NOTES

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1. I recognize that the use of the term "white" may be construed as a simplistic generalization that does not adequately distinguish the particular Euro-American with whom the Indians came into contact. Historically, the Indians who settled Kansas had encountered the French, the Spanish, and the British and had dealt with Americans of various ethnic backgrounds. Some of these "whites" were settlers, farmers, and other ordinary citizens; some were businessmen such as fur traders, merchants, land speculators, and railroad operators. Others were federal and state politicians, agents, commissioners, and other governmental employees. There were also Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, Catholic, and other missionaries. When pertinent and feasible, I will specify the particular ethnic background of the individuals in this story. However, I believe that the term "white," under certain circumstances, is useful when referring to Euro-Americans as a group who generally held the same attitudes and opinions of themselves and of the Indians. Reginald Horsman points out that nineteenth-century Americans, as well as the British, the French, and other western Europeans, thought of themselves as Anglo-Saxons. Ignoring logical inconsistencies and contradictions, these whites believed themselves to be an "innately superior people." Anglo-Saxon government, religion, and other institutions were also considered superior. Indians and other peoples of color, as well as their cultures and institutions, were deemed innately inferior. Americans especially, writes Horsman, believed themselves to be the chosen people, who by the 1830s and 1840s used their ideology of racial superiority to force political, economic, and social conformity upon immigrants and to justify the exploitation of blacks, Indians, and Mexicans. For an astute analysis of nineteenth-century attitudes, including the prevailing scientific conclusions that "proved" Indian racial inferiority, see Horsman, Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1981), 1–6, 116–186; see also Robert E. Bieder, Science Encounters the Indian, 1820–1880: The Early Years of American Ethnology (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986), 3–15, 60–103.

2. Scholars are now arguing that the use of the term "Indian" may also be misleading. Some writers draw attention to the fact that Columbus misnamed America's original inhabitants, who should be called Native Americans. In an attempt at clarity, some scholars have begun using such contrived terms as
"Amerind" and "Amerindian." But even these labels can project false meaning. James A. Clifton rightly asserts that a writer's "uncritical use of culturally derived terms such as White, Indian, and Black for individuals and groups is a misleading and intellectually inhibiting practice. To assume automatically that such nomenclature denotes separate, immutable groups of humans in North America effectively blocks understanding." Clifton writes that since the nineteenth century many people for various reasons have laid claim to Indian status based on a real or imaginary percentage of Indian "blood." Since the early days of Indian-white contact, as Clifton explains, there has been much "interbreeding" between peoples, producing large numbers of so-called mixed-bloods. These offspring have possessed mixed cultural heritages, a fact that has had a great impact on them and the particular European and Indian cultures with which they interacted [see Clifton, "Alternate Identities and Cultural Frontiers," in Being and Becoming Indian: Biographical Studies of North American Frontiers, edited by James A. Clifton (Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1989), 1-37].

My study will use the term "Indian" as it refers to ethnic identity; one who identified with a particular Indian band and cherished the customs and religion of that band and who, in turn, was accepted by the majority of the band as a member will be designated as Indian. Most of the Indians in this study were members of patrilineal tribes, and, as Clifton points out, they did not easily accept as members those bicultural individuals who had white fathers and Indian mothers. The mixed-bloods (those who identified with two or more cultures) in this study, however, will also be designated as Indian as long as they called themselves such and were accepted by most others of a particular band as members of that band.

3. Most scholars are vague in their definitions and use the terms "acculturation" and "assimilation" interchangeably. My intention is to demonstrate that many American Indians have resisted their absorption into the so-called American melting pot and, therefore, a clarification of these terms is necessary. The Indians of Kansas have willingly adopted the trappings of Euro-American culture, but they have consciously remained separate from mainstream society. They have always seen themselves as Indians of one particular tribe or another, with a culture and heritage distinct from those of other American ethnic groups.

