

VI. "A CENTURY OF DISHONOR"

1.

This is the title of a book by Helen Hunt Jackson of Ramona fame. It is a devastating indictment of inhumane and atrocious acts of greed and cruelty committed against millions of inoffensive Amerindians.

Accustomed, as we are, to make the mistreatment of the Indians a Spanish monopoly, we cannot avoid the impression that this book was intended to characterize in a few strongly drawn pictures, as red with blood as a colossal conflagration, all work of Spain in America, as it has been related, taught, and reiterated, by the chroniclers of prejudice and hatred.

But A Century of Dishonor is not another history of Spanish greed and cruelty towards the Indians. It is a chapter of our own history. It is the story of three odd million Nabots exterminated by Ahab who coveted their vineyard. It is the story of 3,000,000 Indians—men, women and children—who received us in their midst as friends, who often helped us in time of distress, who never told us a lie until we taught them that lying might sometimes save them from further injustice. These we exterminated, so that we might appropriate their own substance without opposition. Does it seem too fantastic for credence? Perhaps. But this is one book in which the authoress of Ramona did not use her fantasy at all. She used, instead, government documents relative to Indian affairs, and also trustworthy documents contemporary with the facts in question. Besides, there is another proof of the

stark reality. The Spanish Indians are still alive—in greater numbers than at the time the Conquistadores arrived on the shores of the New World. How about the North-American Indians? They are no more! They have been turned to dust! The 6 percent left of the primitive American population are just a few ghosts who took refuge on the fringes of our inhospitable deserts and there they await stolidly for our sure and relentless arrival. The aridity of the desert will not save the remnants of the noble North-American Indians.

2.

It is generally conceded that some of the English colonists in North America began by treating the native Indians well. They could ill afford to do otherwise. That such good treatment was nothing more than a measure of sheer necessity is abundantly proved by the rapid and progressive change of policy in the opposite direction in proportion to the continually increasing strength of the colonies. This was in accord with the spirit of the English people who, down deep in their hearts, believe that the inferior races have no valid right to life and liberty, but are to be kept in subjection, or exterminated, to make room for the superior race—the Anglo-Saxon.

Just when they developed this maxim of political economy is difficult to tell. At home they were fully alive to it at the time that Spain was affirming in America the absolute equality of the natives with the most free and most privileged of her sons.

In his book The Age of Reformation says Preserved Smith referring to the Irish whose homeland the English considered as a mere colony peopled by an inferior race: "England had already tried to solve the Irish problem by colonization. Leinster had long been a center of English settlement, and in 1575 the first English colony was sent to Ulster. But as it consisted chiefly of bankrupts, fugitives from justice and 'others of so corrupt a disposition as England rather refuseth', it did not help matters much but rather 'irrecuperably damnified the state'!" (1)

This colonization of the Emerald Island was a desperate and Machiavellian attempt at displacing her rightful inhabitants until she might be as free from them as she had been from snakes, thanks to her patron saint. And it was to bankrupts, fugitives from justice and others 'of so corrupt a disposition as England rather refuseth,' that was given the role of a new St. Patrick.

But lest there be any doubt about the intentions of England in regard to her colonial policy in Ireland, I quote further: "Intermarriage of colonists (English) and natives (Irish) was forbidden by law. The only way the Tudor government knew of asserting its suzerainty over these septs, correctly described as 'the King's Irish enemies', was to raid them at intervals, slaying, robbing and raping as they went." (2) This seems perfectly clear, and leaves no room for misinterpretations that might be resorted to in extenuation of, or in explaining away, the real intentions of England towards her little colony next door. Some, however, may still doubt,

(1) Smith, P. The Age of the Reformation, p. 348. New York, H. Holt and Co., 1920.

(2) Id. *ibid.*, p. 347.

and so the author we have been quoting adds: "England then regarded the Irish much as the Americans have seemed to regard the Indians, as savages to be killed and driven off to make room for a higher civilization. Had England been able to apply the method of extermination she would doubtless have done so and there would be then no Irish question today."⁽³⁾

The last words of this quotation give the real and most cogent reason why the whole world is not yet an exclusive preserve of Anglo-Saxon domination, swept clean of other strains of the human race, to whom the culture, the power, wealth, and welfare of England, owe absolutely nothing. Yes, had England been able... what would have been the fate of the 350,000,000 inhabitants of India, and South Africa's several millions of black natives? The same that overtook the native peoples of Tasmania, New Guinea and Australia, to name only three of her overseas dominions.

It was impotence and fear that made the first English colonists in America respect for a while the lives of the Indians in whose midst they took refuge from the intolerance and tyranny of their own mother land. It was impotence and fear that made them pay, at first, for the necessities of life, or for the lands, they obtained from the Indians. As soon, however, as they began sufficiently to trust their numbers and their guns, who ever spoke of paying an injun for the things they could take without danger of life or limb? That would be degrading to full-blooded Englishmen, even if he had been a helot in his own country. And therefore, should a native, no matter how high in the councils

(3) Id. *ibid.*, p. 346.

of his nation or tribe, be in the way of the Anglo-Saxon's desire to appropriate his lands and his wealth? Not as soon as his numbers had grown sufficiently large, his fortifications had been made strong, and his armory well supplied with every efficient implement of slaughter and extermination.

A recent bulletin issued by the Smithsonian Institution related that a numerous and very prosperous Indian population lived in the valley of the Potomac at the time the English colonists arrived in that region. It states that they not only had developed many important industries of their own, but also carried on a very brisk trade among themselves and with neighboring tribes. The whole Potomac basin was the arena of a very busy life, of much prosperity and comparative happiness on the part of its numerous Indian population. But seventy years later, as if swept by a Spanish tornado, not an Indian was to be seen anywhere, by the shores of the Potomac, to tell his tale of woe!

It has already been remarked how the 'bloody infidels' of Virginia were treated by the Englishmen who, according to Charles M. Andrews, "made many excursions into Indian territory, destroying Indian towns and crops and overawing the red men by the superiority of their weapons—guns in hand or cannon from the ships." And he adds: "Their methods were often atrocious in the use of poison and treachery."⁽⁴⁾

The instances might be multiplied ad infinitum, but our purpose is not so much to show the English versus the Spanish policy towards the Indians, and unmask the hypocrisy and lack of

(4) Andrews, loc. cit., p. 141.

sincerity of the former when they accuse Spain of mistreatment of the natives and, at the same time, pose as paragons of tolerance, humanitarianism, justice and fair-play towards all peoples, as to give in advance a clue of our own relations with the Indians. In fact, and in spite of our declaration of the rights of men, as inheritors and keepers of the Anglo-Saxon tradition we set out to carry to completion what the British started in America, and what is one of the fundamental principles of their political economy: The extermination of the inferior races in order to make room for the superior ones, that is, ourselves.

3.

Of course this policy is subordinated to purely materialistic considerations, to expediency. Our whole history is full of instances that show how tolerant, magnanimous and forgiving we are with the strong, but, on the other hand, how intolerant and domineering with the little fellow who is powerless to defend himself. When Russia defaulted on her debts to the United States we magnanimously failed to use the big stick. We could afford to lose money and be called bad names in the bargain. But when Sandino questioned our authority over his diminutive country, as well as the right of a few American industrialists to exploit it as if it were their own backyard, we dispatched immediately expedition after expedition to chastise the little fellow, as he most certainly deserved for being so little and so unwilling to be bribed or browbeaten. But Sandino proved to be no easy prey, so we decided to make up with him after a good number of our boys had been slain in that imperialistic adventure. Sandino, however,

was soon found shot in the back under a flag of truce.

