Univ. of AZ Press, 1985); Vecsey, C. and Venables, R., American Indian Environments: Ecological Issues in Native American History (Syracuse: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1980), pp. 74-75; Otis, D.S., (F.P. Prucha, ed.), The Dawes Act and the Allotment of Indian Lands (Norman: Univ. of OK Press, 1973), pp. 33-39; Bolt, Christine, American Indian Policy and American Reform: Case Studies of the Campaign to Assimilate the American Indians (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1987), pp. 90-92.

10. N.I.D.A. preamble and platform printed in Prucha, Francis Paul, Americanizing the American Indians (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1973), pp. 141-145. Also see Bolt, pp. 96-97; Washburn Assault, p. 28; Prucha Crisis, pp. 165-167; Hagan I.R.A., pp. 56-64.

11. "General Allotment Act" printed in Washburn, Wilcomb E., The American Indian and the United States: A Documentary History; New York: Random House, vol. III, 1973, pp. 2188-2193. For discussion of its passage, see ch. 8, "Allotment of Lands in Severalty" in Prucha Crisis.

12. Hagan I.R.A., p. 66; Hoxie, pp. 70-71 and Mohonk 1886, p. 11.

13. Limerick, p. 197.

14. Trachtenberg, Alan, The Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982) explains that U.S. Indian policy had turned into a process of incorporating native resources, pp. 30-31; as does Limerick, p. 200. Turner, Frederick, Beyond Geography: The Western Spirit Against the Wilderness (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1980) describes Dawes Act as a strike against the existence of tribes, p. 287.

15. Washburn Assault, p. 163; Berkhofer, Robert, The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), p. 113; Washburn Red Man's Land, pp. 73-74; Deloria, Vine, Jr., Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto (New York: Avon, 1969), p. 53; Otis, p. 20; Takaki, p. 189; Limerick, p. 191; Hoxie, p. 52.

16. Hoxie, pp.12-13; Trachtenburg, pp. 27-33; Takaki, pp. 253-265.

17. For the history of the legislation of the Dawes Act, see Holford, David M., "The Subversion of the Indian Allotment System, 1887-1934;" in The Indian Historian, Spring 1975; and Otis. Sixty percent of tribal holdings lost: Takaki, p. 189.

18. See Prucha's editor introduction in Otis, pp. xi-xv.

19. Otis, p. 9.

20. Bolt has considered the opposition, but more analysis is needed in her challenge of the mainstream reformers.

21. Hagan, p. 65; Prucha Crisis, pp. 166-67.

22. Prucha Crisis, p. 404. A similar statement is made by Haga, p. 255. However, this position is challenged a bit in Washburn Assault, p. 30.

23. Utley, p. 269. Also see Prucha Crisis, p. vi; Bowden, Henry Warner, American Indians and Christian Missions: Studies in Cultural Conflict (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1981), pp. xii-xiii.

24. See Neal Salisbury "American Indians and American History" in Martin, Calvin (ed.), The American Indian and the Problem of History (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1987), pp 53-54; Nash, Roderick, Wilderness and the American Mind (New Haven: Yale Univ Press, 1967), p. 42; Trachtenburg, p. 27.

25. Boelhower, William, Through a Glass Darkly: Ethnic Semiosis in American Literature (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1987), pp. 42-44.

26. Boelhower calls it a "virulent version of geographical determinism," pp. 11-12.

27. For discussion of Fiske's "Manifest Destiny," see Drinnon, pp. 237-242; Takaki, p. 257; Horsman, Reginald, Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1981).

28. See Takaki's preface.

29. Boelhower, p. 2.

30. Turner "The Significance of the Frontier in American History" in Turner, Frederick Jackson, The Frontier in American History (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1920). For discussion of Turner, see Smith, pp. 250-259.
31. Lamar, H. and Thompson, L. (eds.), The Frontier in History: North America and South Africa Compared (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1981), p. 12.
32. Kreyche, Gerald F., Visions of the American West (Lexington: Univ. Press of KY, 1989), p. 6.
33. Trachtenburg, p. 17.
34. Referring specifically to works such as Smith, Huth, Marx, Pearce, Berkhofer and Fiedler. Also, refer to Malone, Michael, (ed.), Historians and the American West (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1983).
35. Smith, pp. 203-208; Fiedler, Leslie A., The Return of the Vanishing American (New York: Stein and Day, 1968), pp. 75-76.
36. Limerick, pp. 20-23.
37. Limerick, P. 27. Also, see Utley, Robert M., The Indian Frontier of the American West, 1846-1890 (Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Press, 1984), p. 261.
38. MARHO, The Radical Historians Organization; Visions of History (New York: Pantheon Books, 1983), p. ix. Also, see N. Scott Momaday "Personal Reflexions" in Martin, pp. 160-161, speaking how historians have silenced Indians.