Anthropologist Charlotte Seymour-Smith has recently pointed out that twentieth-century ethnologists have usually defined acculturation as a phenomenon that results when two or more groups come into firsthand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of each group. She defines assimilation as one of the outcomes of acculturation; assimilation occurs when one group is absorbed by the other and becomes culturally indistinguishable from it. She notes that many recent analyses of cultural interaction and change have focused on the "strategic use of cultural elements in contact situations" [see Seymour-Smith, Dictionary of Anthropology (Boston: G. K. Hall & Company, 1986), 1, 18]. My study will demonstrate how the various Kansas bands strategically utilized their syncretic cultures in order to survive in a hostile Kansas social environment.

4. Agent Daniel Vanderslice to A. Cumming, superintendent of Indian affairs at St. Louis, Mo., 6 Sept. 1854, Letters Received, Great Nemaha Agency, 1848-1876, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 234, Roll 308 [hereafter cited as LR, Great Nemaha Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R[300-314]].


9. Hoecken was undoubtedly referring to an Indian shaman, a traditional spiritual healer who uses special powers to communicate with spirits, treat patients, control events, or divine hidden objects; Eshtonoquot, or Francis McCoonse, of the Kansas Chippewas possessed such shamanistic traits. An Indian prophet may hold similar powers; but a prophet proclaims a revelatory message and carries a moral mandate to the people. Possessing a vision of historical destiny, prophets such as Kenekuk of the Kickapoos work to help solve a crisis facing their people. For a concise analysis and comparison of such religious leaders, see James R. Lewis, “Shamans and Prophets: Continuities and Discontinuities in Native American New Religions,” *American Indian Quarterly* 12 [Summer 1988]: 221–228. Hoecken is quoted in Arthur T. Donohue, “A History of the Early Jesuit Missions in Kansas” [Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, 1931], 200.

10. For Coffin’s remarks, see *Minutes of Kansas Yearly Meeting of Friends, Held at Lawrence, Kansas* [1873] [Lawrence: Journal Steam Book and Job Printing House, 1873], 36–37.

11. Johnston Lykins to commissioner of Indian affairs, 30 Sept. 1849, quoted in


13. For the development of the federal reservation system, see Robert A. Trennert, Jr., *Alternative to Extinction: Federal Indian Policy and the Beginnings of the Reservation System, 1846–1851* [Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1975], 1–15, 40–60, 152–153, and Robert M. Utley, *The Indian Frontier of the American West, 1846–1890* [Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984], 31–63. Trennert correctly maintains that federal officials developed the general reservation system in the late 1840s; however, he overlooks the fact that, beginning in the 1820s, the Indians of Kansas had been placed on reservations, under federal supervision, and were expected to confine most of their activities to their particular reservation. These early reservations were nearly identical to the kind established in the 1850s and after.


In his book describing the actions of corporations in Indian Territory, H. Craig Miner points out that the dispossession of the Five Civilized Tribes was a very complex matter with no clear villains or heroes. "The corporation was both the chief despoiler of Indian sovereignty and its most powerful supporter," Miner writes. "The Indian was both a promoter and an opponent of corporate privilege—even a single Indian might be each at different times, in different situations, or at different levels of perception. The government was often simultaneously friend and foe of a development and worked at cross purposes within itself" (see Miner, *The Corporation and the Indian: Tribal Sovereignty and Industrial Civilization in Indian Territory, 1865–1907* [Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1976], 207–208). Although Miner provides a thorough analysis of corporations and their interactions with "progressive" Indians, he pays little attention to the more traditional or "conservative" Indians, most of whom rejected corporate interference in tribal affairs and defended their people's interests and, in many cases, should be considered the true voice of their people. The corporations, at least in Kansas, were primarily interested in profits and were little concerned with Indian welfare.


20. Most of these individuals were mixed-bloods, or bicultural people, such as Edward McCoonse of the Chippewas, Henry Donohoe of the Munsees, Moses Keokuk of the Sacs, and Eli Nadeau of the Potawatomis. These men possessed mixed Indian and Euro-American cultural heritages and lived on the margins of two or more cultural frontiers. They knew the ways of white society and frequently used this knowledge for political and economic gain. Gary Clayton Anderson points out that such “cultural marginals” were tied to tribes through marriage and/or descent. Through the generations, they had become involved in a set of mutual obligations and rights that had “evolved into a distinctly bicultural pattern of values and sentiments neither traditional Indian nor European in character” (see Anderson, “Joseph Renville and the Ethos of Biculturalism,” in Being and Becoming Indian, 60–63).