When the Boxer Rebellion threatened the open door in China we went against her without a moment's hesitation. China could be whipped with impunity. But when Japan closed the doors of Manchuria we did not consider it a casus belli and looked foolishly to the other side.

When the Chinese were needed for the development of California, we received them with public festivals and great demonstrations of rejoicing. But when they became successful competitors in the American industry, or in the markets of labor, they were legislated against, and became the object of persecution and even massacre. The same thing happened in due time to the Japanese, the Filipinos, and the Mexicans.

The purchases of various Spanish American territories, and the conquest of others, were likewise timed so that they might be effected with impunity. In many cases American trickery started the whole process of conquest of some coveted Spanish or Mexican province. California is a case in point. Royce's California gives a fair glimpse of the greed, treachery and cowardice that brought about the conquest of the land of oranges and movie stars.

But it was in our treatment of the weakest of all the peoples we came in contact with—the Indians—that we displayed those qualities to the highest degree.

On taking over the American territories that first belonged to England, and, later on, those that had belonged to Spain, we assumed all the responsibilities and obligations undertaken by those Powers towards the Indians, and pledged our word to carry on for ever the policies they had established in their behalf.

The Indians' rights of occupancy, especially, which Spain proclaimed at the beginning of her conquests and observed scrupulously during three centuries and a half, and which are still observed throughout Spanish America, were accepted and recognized by the United States, with the solemn promise that they should never be disturbed, and that they could only be extinguished by purchase or conquest following a just war.

In consequence of this pledge, and because we were not in a position to start the extermination of this undesirable element of the American population, and also because we either did not yet know the value of their lands, or had no sufficient number of hands to grab them, we soon entered into negotiations with the native tribes and made treaties with them for the express purpose of defining and limiting the rights and duties, and the different spheres of influence, of either contracting party. The treaties stated, "in a succession of numbered articles, promises of payments of money, and surrenders and cessions of lands by both parties," which articles "were understood by the Indians agreeing to them to be as binding as if they had been called treaties." (5)

In these treaties the Indian tribes were called Nations, and so recognized by the United States for all the purposes of the application of international law. And, naturally enough, both the Indian Nations and the United States carried on their respective negotiations on a footing of perfect equality. Whether we were sincere or not will soon be seen. The Indians certainly acted in all sincerity, and once they had subscribed to a treaty they

(5) Jackson, H. H. A Century of Dishonor, p. 28. Boston, L., Brown and Co., 1929.

not only meant to keep it but they did in fact keep it, never dreaming of circumventing obligations it imposed, thinking, on the other hand, that we felt also all the force of our commitments.

And so we did...as long as we were weak and powerless to cope with an outraged Indian tribe or nation. However, as we grew in numbers and power, we deliberately proceeded to violate every treaty entered into with the Indian tribes, as if we were not a party to them. It was not greed alone that made us break our treaties with the Indians. It was the old spirit of superiority asserting itself. The inferior races have no share in a world which was made exclusively for the Anglo-Saxon. Besides, we can afford to humble ourselves, even before a savage, when we are weak, but let us grow up and become strong, and then we will bully any child that crosses our path.

This breaking of our plighted faith, not to all tribes at once, for that would be evidently dangerous, but to one at a time, for safety's sake, was often followed by serious and unexpected complications in which we might stand to lose. What to do then? Make a new treaty, by which the simple-minded Indians would consider themselves bound for a time, while we gathered new strength to violate it without unpleasant consequences to ourselves.

Thus each treaty became more solemn and more binding in its phraseology as the time went on, and its violation more swift and barefaced, until "under the cloak of a hundred years of treaty-making and treaty-breaking"⁽⁶⁾ we plunged into a diabolical orgy of unspeakable cruelty and rapacity, without parallel in the darkest pages of the world's history.

(6) Id. *ibid.*, p. 27.

The anomaly of our situation became so glaring that in 1871, ^{the} Congress, perhaps ashamed of making treaties only to break them, passed an act providing that in the future no Indian tribe should be considered as a foreign nation for the purpose of treaty-making. This is a clear confession of guilt. Thus Congress acknowledged the fact that it had considered the Indian tribes as foreign nations and that it had violated the treaties made with them. In other words, Congress acknowledged that it had trampled international law under foot whenever it had been able to do so without danger of due retribution. It implied that the sacredness and strength of our treaties were proportional to the strength of the nation with which we treated; or again, that might was right. Our behavior was not different from that of Germany, Russia, Italy or Japan of today.

Transactions of this kind with the Indians, declared Congress, in that memorable session, were to be called agreements or conventions and not treaties. "The fact that no man's sense of justice openly revolted against such subterfuges, under the name of agreements, is only to be explained by the deterioration of the sense of honor in the nation." (7) But even these were empty words, for neither with agreements nor with conventions did the United States Government keep faith, as it had not kept faith with the treaties made previously. "The history of the United States Government's repeated violations of faith with the Indians thus convicts us, as a nation, not only of having outraged the principles of justice, which are the basis of international law; and of both cruelty and perfidy, but of having made ourselves liable to...arbitrary punishment at the hands of any

(7) Id. *ibid.*, p. 29.

civilized nation who might see fit to call us to account." (8)

The story of our atrocious, cowardly, and perfidious treatment of the Indians, not as sporadic cases perpetrated by irresponsible individuals or communities, but as national and states' policies, is so flagrant and so unique in its ruthlessness and barbaric refinements of cruelty and orgiastic sadism, so clear a case of insatiable greed and unscrupulous rapacity, that it appears quite incomprehensible how we can muster our courage to accuse Spain of greed and cruelty towards the Indians, when in reality and paradoxically her whole Indian policy was more humane and just than that of any other colonial Power.

This Spanish policy, consistently followed during Spain's rule in America, is no secret and has never been such, except for those who prefer to close their eyes to historical truth rather than to see crumbling to pieces the castles of their prejudices, wherein their smug complacency has taken refuge. In A Century of Dishonor, by Helen Hunt Jackson; in Massacres of the Mountains, by J. P. Durm Jr.; in Spanish Pioneers, by Charles F. Lummis, and in many other works in which truth is placed above prejudice, we have the other side of the question, that is, the documentation of our Dishonor in regard to our Indian policy.

4.

Before we give a few samples of the inhumane, and dishonorable treatment we accorded the Indians, until they were exterminated

(8) Jackson, H. H. A Century of Dishonor, p. 29. Boston, L., Brown and Co., 1929.

almost to the last one, it may be pertinent to find out what kind of ogres these Indians were, for even to those who are ready to accept the fact that we acted towards them in a manner that would put the blush in the faces of the hords of Genghis Ken, Tamerlane, or Attila, we hasten to justify ourselves in the conviction that the native Americans were bloodthirsty savages, full of treachery, thieves and liars by nature, uncivilizable and unamenable to any form of progress.

There is nothing farther from the truth than such monstrous charges. They are nothing more than the customary attempt at justifying ourselves by attributing our own crimes to the victims of our greed and inhumanity. It is the same old trick that has been played to satiety by Italy, France, and especially the Anglo-Saxon nations against Spain for over three centuries. It is the favorite trick played by Germany against her weak neighbors.