II. Mainstream Reform

1. Ch. 9, "The Promotion of Indian Schools" in Prucha Crisis.
2. "Emancipation Day" in Indian's Friend (Philadelphia: Women's National Indian Association), April 1889.
3. Hoxie, pp. 9-11; ch. 5, "Grant's Peace Policy 1869-1876" in Utley.
4. Utley says, "Thus did grubby politics and high altruism spawn the intimate, often contentious, constitutionally dubious alliance between church and state that would so prominently characterize Grant's Peace Policy," pp. 133-134.
5. Ch. 7, "The Vision of the Reformers" in Utley, especially pp. 205-210; ch. 5, "The New Christian Reformers" in Prucha Crisis,

especially pp. 145-147.

6. Slotkin, pp. 309-316; Berkhofer talks of "individualization" of the Indians, pp. 171-172; Takaki talks of a similar process under Jackson, pp. 98-100; ch. 1, "The Appeal of Assimilation" in Hoxie; introduction to Prucha Americanizing; Prucha Crisis, pp. 150-158. For contemporary responses, see "Mr. Walter Allen" in Mohonk 1886, pp. 40-41.

7. Slotkin, pp. 47-52, discusses how class strife in the East was ignored as the myth of the West and its vacant lands promised that class warfare would never be an American reality.

8. For discussion of the myth of the Vanishing American, see Berkhofer, pp. 29-38.

9. McNaughton, J.H., "The Red Man" in The Nineteenth Century, May 1885, p. 824. For similar sentiments of searching for simplistic solutions, see "Indian Citizenship" in Mohonk 1886, pp. 8-11; C.C. Painter "A Change in Policy Requires a Change of Methods" in Mohonk 1887, pp. 3-7.

10. Jackson, Helen Hunt, A Century of Dishonor: A Sketch of the United States Governments' Dealings with Some of the Indian Tribes (Boston: Roberts Bros., 1888), author's note.

11. Quoted in Gates, "Land and Law as Agents in Educating Indians;" in Journal of Social Sciences, American Social Science Association, September 1886, p. 131.

12. "Nisqually and Skokomish" in Harrison, J.B., The Latest Studies on Indian Reservations (Philadelphia: The Indian Rights Association, 1887), p. 89.

13. Smith, pp. 123-124; Berkhofer, p. 92. For contemporary examples of the drive to cultivate, see Thayer, James B., "The Dawes Bill and the Indians;" in Atlantic Monthly, March 1888, pp. 316-317; Gates, p.114.

14. "A Plea for the Indian;" in Catholic World, March 1886, p. 850.

15. See Horsman. Also see Welsh, Herbert, "The Indian Question Past and Present;" in New England Magazine, October, 1890, p. 257.

16. Horsman, pp. 302-303, Gates, pp. 119-120.

17. McNaughton, p. 821. Also see Jackson, p. 2; McCullough, John, "A Suggestion on the Indian Question;" in Overland Monthly, December 1885, p. 569; Gates, p. 113; Mohonk 1888, p. 42.