James Axtell is one of many scholars who argue in favor of using the “neutral” French word métis in place of mixed-blood, which causes confusion and is pejorative (see Axtell, “Forked Tongues: Moral Judgments in Indian History,” American Historical Association Perspectives 25 [Feb. 1987]: 13). Although métis may be a useful term to define some peoples of mixed descent, it is not appropriate for the Indians of Kansas. French-English dictionaries, moreover, invariably translate métis as “half-breed,” an ethnocentric term.


CHAPTER 2. REMOVAL TO "KANSAS"

1. The Missouri Sacs are usually referred to as the Missouri Sacs and Foxes. At the time of the band's removal to Kansas in 1837, there were small numbers of Foxes associated with the band. Over the years, however, most of the Foxes left to join kinfolk in Iowa and elsewhere. I believe, therefore, that a more appropriate name for this band is the Missouri Sacs.


3. Jerome O. Steffen disagrees with writers who find continuity between the Jeffersonian approach toward Indians and the later removal policy of Andrew Jackson. According to Steffen, acquisition of land and Indian assimilation were mutually dependent ideas in the minds of Jeffersonians such as William Clark. The Jeffersonians hoped that assimilation of Indians would open surplus tribal lands and make removal unnecessary; the Jeffersonians, as believers in human progress, thought that the Indians had the potential of equality with whites. If the assimilation process proceeded too slowly, however, removal to isolated regions away from interfering white settlers would provide enough time for Indians to become civilized. Jacksonians believed, on the other hand, that Indians were savages and incapable of advancement. Assimilation, therefore, was not an option because Indians were racially inferior to whites. Removal served the interests of politically powerful whites, and the Indians must move west to make way for progress and the growth of the American nation. See Steffen, *William Clark: Jeffersonian Man on the Frontier* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1977), 130–142, 166–168, 176; see also Steffen, "William Clark," in *Soldiers West: Biographies from the Military Frontier*, edited by Paul Andrew Hutton, with an introduction by Robert M. Utley (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1987), 21–22.

A thorough discussion of Jeffersonian concepts can be found in Bernard W. Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1974). For detailed analyses of nineteenth-century views on the possibilities for Indian social progress, see

4. Francis Paul Prucha argues convincingly that the governmental officials who engineered removal never intended to place Indians on desert wastelands. Officials knew that the fertile lands just beyond the borders of Iowa, Missouri, and Arkansas were suitable for farming (see Prucha, "Indian Removal and the Great American Desert," *Indiana Magazine of History* 59 (Dec. 1963): 299–322). Wilcomb E. Washburn questions Prucha's contention that removal was administratively and historically inevitable. Washburn insists that other approaches could have been pursued and enforced by governmental officials; until removal was made official policy, the fundamental elements of federal policy included the protection of Indian rights to their land, the regulation of Indian trade, the control of liquor traffic, and the promotion of "civilization" and education of the Indians in order to assimilate them into American society. Washburn maintains that the removal policy was unjustifiable even by the standards of white morality in the nineteenth century (see Washburn, "Indian Removal Policy: Administrative, Historical, and Moral Criteria for Judging Its Success or Failure," *Ethnohistory* 12 [Summer 1965]: 274–278).


11. Monroe is quoted in Prucha, Great Father, 1:184; Secretary of War John C. Calhoun to Agent Benjamin Parke, 8 Sept. 1819, Records of the Secretary of War relating to Indian Affairs, Letters Sent, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 15, Roll 4.


18. Agent Richard Graham to William Clark, superintendent of Indian affairs at St. Louis, Mo., 15 Jan. 1825, Letters Received, St. Louis Superintendency, 1824–1841, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 234, Roll 747.