"Indians," says Lummis, "are not perfect, nor ideal supermen. There have been bad Indians, treacherous Indians, foolish Indians, bloodthirsty Indians. But no Indian tribe was ever any one of these things; and the proudest American community was never ruled by officials more absolutely honest, honorable and high-minded...These are no sentimentalities, nor idealism, nor heroics. The American Indian is a fine, unspoiled human being, from whom we have much to learn...What I have said is not my opinion merely...It is corroborated by all who have really known the Indian, and by the official records of our own Government, overwhelmingly and beyond controversy." (9)

(9) Lummis, Ch. F. Mesa, Cañón and Pueblo, p. 256.

"Broadly speaking," he says elsewhere, "the American Indian had all virtues, and only a part of our vices. In any community of his, honesty, charity, conjugal faithfulness, filial respect and parental love ranked higher than in any community of ours. There was no child murder, no defalcation, no swindling, no crooked politics, no hold-ups, no petty larceny, no burglary, no murder, no suicide, no desertion..."(10)

Stanley Vestal, in his biography of Sitting Bull, quotes General Sully, 'who rarely had a good word for Indians', as saying in one of his official papers; "The females of the wild bands of Sioux, called the Teton Sioux, set an example of virtue worthy of being copied by any civilized nation."(11)

Sam Houston "had found Caucasian's capacity for 'coldness' and 'treachery' superior to that of an Indian. Near the close of his stormy life, Sam Houston said he had yet to be wronged or deceived by an Indian, but that every wound he had known was the work of those of his own blood."(12)

The Indians are eminently religious and pervaded with the most sincere sentiment of piety. Religion is not for them just a set of beliefs without practical significance, without a deep and effective meaning. It is a living force that determines all his behavior and keeps him constantly in the straight line of duty. Of the Pueblo Indians says Lumis: "The Pueblos have a ritual religion as profound, as noble, as beautiful, and perhaps as old,

(10) Id. *ibid.*, p. 252.

(11) Vestal, S. Sitting Bull, p. 25.
Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1932.

(12) James, M. Sam Houston, p. 147.
Indianapolis, The Bobbs Merrill Co., 1929.

as the Hebrews. They have lived by it for milleniums—and living by it they are better citizens, parents, children, and neighbors than we can show."(13) And pointing out to one of our lines of attack directed to the complete extermination of the Indians, he adds: "If this ancient faith can be broken up, the community will fall a prey to his smarter neighbors. That is precisely the present attack. The venerable Pueblo ceremonials are to be broken up. They are Pagan! So was Homer—and Socrates. Nor was Moses exactly Christian."(14)

Of course our pretexts for converting infidels have a semblance of justification. But only a semblance, for, if religion is a way of life, that religion is superior and preferable to all others to the extent of its results in keeping both the individual and the community in the straight path of duty and helpfulness to their fellow-beings. Ours does not seem to have such power, while that of the Indians was most certainly a positive and living force in that direction. The Indians believe in witches but they also "believe in the fear of God, and reverence to age, in filial and parental obligation, in paying their debts, in honesty and truthful dealing, in chastity and continence and the sacred care of women. They believe in law and order, in authority and charity and tolerance, in mercy and righteousness. They do not believe in divorce, alimony, murder-at-home, race suicide, abandonment or disowning of children. A lynching or a Ku-Klux never blotted their record. And they are hospitable as Abraham and the

(13) Lummis, loc. cit., p. 271.

(14) Id. ibid.

Patriarchs—not just to 'their set', but to any wayfarer. The Puritans, who equally believed in witches, had none of that gentle disease 'My house is yours'. And in all their virtues not an American can make faces at the poorest Mexican hamlet or Indian Pueblo in New Mexico."(15)

The trustfulness and innocent matter-of-factness with which the American Indians received the white strangers who invaded their shores and overran their lands, and the hospitality and generous help that they lavished upon them, while the hands of the latter were yet unstained by violence and rapine, and the crookedness of their tongues had not yet been discovered by the former, show conclusively the excellency of their religious beliefs and how superior their moral code was when compared with our own. "In my day," says Lummis, "one...could travel, afoot or on horseback, from Santa Fé to Panama, without a dollar or a name; sure of welcome alike at hovel or hacienda—and safer than in any American city. So Bandelier traveled, afoot, unarmed, alone, thousands of miles in our Southwest and Mexico. So have I, alone, afoot or on horseback, like thousands—and never had rebuff from Indian or Mexican."(16)

The Indians are dirty, lazy, unprogressive, impervious to education and civilization, incapable of improving or trying to improve their lot. Such are some of the reasons we adduce to justify our neglect and our hostility towards American natives, our policy of expropriation and extermination of nearly three million Indians.

(15) Lummis, loc. cit., p. 353 ff.

(16) Id. ibid., p. 354.

Of the Pueblo Indians, who are no better and no worse than those of other tribes, says the author of Mesa, Cañon and Pueblo: "They live neatly and comfortably, and their homes are generally clean as wax. They are peaceable and industrious, good hunters and brave warriors when need be, but quiet farmers by profession, as they were when the outside world first found them. They have always elected their own officials, and they obey the laws both of their own strange government and of the United States in a way which they certainly did not learn from us, for there is no American community nearly so law-abiding. They are entirely self-supporting, and receive nothing from our government. They are not poor nor lazy, and they do not impose servile tasks upon their wives. One of my Pueblo neighbors in Isleta (Ambrosio Abelta) lent our government the hard cash to pay off our troops in New Mexico during the civil war." (17)

The rational use ~~the~~ Indians make of the bounties Nature offers them, their lack of greed in the exploitation of the public domain, their gentleness towards all living beings, and their respect for the natural rights others have on the common sources of food and raiment, when contrasted with our greedy, selfish and destructive habits, should cause us to hide our faces for utter shame. The untutored Indians "never knew the game-hog until the advent of the Superior Race. The former killed to satisfy his needs and the bison still grew in numbers. The latter shooting from railroad trains, hunting them for tongues, then for robes, killed more than ten million in ten years, thus obliterating this noble animal. It is not very long since parties of respectable

(17) Lummis, loc. cit., p. 277.

people would charter a launch, sail to Catalina island, catch a ton or two of tuna fish, be photographed with them, and then haul them back to sea and dump them overboard." (18) A few years ago it was reported in a magazine article that a United States Senator, needing a rest from his arduous labours, went to shoot moose in Alaska. And he proved to be a truly fierce Nimrod. Yes, in that short season he felled 700 moose just for sport! The same kind of story could be told of all other kinds of game, of our forests, oil and coal deposits, and everything that means wealth...and sport, that is, greed, cruelty, destructiveness.

Of Sitting Bull, Stanley Vestal says: "He thought of the animals he hunted as fellow creatures, many of them with keener senses and greater strength than his own. He was no game hog, no butcher. He thought it cruel to kill more than was necessary. The animals were his friends; wolves led him to game, knowing he would share with them; birds gave warning when foes were about. To have slaughtered these friends recklessly would have been black ingratitude, and he let them know how he felt about it." (19) And further on he says: "Before his finger pressed the trigger, before his hand released the arrow, he would whisper, 'Grandfather, my children are hungry. You were created for that. So I must kill you!'" (20)

We have no right to qualify the Indians as savages. Instead of sending them missionaries to preach to them a gospel which we do not understand and which fails to instil in us sentiments of

(18) Lummis, loc. cit., p. 332.