18. Dippie, Brian W., The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1982), pp. 174-175.

19. Gates, p. 115.
20. "A Plea for the Indian," p. 850; Indian Record; Presbytery of the Indian Territory, June 1886. Also see McNaughton, pp. 821-822.
21. C.C. Painter, "Our Indian Policy As Related to the Civilization of the Indian" in Mohonk 1886, pp. 18-26; Gates, pp. 141-142.
22. Welsh, p. 260.
23. Phillip C. Garrett, "Indian Citizenship" in Mohonk 1886, pp. 8-11; Gates, pp. 114-115.
24. "Devoted to the Discussion of the Dawes Bill" in Mohonk 1887, p. 68. Another example of the ambivalence, Welsh, pp. 258-259.
25. Mohonk 1886, p. 47; "Senate Debate on Bill to Provide Lands in Severalty" in Washburn Documentary, pp. 1786-1787.
26. Welsh, p. 261.
27. "First Day-Second Session" in Mohonk 1887, p. 31. Also see "Indian Citizenship" in Mohonk 1886, p. 8; Gates, pp. 121-122; Indian's Friend, December 1888.
28. "Indian Citizenship" in Mohonk 1886, p. 11.
29. "Discussion on Law for the Indians" in Mohonk 1888, pp. 65-66.
30. "A Plea for the Indian," p. 851.
31. The Indian Helper; Carlisle, Pennsylvania: The Indian Industrial School, April 6, 1888.
32. "The Rights of the Indians: Hoping to Awaken Public Feeling," NYDT, April 3, 1886. Also, see Welsh, pp. 264-265; "The Rights of the Red Man;" in Our Day, November 1888, p. 820.
33. "Final Report of the Business Committee" in Mohonk 1887, p. 104. Also see Harsha, William Justin, "What Next for the Indian?;" in Lend a Hand, September 1886, pp. 531-532; Sumner, pp. 261-262; Gates, p. 141.
34. Turgovnick, Marianna, Gone Primitive: Savage Intellectuals, Modern Lives (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press 1990) discusses similar colonialist mindsets in the expansionist enterprise in the thinking of the Western World, p. 99.
35. "Indian Citizenship" in Mohonk 1886, p. 11.
36. "A Change in Policy Requires a Change in Method" in Mohonk

1887, p. 4. Also, see "Letter of General Armstrong" in Mohonk 1886, p. 26; Mohonk 1887, p. 24.

37. Indian's Friend Oct. 1888. Also, see Smith, pp. 51-52 for discussion of the flexible construct of Westerners - both as corrupt and romanticized.

38. C.C. Painter, "The Indian and His Property" in Mohonk 1889, p. 84. Also, see an article reprinted from the Christian Nation in CF, Mar. 1887, p. 49.

39. C.C. Painter, "A Change in Policy Requires a Change of Methods" in Mohonk 1887, p. 7. Also, see "Michigan Indians" in Mohonk 1886, p. 7; C.C. Painter, "The Indian and His Property" in Mohonk 1889, pp. 88-89; Welsh, p. 263-264; "The Rights of the Red Man," p. 822; Gates, p. 122, "President Sunderland's Address" in CF, Feb. 1887, p.19. Bolt also discusses the warnings of the reformers.

40. Tibbles, Susette (Bright Eyes), "Perils and Promises of Indian Citizenship;" in Our Day, June 1890.

41. "Indian Citizenship" in Mohonk 1886, p. 9; and "A Plea for the Indian," p. 852. Also, see Welsh, p. 266.

42. Indian's Friend, Jan. 1889.

43. "Closing Address" in Mohonk 1887, p. 114. Also, see "Address of General Clinton B. Fisk" in Mohonk 1889, p. 6.

44. Jackson, p. 10.

III. Dissent

1. Washburn Assault, p. 28.

2. Washburn Assault, pp. 15-16; Prucha Crisis, pp. 165-168; Hagan, pp. 36-37; Bolt, pp.96-97.

3. "The Mohonk Platform for 1886" in CF, Nov.-Dec. 1886, p. 160. For similar accusations, see CF, Feb. 1886, p. 22; "There Are Two Kinds of Progress" in CF, April 1886, p. 61; "Senator Dawes on the Indian Question" in CF, Oct. 1886, p. 137; "A Frank Confession by Mohonkers" in CF, Jan 1887, pp. 1-2.

4. "The Mission Indians of California" in Mohonk 1886, p. 39; Jackson, pp. 10-11; "The Indian Problem" in IC, Nov. 25, 1886; "The Sioux City Journal on Indian Policy" in CF, July 1886, p. 106; "An Address to the Friends of Justice" in CF, March 1887, p. 37.