26. "Message of Andrew Jackson," ibid. Prucha argues unconvincingly that because the Jacksonians took a paternalistic approach toward a dependent people whom they considered inferior, they carried out the removal policy with the best interests of the Indians at heart. "Christian statesmen and their missionary allies," writes Prucha, "looked upon Indians as children toward whom they had a parental or paternal responsibility. It was the duty of parents to provide what was best for their minor children, look out for their best interests (which the children themselves could not judge), and assist the children to move to full maturity" (see Prucha, The Indians in American Society: From the Revolutionary War to the Present [Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1985], 10–16; see also Prucha, "Andrew Jackson's Indian Policy: A Reassessment," in The Indian in American History, edited by Francis Paul Prucha [Hinsdale, Ill.: Dryden Press, 1971], 67–74).

Although men such as Thomas Jefferson and Thomas McKenney probably were truly concerned about uplifting the "savage," Jackson's actions appear far more politically motivated than Prucha admits. Southern and western voters were more important than Indians, and the harsh removal policy, carried out during Jackson's presidency, demonstrates most emphatically where Jackson's sentiments lay. For analyses of Jackson's attitudes toward Indians that differ from Prucha's, see Steffen, William Clark, 130–142, 166–168, 176; Remini, Andrew Jackson, 128–130; and Glyndon G. Van Deusen, The Jacksonian Era, 1828–1848 [New York: Harper & Row, 1963], 48–50.

28. For Isaac McCoy's views on the matter, see History of Baptist Indian Missions (Washington, D.C., and New York: W. M. Morrison and H. & S. Rayner, 1840), 400.

29. See James C. Malin, Indian Policy and Westward Expansion, Bulletin of the University of Kansas Humanistic Studies, vol. 2, no. 3 (Lawrence: University of Kansas, 1921), 11–14.


33. Ibid.


40. Eshtonoquot to Henry Schoolcraft, 29 Nov. 1839, Letters Received by the Office of Indian Affairs, Michigan Superintendency, 1834, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Record Group 75, Microcopy 1, Roll 38.


42. De Smet is quoted in Malin, Indian Policy and Westward Expansion, 53; for the governmental approach toward the immigrant Indians living along the
CHAPTER 3. THE VERMILLION KICKAPOOS


2. Ann Ruth Willner and Dorothy Willner define charisma as a particular leader's capacity to elicit deference, devotion, and awe toward himself as the source of authority within the group. A charismatic leader (such as Kenekuk) is seen by his followers to possess almost supernatural powers; he becomes associated with the sacred symbols of the society. The charismatic leader's appeal, however, is limited to those who share the traditions of a given culture. See Willner and Willner, "The Rise and Role of Charismatic Leaders," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 358 (Mar. 1965): 77–88.


4. Kenekuk and his followers had begun a revitalization of their Kickapoo culture and society similar to that of Handsome Lake and the Seneca Indians of the early 1800s. Revitalization movements have been studied by anthropologists and historians for many years, and Fred W. Voget and Anthony F. C. Wallace provide two analyses. Voget would call the Vermillion Kickapoo experience positive nativism, meaning an attempt to attain social "reintegration through a selective rejection, modification and synthesis of both traditional and alien cultural components." Wallace would classify their movement as a "deliberate, organized, conscious effort by members of a society to construct a more satisfying culture." See Voget, "The American Indians in Transition: Reformation and Accommodation," and Wallace, "Revitalization Movements," American Anthropologist 58 (Apr. 1956): 249–263 and 264–281.

James R. Lewis has recently modified and added clarification to Wallace's definition. Lewis argues that no prophet could "deliberately" create an acceptable revelatory message. A successful prophet actually believes that the new message was revealed by a deity; the prophet then interprets and adapts the message to the culture's historical situation. Lewis maintains that the prophet's revelatory message is accepted by members of a society "as a new 'story' which..."
expands or supplants a culture’s previous stories (myths) about the way things are.” The new story is most likely to be accepted during periods of severe societal stress. See Lewis, “Shamans and Prophets: Continuities and Discontinuities in Native American New Religions,” American Indian Quarterly 12 [Summer 1988]: 225–227.


6. By the 1830s Kenekuk had assumed the role as head chief. Although most of the band belonged to Kenekuk’s church, some Vermillion Kickapoos chose to adhere to traditional beliefs and remained outside of the church while still retaining membership in the band.