(19) Vestal, loc. cit., p. 34.

(20) Id. Ibid.

universal brotherhood, wouldn't it be more sensible, and infinitely more profitable, to import a few Indian missionaries to teach us a better way of life? How many good things we could learn from them, and how much more happiness we could enjoy therefrom. "After the World War," says Stanley Vestal, "Some of the Sioux veterans (members of the American Legion) sought admission to the old tribal Warrior Orders. But the old men resisted their claims; they considered that killing men with rifle-fire was no qualification for standing as warriors. Such warfare is 'just shooting.'"(21) "Sitting Bull," he says elsewhere, "did not think much of the soldiers. Said he: 'The white soldiers...seem to have no hearts. When an Indian gets killed, the other Indians feel sorry and cry, and sometimes stop fighting. But when a white soldier gets killed, nobody cries, nobody cares; they go right on shooting and let him lie there. Sometimes they even go off and leave their wounded behind them.'"(22)

The Indian's laziness, improvidence, unprogressiveness, lack of desire and inaptitude to learn the better ways of life, are amply disapproved by numerous official utterances of our own government's agents for the Indian Affairs. The Delawares "protected by the strong arm of the government, and dwelling on lands distinctly and permanently established as their own, --turn their attention to the cultivation of the earth, and abandon the chase for the surer supply of domestic animals."(23) After General Wayne

(21) Vestal, loc. cit. p. 61.

(22) Id. *ibid.*, p. 62.

(23) Jackson, loc. cit., p. 49.

had burned their crops and all their dwellings, he confessed that he had never seen anywhere such luxuriant corn and such immense fields of it. This was in 1795 along the Miami River. Undaunted by that barbaric act the Indians returned twice to plant the fields that had been burned. In 1838 they were cultivating 1500 acres of land in grain and vegetables, and raising a great many hogs, cattle and horses. "They are a brave, enterprising people," and "at peace with all neighboring Indians"(24) says the government's agent. Of their eagerness to learn, the agent says, "It is truly astonishing to see the rapidity with which they acquire knowledge."(25) As soldiers under Colonel Weer, this officer says of them: "The Indian soldiers have far exceeded the most sanguine expectations. They bore the brunt of the fighting done by the expedition, and had they been properly sustained, would have effectually ended the sway of the rebels in the Indian Territory."(26)

Of a village of a thousand Delawares who had been removed to Kansas, and were soon to be removed again, the same report states that "several of them have from fifty to one hundred acres of land in cultivation, with comfortable dwellings, barns and outhouses...All the families are domiciled in houses...There are but few Delaware children of the age of twelve or fourteen that cannot read."(27) The report further states that the average of their personal property amounted to one thousand dollars. Twenty

(24) Jackson, loc. cit. p. 80.

(25) Id., *ibid.*, p. 82.

(26) Id., *ibid.*, p. 57.

(27) Id., *ibid.*, p. 88.

thousand dollars worth of stock and twenty eight thousand dollars worth of timber stolen from them in two years by the Delaware Lumber Co., and the Union Pacific Railroad, bespeak of their capacity for hard and productive work, especially if we take into consideration the fact that they had been on the move for nearly two generations, kicked around by Uncle Sam, and without hope of a permanent abode in the grant land that was theirs.

On the occasion of making a treaty with the Nez Percé Indians Colonel Wright asked them what they most desired in the way of help from our government. "Their reply was worthy of a noble race—'Peace, ploughs, and schools'"(28). This was typical of most Indian tribes. Their failure in raising themselves to the level of the best educated, laborious, and thrifty of our own communities was due to our neglect, to our persecutions, to our bad faith in the execution of our treaties with them, and to the fact that we did not pay them the money we promised them for the rich lands they ceded to us at a shamefully small price.

5.

As was remarked before, the assumption of power on the part of the United States over the former territories of England and Spain imposed upon this country obligations towards the Indians, obligations that we solemnly promised to discharge faithfully forever. At that time we still regarded the Indian tribes as Nations and with them we made treaties accompanied by the same formalities that were used in making treaties with any other for-

(28) Id., *ibid.*, p. 116.

sign nation, and our pledges were as solemn and considered as binding as if they were made to the most powerful nation on earth.

In most cases these treaties were negotiated in such a manner that the advantages thereof were almost completely in our favor and were almost the equivalent of orders of eviction. In general they provided that the Indians should relinquish all or part of their lands, which we coveted, and settle farther and farther away in lands which we considered worthless, or of no great value at the moment. To indemnify the Indians somewhat for their loss we would promise them a certain amount of money, generally at the rate of a few cents an acre.

In these treaties the United States would undertake most solemnly never to molest these Nations again, to keep peace and amity with them, to protect them from their enemies, to pay them certain sums of money, generally in installments, and to recognize and sanction their right to deal with any American or foreign trouble-maker who might invade their territories in accordance with their own laws and justice. Had such treaties been executed as faithfully by our government as they were by the Indians, the latter would still be living in their own country, would have adopted our civilization, and would have become valuable elements of our population. But in our government there was duplicity while drawing such treaties, and the general run of the Caucasian population was too unruly to obey any laws except those that promoted their own material interests.

Consequently, no sooner were these treaties signed by the two high contracting parties, than bands of lawless Americans,

sure of encouragement and protection to which they had no semblance of right, would invade the new Indian territory and appropriate to themselves the most desirable portions. The Indians, on their part, though resenting these violent encroachments of their rights, failed to apply that clause of the treaty which permitted them to deal with the aggressors according to their sense of justice in regard to a very serious offense. This failure, which was only the reflex of extreme courtesy and of a very high regard on their part for the government of the United States, both our people and our government were unable to understand, and other enterprising Americans were emboldened to perpetrate new outrages of a similar nature. Instead of arresting the invader and committing him to prison, or killing him outright, as their treaty with our government provided, the Indians thought it more human, and perhaps more politic, to make representations to their Great White Father in Washington, taking also occasion to ask our government to send them the money due for the lands they had relinquished, and fulfill other clauses of the treaty, things that our government was in the habit of forgetting most lamentably.

Of course things would not run smoothly in Washington for the Indian envoys. In general, however, and after long delays, these difficulties were finally settled by a new treaty, in virtue of which they had to relinquish once more, in favor of their greedy neighbors, their new homes and lands, and move farther back a few hundred miles into westward wildernesses which we did not covet at the moment.

These new treaties were, to be sure, final, sacred, absolutely binding, and in perpetuity. In such terms did we pledge our word

of honor and the honor of our Nation, and the guileless Indians would take us at our word and believe our protestations of good will, of honor and honesty, as if they had been made by some other Indian envoys or chief. They could not possibly admit in the innermost recess of their hearts that the responsible agents of the American Government were liars, deceivers, full of duplicity, greed, and lust for power.

And so, after a score or so of treaties made for the Indians to keep, in accordance with their moral code, and for us to break, according to ours, the original Indian Nation whose home might have been on the eastern sea coast, and its numbers twenty or fifty thousand, found itself reduced to a few score of individuals and pushed across the whole continent to the arid fringes of some western desert. Such was the fate of the Delawares, for instance. They constituted a numerous and powerful nation occupying the lands that lay between the Hudson River and the Potomac when we started to make treaties with them. In less than half a century they had been pushed beyond Illinois and Michigan, and, their numbers having been reduced to a few score, finally disappeared as an independent nation or tribe.