5. CF reported loss of support, Feb. 1886, p. 22.
6. "There Are Two Kinds of Progress" in CF, March 1887, pp. 37-38.
7. "An Address to the Friends of Justice" in CF, March 1887, pp. 37-38.
8. "The National Indian Defense Association" in CF, Feb. 1886, pp. 23-26.
9. "Opposing the Dawes Bill" in CF, April 1886, p. 60. Also, see "The Cherokees Oppose Coke's Bill" in CF, May 1884, pp. 77-79; "President Sunderland's Address" in CF, Feb. 1887, pp. 18-20; "An Address to the Friends of Justice" in CF, March 1887, pp. 37-39; "allotment" in IC, March 25, 1886; "The National Indian Defense Association" in IC, Nov. 4, 1886.
10. "The Cherokees Oppose Coke's Bill" in CF, May 1884, p. 78; Cherokee Advocate, Jan. 26, 1887.
11. "An Interesting Letter From Wm. C. Ivins" in CF, Feb. 1886, pp. 33-34. Also, see "President Sunderland's Address" in CF, Feb. 1887, p. 20.
12. "A Speech by a Seneca Indian" in CF, April 1886, p. 63; "Indian Land Tenure Not Understood" in CF, March 1887, pp. 42-43. For a similar view concerning the Coke Bill, see "Dissenting Opinion of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives on H.R. 5038" in Washburn Assault, pp. 35-39.
13. "A Speech by a Seneca Indian" in CF, April 1886, pp. 63-64. Also, see "Osages Visiting Washington" in CF, April 1884, p. 60; Cherokee Advocate, Jan. 26, 1887.
14. "The Secret of the Dawes Bill" in CF, April 1886, p. 66.
15. "The National Indian Defense Association" in IC, Nov. 4, 1886.
16. "Rampageous Dawes" in IC, Jan, 1887, pp. 2-3.
17. "Chief Brant's View of Civilization" reprinted from Hagers-town, Ontario Indian in CF, June 1886, p. 97. Also, see "The Peorias Protest Against Land in Severalty" in CF, Feb. 1887, pp. 35-36; "About Indians and Land" in CA, Sept. 28, 1887.
18. "President Sunderland's Address" in CF, Feb. 1887, pp. 18-19. Also, see "Lease of Indian Lands" in IC, June 2, 1887.
19. Washburn Assault, p. 8; "President Sunderland's Address" in CF, Feb 1887, p. 20.
20. Carlson, pp. 29-32.

21. The dangerous transition period: McCulloch, p.571; Harsha, p. 531; "The Rights Of Red Man," p. 392. The CF sought to encourage the Five Civilized Tribe model: "Speech of Col. G.W. Harkins of the Chickasaws" Feb. 1886, pp. 23-24; and "Rev. Alexander Kent on Indian Policies" June 1887, pp. 7-8.
22. Washburn's Red Man's Land, p. 39; Carlson, pp. 23, 83-92; "Some Sensible Words From General Mills" in CF, April 1884, p. 62.
23. Trachtenburg, p. 22; Smith, p. 191; Limerick, p. 62.
24. "Col. G.W. Harkin's Speech" in CF, Feb. 1887, pp. 20-21. Also, see "The Cherokees Oppose Coke's Bill" in CF, May 1884, pp. 78-79; "Indians Plead for Justice" in CF, July 1886, p. 114; "About Indians and Land" in CA, Sept. 28, 1887.
25. "Allotment" in IC, March 25, 1886. Also, see "Mr. Beck to Mr. Adair" in IC, June 24, 1886; "Lease of Indian Lands" in IC, June 2, 1887; "About Indians and Land" in CA, Sept. 28, 1887.
26. "An Indian Compact" in NYT, March 25, 1886.
27. "Editor Stone's Death" in NYT, Oct. 24, 1887.
28. "Cherokee Politics" in IC, April 7, 1887. Also, see "Cherokee Affairs" in IC, Feb. 18, 1886; "Allotment" in IC, March 25, 1886; "The Cherokee Lands" in NYT, Jan. 2, 1886.
29. "Platform of the Downing Party" in IC, Feb. 3, 1887.
30. "Platform of the New Independent Party" in IC, Aug. 19, 1886. Also, see Cherokee Advocate, Jan. 26, 1887.
31. "Lease of Indian Lands" in IC, June 2, 1887. Also, see "President Sunderland's Address" in CF, February, 1887, p. 19.
32. "Speech of Col. G.W. Harkin's of the Chickasaw" in CF, February 1886, pp. 23-24. Also, see "Give the Tribes Patent in Fee" in CF, June 1886, pp. 92-93; "Indian Matters" in IC, June 10, 1886.
33. "Miss Fletcher Sadly Disappointed" in CF, February 1887, pp. 27.
34. "The Peorias Protest Against Land in Severalty" in CF, February 1887, pp. 35-36. Also, see "Osages Visiting Washington" in CF April 1884, p. 60; "Protest of the Indian Delegations" in CF, February 1887, p. 35; "The Editors' Reception to Indian Delegates" in CF, March 1887, p. 49; "Osages" in CA, Jan. 26, 1887.
35. "An Address to the Friends of Justice" in CF, March 1887, p. 38. Also, see "The Choctaw Nation: Annual Message of Principle Chief M'Kinney" in NYT, Oct. 7, 1887.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Books and reports of the Dawes Act era