10. In keeping with Kickapoo tradition, Kenekuk initially worked to
strengthen the clans. He realized that adherence to clan membership rules had meant a stronger band that could better resist outside pressures. If the Kickapoos adhered to his teachings, Kenekuk promised that the clans would gain renewed strength. According to the prophet, the Great Spirit had spoken: "'Our old men had totems [clans]. They were good and had many totems. Now you have scarcely any. If you follow my advice, you will soon have totems again'" (quoted in James Mooney, The Ghost-Dance Religion and Wounded Knee [New York: Dover Publications, 1973], 695–696). The clans never completely disappeared among either the adherents to Kenekuk's church or the other Kickapoo bands, and various Kickapoo informants tell me that the clans are still considered important on their Kansas reservation.


15. Elbert Herring to William Clark, 3 June 1833, Letters Sent by the Office of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 21, Roll 10.


17. John Dunbar and Samuel Allis, "Letters Concerning the Presbyterian Mission in Bellevue, Nebraska, 1831–1841," Kansas State Historical Society Collections 14 [1915–1918]: 693. For reports on the strife that erupted between the two bands, see Agent Richard Cummins to Herring, 30 Sept. 1835, and Capt. Matthew Duncan to Col. Henry Dodge, 23 May 1835, Letters Received, Fort Leavenworth Agency, 1824–1851, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 234, Roll 300 [hereafter cited as LR, Fort Leavenworth Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R[300–303]; see also "Council with the Kickapoo," 13 June 1836, and Duncan to Gen. Henry Atkinson, 14 June 1836, Letters Received, St. Louis Superintendency, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 234, Roll 751 [hereafter cited as LR, St. Louis Superintendency, BIA, RG75, M234, R751].


19. According to one observer, the Kickapoos lived in a place "'as attractive as any yet settled by civilized man.'" See the Missouri Republican [St. Louis], 28 May 1842; reprinted in "Bypaths of Kansas History," Kansas Historical Quarterly 10 [Aug. 1941]: 324.


21. "Council of Ellsworth with the Kickapoo," 2 Sept. 1833, Letters Received,

22. Ibid.


33. Van Quickenborne to Father McSherry, 29 June 1836, and Van Quickenborne to McSherry, 1 July 1836, in Garraghan, “Kickapoo Mission,” 32–33, 37–40; “Council with the Kickapoo,” 13 June 1836, LR, St. Louis Superintendency, BIA, RG75, M234, R751.
34. Pashishi is quoted in Garraghan, "Kickapoo Mission," 47. The agency doctor certified that most of the Kickapoos had been vaccinated by Jerome Berryman; see J. A. Chute to Cummins, 23 July 1838, LR, Fort Leavenworth Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R301


43. For reports on Kickapoo farming, see Cummins to St. Louis Superintendent of Indian Affairs D. D. Mitchell, 12 Sept. 1842, Senate Executive Documents, 27th Cong., 3d sess., ser. 413, p. 436; Cummins to Mitchell, 1 Oct. 1843, Senate Executive Documents, 28th Cong., 1st sess., ser. 431, p. 404.

44. For reports on the Kickapoos' work habits, see Nathaniel Talbott to John C. Spencer, 28 Jan. 1843, LR, Fort Leavenworth Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R302; McCoy, Baptist Indian Missions, 458; David Kinnear to Cummins, 30 Sept. 1838, LR, Fort Leavenworth Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R301; Samuel Mason to Cong. John C. Mason, 26 Dec. 1849, LR, Fort Leavenworth Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R303; Cummins to St. Louis Superintendent of Indian Affairs William Clark, 31 Jan. 1838, Cummins to Clark, 16 May 1838, and Cummins to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Carey A. Harris, 23 Sept. 1838, LR, Fort Leavenworth Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R301.


50. Agent David Vanderslice to Manypenny, 25 Nov. 1853, Letters Received, Great Nemaha Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 234, Roll 308 (hereafter cited as LR, Great Nemaha Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R308).


56. Both observers are quoted in Barry, *Beginning of the West*, 1227 and 1232.


59. Royal Baldwin to superintendent of Indian affairs in St. Louis, A. Cumming, 7 Sept. 1853, Letters Received, Kickapoo Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 234, Roll 371 (hereafter cited as LR, Kickapoo Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R371). The settler's description can be found in the “Reminiscences of William Honnell,” no date, History, Indians, Kickapoo File, Manuscript Division, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.