Growth in numbers and wealth, often acquired by such means, on our part, and decrease both in numbers and wealth, on the part of the Indians, owing both to their faith in our pledges and our lack of faith in keeping them, made us bolder, more aggressive, more ruthless in our methods of expoliation and extermination of the natives, so that we now began to act towards them with complete disregard of the Law of Nations and of the Laws of Nature. And so, when we perceived that the lands of Ohio, of Illinois,

of Michigan, which had been assigned to the Indians of the eastern seaboard and, on our word of honor, guaranteed to them in perpetuity, were among the best in the Union, we threw down our mask and instead of sending to the Indians of these territories, agents to draw new treaties of expropriation, we sent them Anthony Wayne in the capacity of ambassador of death, conflagration, and destruction. This method had at least the virtue of being more straightforward and less hypocritical, though more frightful in the horrors which that military hero inflicted upon the peaceful and innocent Indian tribes of those territories. It was the Delawares, especially, whom we had induced to flee from their original home between the Hudson and the Potomac Rivers and had established themselves along the Miami River, that Anthony Wayne was ordered to evict once more from their well tilled and fertile lands. The General had decided to attack them by surprise and butcher them wholesale, as the quickest means to obtain a large and rich territory for the United States. Fortunately for the intended victims, a deserter warned them of the impending danger and they saved themselves by flight. Thus the heroic general won a bloodless victory of the greatest importance for the Union. However he considered it a bitter and inglorious victory, for he himself complained in his report that, except for the villainous treachery of that deserter he would have surprised the Indians and drowned the whole lot of them in rivers of blood. There was some consolation, however, in the fact that the Indians had left behind them both their homes and their crops, and on these Anthony Wayne was able to wreak his vengeance by having them burnt and completely destroyed. (29)

(29) Id., *ibid.*, p. 43 ff.

However, we did not always come out of these razzias as heroically as Anthony Wayne did. For instance consider the band of Spotted Tail's Sioux. By trickery on the part of our government they had been compelled to move to the old Ponca Reservation. The understanding was that the following spring they would be placed permanently in the White Clay Creek. As this promise was on the way of all our government's promises to the Indians, Spotted Tail's Sioux took the desperate step of breaking with the Treaty-Breakers. The Commissioner of the Indian Affairs went in at last to hold a council with the enraged Sioux to see if it might not be possible to trick them once more. When he arose to speak Spotted Tail sprang up and waving in his hand the scrap of paper where the promises of the government were written regarding their immediate return to the White Clay Creek, addressed him in these words: "All the men who come from Washington are liars, and the bald-headed ones are the worst of all! I don't want to hear one word from you—you are a bald-headed old liar! You have but one thing to do here, and that is to give an order for us to return to the White Clay Creek. Here are your written words, and if you don't give this order, and everything here is not on wheels inside of ten days, I'll order my young men to tear down and burn everything in this part of the country." (30) In less than ten days Spotted Tail was leading his people to White Clay Creek, and the Secretary of the Interior was able to say in his Report of 1868: "The Indians were found to be quite determined to move westward, and the promise of the government in that respect was faithfully kept." (31)

(30) Id., *ibid.*, p. 183 ff.

(31) Id., *ibid.*, p. 184.

What made our government be, in this instance, so alive to its solemnly pledged faith? A strong belated sense of justice? No! It was 4000 armed warriors whose despair brooked no delays.

The case of the Ponca tribe, as it stood in 1877, is very similar, except in one circumstance to be related forthwith. The Poncas were to be removed from their homes in Dakota to Nebraska, which removal was to be done according to their own will and consent for a consideration in money and other advantages. As, in fact, they were unwilling to move, the government sent an order to the agent to have them removed peaceably or by force. Of course the by force meant what it did for the Cheyennes when they were compelled to go to the Indian Territory, that is, massacre, in which "the Cheyenne men, women, children and babies were all shot down together!"(32) Why was the government, in the case of the Ponca Indians, obdurate in its determination to have them removed in the face of their reluctance to leave their homes and undergo a frightful journey, when it had so faithfully kept its promise to the Sioux? Because the Poncas numbered only 700 people, more than half of them women and children! Where would be our bravery if we failed to play the strong man?(33)

We made hundreds of treaties with the Indians. In every one of them we were supposed to be dealing with equals, for Nations are so recognized by international law regardless of their size and strength. In each treaty were written our solemn promises of respect for their autonomy, of due indemnization for the lands

(32) Id., *ibid.*, pp. 98 and 211.

(33) Id., *ibid.*, p. 211 ff.

they had ceded to us. They kept their part of the solemn contract in every instance, and in every instance we violated ours. We made dozens of treaties with many individual tribes, and with each treaty each tribe was thrown farther back into the wilderness; their lands, solemnly guaranteed to them by our government were taken from them by trickery or by force, and in many cases stolen outright, and our debts to them were in many instances repudiated by the government, or not paid when due, or paid only in part.

The net result of this inhumane, cruel, rapacious policy towards the Indians, was their almost complete annihilation in the whole of the United States whose constituted government had pledged its honor to protect them and respect both their rights and their property.

6.

To illustrate what has been said in the preceding paragraph the following cases, borrowed from A Century of Dishonor, are herein briefly set forth.

Our first Indian treaty was made with the Delawares in 1778. One of its dispositions reads: "Whereas the enemies of the United States have endeavoured by every artifice to possess the Indians with an opinion that it is our design to extirpate them, and take possession of their country; to obviate such false suggestions, the United States guarantee to said nation of Delawares, and their heirs, all their territorial rights in the fullest and most ample manner as bounded by former treaties." (34) Noble words, indeed, but

(34) Id., *ibid.*, p. 34.

just words. Our tongues were twisted, as an Indian would say, and therefore they expressed the exact reverse of our intentions.

In the treaty of 1798 made with the Delawares, Wyandottes, Chippewas and Ottawas, it was stipulated that if "any citizen of the United States," or "any other person not an Indian" attempted "to settle on any of the lands allotted to the Delaware and Wyandotte nations in this treaty, the Indians may punish him as they please."⁽³⁵⁾ That these provisions were equally disregarded is clear from a message sent to Congress in 1798 by the Great Council of the Indians, in which it asks redress for the continuous encroachments on their territory perpetrated by American citizens. "We beg," said the message, "that you will prevent your surveyors and other people from coming upon our side of the Ohio River."⁽³⁶⁾

In 1787 the President wrote to the Governor of the territory northwest of the Ohio: "...You will not neglect any opportunity that may offer of extinguishing the Indian rights to the westward, as far as the Mississippi."⁽³⁷⁾ The Governor did not neglect such opportunities. He even created them. One device was to make treaties with each tribe separately for the purpose of arousing jealousies and hostility among them, a state of affairs which he was "not willing to lessen" because it weakened their power. "Indeed it would not be very difficult," he added, "if circumstances required it, to set them at deadly variance."⁽³⁸⁾ This

(35) Id., *ibid.*, pp. 36, 39, and 45.

(36) Id., *ibid.*, p. 38.