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior; Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1885-1890.

Harrison, J.B., The Latest Studies on Indian Reservations; Philadelphia: The Indian Rights Association, 1887.

Jackson, Helen Hunt, A Century of Dishonor: A Sketch of the United States Governments' Dealings with Some of the Indian Tribes; Boston: Roberts Bros., 1888.

Lake Mohonk Conference Proceeding; Philadelphia: The Indian Rights Association, 1883-1890.

Turner, Frederick Jackson, The Frontier in American History, New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1920, (1893).

II. Articles of the Dawes Act era

Gates, "Land and Law as Agents in Educating Indians;" in Journal of Social Sciences, American Social Science Association, September 1886.

Harsha, William Justin, "What Next for the Indian?;" in Lend a Hand, September 1886.

McCullough, John, "A Suggestion on the Indian Question;" in Overland Monthly, December 1885.

McNaughton, J.H., "The Red Man;" in The Nineteenth Century, May 1885.

"A Plea for the Indian;" in Catholic World, March 1886.

Rhoads, James E., "The Indian Question in the Concrete;" in Lend a Hand, March 1886.

"The Rights of the Red Man;" in Our Day, November 1888.

Sumner, W.G., "The Indians in 1887;" in Forum, May 1887.

Thayer, James B., "The Dawes Bill and the Indians;" in Atlantic Monthly, March 1888.

Tibbles, Susette (Bright Eyes), "Perils and Promises of Indian Citizenship;" in Our Day, June 1890.

Welsh, Herbert, "The Indian Question Past and Present;" in New England Magazine, October, 1890.

III. Journals of the Dawes Act era

Cherokee Advocate; Tahlequah, Indian Territory: Cherokee Nation, 1886-1887.

Council Fire; Philadelphia: Bland and Bland, 1884-1889.

Indian Arrow; Ft. Gibson, Indian Territory: Arrow Publishing Co., 1888.

Indian Chieftain; Vinita, Indian Territory: Chieftain Publishing Co., 1886-87.

Indian's Friend; Philadelphia: Women's National Indian Association, 1888-1889.

The Indian Helper; Carlisle, Pennsylvania: The Indian Industrial School, 1887-1888.

Indian Record; Presbytery of the Indian Territory, 1886-1887.

New York Daily Tribune; 1886.

New York Times; 1886-1888.

Tahlequah Telephone; Tahlequah, Indian Territory, 1887-1888.

IV. Secondary sources

Berkhofer, Robert, The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.

Boelhower, William, Through a Glass Darkly: Ethnic Semiosis in American Literature; New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1987.

Bolt, Christine, American Indian Policy and American Reform: Case Studies of the Campaign to Assimilate the American Indians; Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1987.