(37) Id., *ibid.*, p. 39.

(38) Id., *ibid.*, p. 39 ff.

base policy soon became that of the government of the United States.

In 1791 the Secretary of War avers that "these tribes are our friends" and adds that "the treaties have been well observed by them." (39) In 1792, when they began to show signs of broken promises, the government sent them this message: "Brethren: The President of the United States entertains the opinion...that you believe the United States want to deprive you of your lands, and drive you out of the country. Be assured that this is not so... Repair to Philadelphia, the seat of the Great Government, and there make a peace founded on the principles of justice and humanity. Remember that no additional lands will be required of you, or any other tribe, to those that have been ceded by former treaties." (40) For hypocrisy, mendacity, and effrontery nothing can compare with this unblushingly dishonest scrap of paper.

In 1793 a great council of chiefs of the Delawares and twelve other tribes met the commissioners of the United States, made a plea for peace and the observance of the treaties, and then advanced a proposition worthy of the high ideals that animated them but which were lost on those of a purely materialistic philosophy. What they proposed was that the money the United States offered them to pay for their lands, plus that which the government had promised to give them yearly as indemnity, together with that which the government would have to raise to make war on them, be divided among the poor white settlers, who in turn should move away and leave them in peace. "We can retreat no farther," they said, "because the country behind hardly affords

(39) Id., *ibid.*, p. 40.

(40) Id., *ibid.*

food for its present inhabitants, and we have therefore resolved to leave our homes in their small space to which we are now confined."(41)

It was at this juncture that Anthony Wayne descended upon them like the wrath of God, thus giving the lie many times over to the government's message of the year before. His disappointment at the flight of the Indians who had been warned by a deserter of the fate that awaited them, he expresses in these words of his report: "I have good grounds to conclude that the defection of this villain prevented the enemy from receiving a fatal blow at this place when least expected." But he consoles himself with the thought that he has "gained possession of the grand emporium of the hostile Indians of the West without loss of blood." Then he adds that "the margins of those beautiful rivers--the Miami, of the Lake and Aughize--appear like a continued village for a number of miles, and he never "before beheld" such immense fields of corn in any part of America, from Canada to Florida. All these villages were burnt, and all these corn fields destroyed; the Indians were followed up and defeated in sharp fight."(42)

Yielding to brute force, and after being told that "the heart of General Washington--wishes for nothing so much as peace and brotherly love"(43) the Delawares had no choice but to sign another treaty in virtue of which they ceded to the United States two thirds of the present state of Ohio and received the promise that

(41) Id., *ibid.*, p. 42 ff.

(42) Id., *ibid.*, p. 44.

(43) Id., *ibid.*

they were to enjoy their new home for as long as they please without any molestation from the United States.

By the treaty of 1813, the Indians "as a mark of their regard and attachment to the United States, relinquished...the great salt spring on the Saline Creek." (44) In less than one year another treaty was made by which they ceded a tract of land between the Ohio and the Wabash rivers. By 1833 they had been dislodged from the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Michigan. In 1844 they requested that all the school funds to which they were entitled by treaty be applied to the Indian Manual Labor School. The Secretary of War consented under certain conditions, one of which reads: "The interest to be paid annually when it may suit the Treasury; and this ratification to be subject to withdrawal, and the agreement itself, to rescission, and to be annulled at the pleasure of the Department." (45)

Step by step, lured by false promises, and by what they thought the sacredness of treaties, the Delawares, reduced now to a handful of pitiable victims of our heartlessness and insatiable greed, were now fighting their last losing battle with packs of Kansas hungry wolves. "In 1866 the Indian Commissioner reports that the State of Kansas is fast being filled by an energetic population who appreciate good land; and as the Indian Reservations were selected as being the best in the State, but one result can be expected to follow...Surrounded...by white settlers who too often act on the principle that an Indian has no rights that a white man is bound to respect, they (the Indians) are injured and annoyed in many ways. Their stock are stolen, their fences broken

(44) Id. *ibid.*, p. 46.

(45) Id. *ibid.*, p. 51.

down, their timber destroyed, their young men plied with whiskey, their women debauched." (46)

In 1917 this writer met in Lawrence, Kansas, an old timer whose great pride was a collection of old guns which he said he used in hunting wild Injuns. He told horrible stories about these wild savages in justification of his murders in cold blood. He was a powerful man, in spite of his seventies, rather prosperous and much respected in the community. He was a typical frontiersman, as strong as a bull, with little sparks of sentimentality in a heart of flint. I believed as pure gospel his bloodcurdling yarns, until many years after I realized that he had reversed entirely the role played by the characters of his story. A small and vanishing band of gentle, law abiding, cruelly treated, heartlessly persecuted victims of a powerful government, chased from place to place towards the barren deserts of the West, confronting a motly crowd of well armed, determined, desperate, conscienceless, unprincipled, murderous frontiersmen, what could they possibly do to call upon their heads the vengeance of their enemies?

And thus passed the Nation of the Delawares, who had reigned between the Hudson and the Potomac rivers, who had befriended the first American settlers, who had always kept their word and respected the sacredness of their contracts with us. Thus they passed through our lies, our perfidies, our broken promises, our dishonorable transactions with them, our insatiable greed and ferine cruelty.

(46) Id., *ibid.*, p. 61.

7.

The Cherokees are another typical example of our inhumane and ruthless Indian policy of expropriation and extermination. Considered as the most intelligent of the North American tribes, the Cherokees established their first formal relations with the whites at the time they "welcomed Oglethorpe and his respectable paupers" to Georgia in 1733. The British recognized them as an independent nation and received its ambassador at St. James. At the close of the Revolution the United States, being in need of peace at any price, recognized the sovereignty of the Cherokee Nation of Indians and made a treaty with them with provisions similar to those accorded to the Delawares. But with our strength grew our arrogance and our disregard for the Law of Nations, when these happen to be weaker. So the story of the Delawares was repeated in the case of the Cherokees in every essential detail, and the great farce of treaty-making and treaty-breaking went on as a matter of national policy. Each new treaty pushed the Indians farther and farther into the wilderness, until in 1809 they decided to get out of contact with the whites and establish themselves far away on the banks of the Arkansas river.

But they were not to enjoy for long the peace and tranquility they sought. Settlers continued to invade the Indian domain and to appropriate to themselves the best of their lands. Agents of the Federal government appeared among the chiefs and headmen, bribing, intimidating and distributing whiskey. (47)

(47) James, loc. cit., p. 94 ff.

After many more treaties were made and broken by our government, the United States once more promised to give "the Cherokee Nation of Indians...a permanent home, and which shall, under the most solemn guarantee of the United States be and remain theirs forever...never, in all future time...embarrassed by having to live in a Territory or State!"(48) The Indians were also to get \$50,000 indemnity cash down, and \$2,000 annually for three years. Chief Oo-loo-te-ka hesitated, but, as his envoy in Washington had been deceived into signing this treaty, the chief accepted and considered the compact as binding.

"In the voluminous history of intercourse between the Indian and the white race, nothing reflects so little credit upon the latter as the case of Georgia and the Cherokees. Indifferent as the sentiment of the day was to the right of an Indian, there was a popular outcry of sympathy for the Cherokees. This, however, did not hinder Georgia's legislature, which annulled Federal treaties and, in effect, licenced the murder of Indians."(49) This refers to the eviction and expulsion of all the Indians from the state of Georgia, which action was in itself an act of rebellion against the Federal Government. The remark that "Georgia's Legislature..., in effect, licenced the murder of the Indians," proves that the sympathy accorded to them on this occasion was purely local and due to the too obvious and too glaring injustice of such a draconian decree. The spirit of the settlers in general was, however, true to tradition, and consequently to send the Indians away was to expose them to the greatest danger of massacre.

(48) James, loc. cit., p. 95.

(49) Id., ibid., p. 96.

By a treaty signed in 1816 between a group of Cherokee chiefs and the United States we obtained one million three thousand acres in eastern Tennessee in exchange for territory west of the Mississippi which we considered without value. The individual tribesmen, however, refused to move because the government had guaranteed to them forever the home where they now lived. The government, thus reminded of its breach of faith, considered it an impertinence and the Governor of Tennessee called them unprincipled and "a set of the most finished tyrants that ever lived in a land of liberty." (50)

Houston, who was a great friend of the Cherokee Indians, who knew them better than any other American of his time, and had many occasions to witness the great injustices they received at our hands, utters these bitter words in regard to the treatment accorded to the Indians in general: "The Indian of other days stood on the shore of the Atlantic...He was monarch of the woods...That age has gone by; the aboriginal character is almost lost in the views of the white man. A succession of injuries has broken the proud spirit and taught him to kiss the hand which inflicts upon him stripes--to oringe and ask favors of the wretch who violates his oath by defrauding him out of his annuities, or refusing him money promised by treaties." (51)

Another example of our greed and bad faith towards the Indians is offered by the case of the Cheyennes. For certain rights given by them to the United States in 1851, our government promised to pay them \$50,000 a year for fifty years. A treaty to this effect

(50) Id., *ibid.*, p. 41.

(51) Id., *ibid.*, p. 48.

was signed by both contracting parties. When it came up for ratification the United States Senate thought that this was quite a lot of money and changed the figure from fifty to fifteen. With this change, which was not made in consultation with the other party to the contract, the Senate gave its approval and considered the deal perfectly legal and in order. In other words "within the first year after the making of our first treaty of any moment with these tribes--while they to a man, the whole fifty thousand of them, kept their faith with us--we broke ours with them in the meanest of ways--robbing them of more than two thirds of the money we had promised to pay." (52)

8.

The cases briefly summarized above are typical of the calculated policy of both government and people to wipe out, as it did, every tribe of Indians that lived within our borders, thus doing away with a hated and inferior race and facilitating the appropriation to ourselves of lands and other forms of wealth that we coveted, and which, according to our notions, belonged by right to the superior race, that is, to those who had better guns and could shoot faster and more accurately.

The two or three cases that follow, picked at random from thousands that have occurred in any year of our brief history, are more significant in relation to both our individual and collective sentiment which some may call superiority complex, others, perhaps more aptly, inferiority complex, but which I shall

(52) Jackson, loc. cit., p. 76.

characterize as motus cuniculosus (rabbit's fear) metamorphosed into wild boar's destructive rage when we discover that the object of our fear is really not a lion but a mouse.

As we are the heirs of the old English settlers, or at least we think we are, and the bearers of their racial characteristics, my first case shall date from 1720. In this year a Oneota Indian was killed by two brothers by the name of Cartledge. The English were then not in a position to defy the natives and for this reason, and in order to appease the Indians, the murderers were arrested and confined to prison. The Indians were consulted as to what to do with the unworthy pair, and their verdict was that, since only one Indian was killed, it would amply satisfy their sense of justice to have one of the two executed. This particular tribe consisted then of only seven men, five women and eight children, who lived in a little miserable village by the Shawanee Creek, in a great want and stark poverty. They were very friendly and affectionate, and incapable of doing any harm to any one even if they had great numbers and the deadliest weapons.

Enraged at the result of their deliberations a band of one hundred per-cent something or other, said by the record to be 'Presbyterians' from Paxton, attacked them with the rage and viciousness of wild boars. Only six—three men, two women, and one boy—were then at home. "These poor defenseless creatures were immediately fired upon, stabbed and hatched to death; the good Shebaes, among the rest, cut to pieces in his bed. All of them were scalped and otherwise horribly mangled, then

their huts were set on fire, and most of them burnt down," (53) The Magistrate of Lancaster brought the other Indians to the newly-erected jail for protection, but two weeks later the murderers, "fifty strong, rode to Lancaster, dismounted, broke open the doors of the jail, and killed every Indian there... Men, women and children were everyone inhumanely murdered in cold blood... Near the back door lay an old Indian and his squaw, particularly well known and esteemed by the people of the town, on account of his placid and friendly conduct... Around him and his squaw lay two children, about the age of three years, whose heads were split with the tomahawk and their scalps taken off... A stout Indian... (had) been shot in the breast, His legs were chopped with the tomahawk, his hands cut off, and finally a rifle-ball discharged in his mouth, so that his head was blown to atoms... In this manner lay the whole of them—men, women and children—spread about the prison yard, shot, scalped, hacked, and out to pieces," (54)

Instead of condemning these acts of a savagery beyond belief many people sided with the murderers. "An Episcopal clergyman in Lancaster wrote vindicating them, 'bringing Scripture to prove that it was right to destroy the heathen;' and the Presbyterians think they have a better justification—nothing less than the word of God," (55) says one of the writers of the massacre. Find, prey, a Spanish priest apologizing for the butchery of a peaceful and inoffensive band of Indians!

The first removal of friendly Indians came after the Conestoga massacre. An ominous cry went about the land denouncing the

(53) Jackson, loc. cit., p. 303.

(54) Id., ibid., p. 306.

(55) Id., ibid., p. 307.

Indians as Canaanites whom the Lord had commanded the Hebrews to destroy. No Moravian Indian was free to go about, even with a governor's passport in his pocket, without being liable to be shot at sight like a mad dog. A Christian Indian was more hated than if he had been a heathen, it seems. A few days later the governor called all baptized Indians from Nain and Wechquetarsk to Philadelphia for protection. They started two days later, the aged, the sick and the little children in wagons, the rest on foot. Some of the Moravian missionaries accompanied them on this painful pilgrimage. On their way to Philadelphia they were cursed, taunted, insulted, and threatened with burning, hanging, and other tortures. It was said that a storm delivered them from an attack by an organized party of zealots.

When they arrived in Philadelphia the soldiers would not receive them in their barracks in spite of positive orders from the governor. For over five hours they were the butt of an enraged and diabolical mob which grew in numbers and viciousness as time passed. The missionaries, who stood bravely by their flocks, became the victims of the same abuse. Unable to compel the garrison to open the barracks for them, the governor sent them to Province Island, six miles away. The mob, greater and greater all the time followed them again through the city "with such tumultuous clamor that they might truly be considered as sheep among the wolves." (56)

Before they had been in the island one month some of the villages they had left were burned and the Paxton demons announced their intention of attacking the island and killing every Indian

(56) Id., *ibid.*, p. 310.

that had taken refuge there. The proclamations of the Governor were derided and jeered in public, the mob even parading contemptuously in front of the Governor's mansion. Parties were organized to march on Philadelphia and slaughter all the Indians under the government's protection.