- Bowden, Henry Warner, American Indians and Christian Missions: Studies in Cultural Conflict; Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Carlson, Leonard A., Indians, Bureaucrats, and Land: The Dawes Act and the Decline of Indian Farming; Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981.
- Danky, James P. (ed.), Native American Periodicals and Newspapers, 1828-1982; Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr., Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto; New York: Avon, 1969.
- Dippie, Brian W., The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy; Middletown, CT: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1982.
- Drinnon, Richard, Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire Building; New York: Schocken Books, 1990 (1980).
- Fiedler, Leslie A., The Return of the Vanishing American; New York: Stein and Day, 1968.
- Hagan, William T., The Indian Rights Association: The Herbert Welsh Years, 1882-1904; Tucson: Univ. of AZ Press, 1985.
- Hagan, William T., "Private Property: The Indian's Door to Civilization;" Ethnohistory, Spring, 1956.
- Higham, John, Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925; New York: Atheneum, 1978.
- Hill, Edward E. (ed.), Guide to the Records in the National Archives of the United States Relating to American Indians; Washington, D.C.: National Archives and records Service, 1981.
- Holford, David M., "The Subversion of the Indian Allotment System, 1887-1934;" in The Indian Historian, Spring 1975.
- Horsman, Reginald, Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism; Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1981.
- Hoxie, Frederick, E., A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920; Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1984.
- Huth, Hans, Nature and the American Mind: Three Centuries of Changing Attitudes; 1957.
- Kreyche, Gerald F., Visions of the American West; Lexington: Univ. Press of KY, 1989.

- Lamar, H. and Thompson, L. (eds.), The Frontier in History: North America and South Africa Compared; New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1981.
- Limerick, Patricia Nelson, The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West; New York: W.W. Norton, 1987.
- Malone, Michael, (ed.), Historians and the American West; Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1983.
- MARHO, The Radical Historians Organization; Visions of History; New York: Pantheon Books, 1983.
- Martin, Calvin (ed.), The American Indian and the Problem of History; New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1987.
- Marx, Leo, The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America; 1964.
- Merk, Frederick, History of the Westward Movement; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.
- Miner, Craig H., The Corporation and the Indian: Tribal Sovereignty and Industrial Civilization in the Indian Territory, 1865-1907; Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1976.
- Nash, Roderick, Wilderness and the American Mind; New Haven: Yale Univ Press, 1967.
- Novick, Peter, That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession; New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988.
- Otis, D.S., (F.P.Prucha, ed.), The Dawes Act and the Allotment of Indian Lands; Norman: Univ. of OK Press, 1973 (1934).
- Pearce, Roy Harvey, Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind; 1988 (1953).
- Perdue, Theda, Nations Remembered: An Oral History of the Five Civilized Tribes, 1865-1907; Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1980.
- Prucha, Francis Paul, American Indian Policy in Crisis: The Christian Reformers and the Indian, 1865-1900; Norman: Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1976.
- Prucha, Francis Paul, Americanizing the American Indians; Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1973.
- Prucha, Francis Paul, (ed.), A Bibliographical Guide to Indian-White Relations in the United States; Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1977.

- Prucha, Francis Paul, (ed.), Indian-White Relations in the United States: A Bibliography of Works Published, 1975-1980; Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1982.
- Prucha, Francis Paul, The Indians in American Society; Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1985.
- Slotkin, Richard, The Fatal Environment: The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialization; New York: Atheneum, 1985.
- Smith, Henry Nash, Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth; Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1978 (1950).
- Swagerty, W.R., (ed.), Scholars and the Indian Experience; Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1984.
- Takaki, Ronald, Iron Cages: Race and Culture in 19th Century America; New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1990.
- Trachtenberg, Alan, The Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age; New York: Hill and Wang, 1982.
- Trennert, Robert A., Alternatives to Extinction: Federal Indian Policy and the Beginning of the Reservation System; 1975.
- Turgovnick, Marianna, Gone Primitive: Savage Intellectuals, Modern Lives; Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press 1990.
- Turner, Frederick, Beyond Geography: The Western Spirit Against the Wilderness; New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1980.
- Utey, Robert M., The Indian Frontier of the American West, 1846-1890; Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Press, 1984.
- Vecsey, C. and Venables, R., American Indian Environments: Ecological Issues in Native American History; Syracuse: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1980.
- Walsh, Margaret, The American Frontier Revisited; Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1981.
- Washburn, Wilcomb E., The American Indian and the United States: A Documentary History; New York: Random House, vols 1-4, 1973.
- Washburn, Wilcomb E., The Assault on Indian Tribalism: The General Allotment Law (Dawes Act) of 1887; Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1975.
- Washburn, Wilcomb E., Red Man's Land / White Man's Law: A Study of the Past and Present Status of the American Indian; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971.
- White, Richard, "Race Relation in the American West;" in American

Quarterly, vol. 38, 1986.

Wiebe, Robert, The Search for Order; New York: Hill and Wang,
1967.