About a month later rumors reached Philadelphia that the mob was on the road to execute their evil purposes. The Governor decided to send the Indians northward where they might be under the protection of the English army. Two sloops took them to New York, but before they disembarked the Governor of New York sent angry orders that no Indian should set foot on that territory. They returned to Philadelphia under a strong escort. The Governor decided at last to take a firm stand, called friendly citizens to arms and surrounded the Indians' shelter with eight heavy pieces of cannon. The cowardly rioters approached the city but did not enter. Next day they returned, but again their prowess failed them because it was not unarmed Indians they had to face but eight pieces of cannon reinforced by four new ones.

After being much reduced in numbers by disease, exposure and unspeakable suffering, the Indians were at last taken to Sandusky where starvation was their only source of worry. They thought of going back to their old homes and gathering the corn which was still in the fields. Hunger gave them the impetus to go back, especially as they had been assured that, peace existing presently between England and her former colonies, the Americans were now friendly to them.

When they were getting ready to return to Sandusky with their packs of corn a party of about two hundred whites walked towards

them and pretended to be their friends, assuring them that they had no more enemies and inviting them to accompany them to town to make preparations for their families' return. They were offered to be taken to Pittsburg and, overjoyed, the Indians surrendered their arms. A certain John Martin went to Salem to tell 'The Salem Indians' the good news. Some whites went also and were received with great joy by the Indians. These were persuaded to come and see their brothers, which they did.

In the meantime the harvesting party was suddenly attacked, driven together, bound with ropes and confined. When 'The Salem Indians' arrived they met the same fate. The murderers then held a council to decide what should be done with them. It was finally decided that they should be tomahawked and scalped, which deed was carried out in the most brutal and gruesome manner while their victims were kneeling and praying. Sixty-two of the victims were adult men and women, and thirty-four were children, a total of ninety-six martyrs to their religion and race at the hands of about two hundred supposedly civilized Americans.

On May 17, 1871, an officer of the United States Army, stationed at Camp Grant, Arizona, wrote a letter to his Colonel in which he related that the previous February five old women had come under a flag of truce, and with a letter from Colonel Greene, in search of a boy, the son of an Indian who had been taken prisoner some months before. The boy, having been well cared for, wished to stay. Two days later the women went home after asking permission to return. In a week they returned accompanied by a few more, and later on a young chief also came with about twenty five followers. He said that he and his people, consisting of about 150 Asavafa

Apaches, were very poor and was told to go to the White Mountain Indians. He said he did not want to go, for the White Mountain Indians were not their people. The officer told him to come with his people and live near the Camp. They would all be taken care of till the Department Commander should decide what was to be done with them.

Other bands had asked and been granted the same privilege until there were near Camp Grant about three hundred destitute Indians, which later on rose to 810. They were placed at about half a mile from the fort, and were usefully occupied so that they practically earned their living. This officer studied them so closely, to avoid any possibility of treachery, that he was able to recognize practically every one by their faces. Meanwhile these Indians settled a little farther from the fort where they found plenty of water and land better suited for crops. The Indians lost their characteristic anxiety of buying ammunition and even sold their bows and arrows.

"Such was the condition of things up to the morning of the 30th of April. They had so won on me that...I had come to feel a strong personal interest in helping to show them the way of a higher civilization. I had come to feel respect for men who, ignorant and naked, were still ashamed to lie or steal; and for women who would work cheerfully like slaves to clothe themselves and children, but, untaught, held their virtue above price." (57)

At 7:30 A. M. he received a dispatch from Camp Lowell informing him that a large party had left Tucson two days before

(57) Id. *ibid.*, p. 328.

with the avowed purpose of killing all these Indians. He sent two scouts to the Indian camp to apprise them of the situation and bring them inside the fort. His messengers returned in about an hour with the intelligence that they could find no living Indians. "The camp was burning, and the ground strewed with their dead and mutilated women and children... Their camp was surrounded and attacked at daybreak... The wounded who were unable to get away had their brains beaten out with clubs and stones, while some were shot full of arrows after having been mortally wounded by gun-shots. The bodies were all stiffed... Of the whole number killed and missing--about 125--only eight were men... One of the chiefs said; 'I no longer want to live; my women and children have been killed before my face, and I have been unable to defend them'... About their captives they say: 'Get them back for us. Our little boys will grow up slaves, and our girls, as soon as they are large enough, will be diseased prostitutes, to get money for whoever owns them. Our women work hard, and are good women, and they and our children have no diseases.'" (58)

Our troubles with the Cheyennes, owing to bad faith, to the impudence of some and the rapacity of the greatest number of the American settlers, multiplied in such a way that in 1864 the Governor of Colorado asked for military aid in order to pacify the region. By proclamation of the Governor all friendly Indians were called to Fort Lyon in order to prevent them from being punished with the guilty. Many bands of Arapahoes and Cheyennes answered

(58) Id., *ibid.*, p. 329.

the summons, were received by the officer in charge, rationed and assured of safety. "Here there occurred, on the 29th of November, one of the foulest massacres which the world has seen. This camp of friendly Indians was surprised at daybreak, and men, women, and children were butchered in cold blood."(59)

White horse-thieves stole innumerable ponies from the Cheyennes. This led to all kinds of complications which resulted in a military campaign commanded by General Miles. The main body of the hostile Indians surrendered in the spring of 1876. "It was decided that thirty-three of the most desperate ones should be sent as prisoners to St. Augustine, Florida; but before the selection was completed a general stampede...took place, resulting in the final excape of some four hundred. They held their ground from 2:00 P. M. until dark against three companies of cavalry and two Gatlin guns, and, 'under cover of...night escaped, leaving only three dead on the field'. It is impossible not to admire such bravery as this."(60)

In 1876, after extreme suffering caused by the climate, lack of food, sickness and the refusal of provisions and medicines, about 300 of the Northern Cheyennes decided to run off and attempt to reach their old homes in Dakota. Persecuted and harassed, they were finally taken to Fort Robinson, Nebraska. Nothing could induce them to return to the hell they had run away from. The army officer at the Fort advised the Department of the Interior and begged to allow them to remain at the North. The orders of the Department were stern and peremptory, but the officer was ab-

(59) Id., *ibid.*, p. 87.

(60) Id., *ibid.*, p. 93.

absolutely powerless to take these resolute Indians hundreds of miles away, especially as they intended to resist with weapons they themselves had fashioned from the iron stoves. He tried to starve them to submission. The mercury froze that night and the Indians were provided neither with food nor fuel. The women and children refused to accept rations which their men-folks would not share. "On the night of the fourth day—or, according to some accounts, the sixth—these starving, freezing Indians broke prison, overpowered the guards, and fled, carrying their women and children with them. They held pursuing troops at bay for several days; finally made a last stand in a deep ravine, and were shot down—men, women and children together." (61) Some 50 women and children, and 7 men, who escaped the massacre, were confined in Fort Leavenworth.

American cruelty towards the Indians has almost disappeared from among us of late for the simple reason that there are practically no more Indians to be cruel to, and their few remnants are relegated to those few corners of the country, so poor and so barren of any materials of wealth that nobody would want them even at a premium. I said almost, because even those relics which survived our massacres are doomed to complete destruction and will pass forever on the day when the fringes of the American deserts have ceased to be barriers in the path of our insatiable greed and inhumane disregard for the rights of others.

(61) Id., *ibid.*, p. 98.