62. F. M. Williams, superintendent of the Methodist School, to Agent Charles B. Keith, 17 Sept. 1861, *Senate Executive Documents*, 36th Cong., 2d sess., ser. 1078, p. 661; Special Indian Inspector Edward Kenible to Commissioner of Indian Affairs E. P. Smith, 19 Nov. 1874, Reports of the Inspection of the Field Jurisdictions of the Office of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record
Group 48, National Archives, Microcopy 1070, Roll 40 (hereafter cited as Field Jurisdiction Inspection Reports, BIA, RG48, M1070, R40).


66. For the story of Pahkahka's death, see William Honnell's account in History, Indians, Kickapoo File; and John Winsea to George Remsburg, 25 May 1908, Remsburg Collection, Box 78:4, Manuscript Division, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.


68. Agent M. H. Newlin to superintendent of Indian affairs at Lawrence, Kansas, William Nicholson, 1 Mar. 1876, and Newlin to Nicholson, 30 Sept. 1876, Letters Received relating to the Agency for Indians in Kansas [Potawatomi Agency] and the Kiowa Agency, 1876, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 856, Roll 71; see also *Minutes of Kansas Yearly Meeting of Friends, Held at Lawrence, Kansas*, [1876], 33–34.


70. Newlin to Nicholson, 31 July 1877, Letters Received relating to the Cheyenne and Arapahoe and the Agency for Indians in Kansas [Potawatomi Agency], 1877, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 856, Roll 79; see also *Minutes of Kansas Yearly Meeting of Friends, Held at Lawrence, Kansas*, [1877], 34.

CHAPTER 4. THE CHIPPEWAS AND MUNSEES


2. Henry W. Martin to Commissioner of Indian Affairs D. N. Cooley, 26 June 1866, Letters Received, Sac and Fox Agency, 1859–1880, Bureau of Indian Affairs,
Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 234, Roll 736 [hereafter cited as LR, Sac and Fox Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R[734–744]].


8. Ibid.


13. Ibid.


15. Ibid.


22. Romig was a member of the Northern Province of the Moravian Church, headquartered in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

23. One reason federal officials permitted the Moravians to establish a mission among the tribes was that church elders agreed to finance the entire venture themselves. Even before Romig arrived on the reservation, however, Donohoe informed Moravian elders that the Indians might ask the government to give the Moravians permanent status on the reservation and allow the church to acquire tribal monies to support the school and mission. See Donohoe to Oehler, 27 Feb. 1862, and Joseph Romig to Brother S. Wolle, 24 Mar. 1862, Moravian Records, Box 185, Folder 1, Items 2 and 3, MR23.


25. Francis McCoonse (Eshtonoquot) and others to Commissioner of Indian Affairs William P. Dole, 15 Feb. 1864, Letters Received, Ottawa Agency, 1863–1865, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 234, Roll 656 [hereafter cited as LR, Ottawa Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R656]; Francis McCoonse and others to Dole, 6 Dec. 1864, and Francis McCoonse to commissioner, 10 Apr. 1866, LR, Sac and Fox Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R735 and R736.


27. Romig to Jacobsen, 4 Aug. 1863, Moravian Records, Box 185, Folder 2, Item 2, MR23; Romig to Dole, 13 Feb. 1865, LR, Sac and Fox Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R735.


29. Romig to Wolle, 4 Apr. 1866, Moravian Records, Box 185, Folder 5, Item 2,
MR23; Romig to Martin, 6 Aug. 1866, LR, Sac and Fox Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R736.


33. Romig to Wolle, 1 May 1865, Moravian Records, Box 185, Folder 4, Item 5, MR23.

34. The June 1865 census listed thirty-eight children, and Romig reported that twenty-nine were attending his school; see “Statement of the Number of Indians Belonging to the Sac and Fox Agency, Kansas, 30 June 1865,” LR, Sac and Fox Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R735; Romig to Martin, 8 Aug. 1865, House Executive Documents, 39th Cong., 1st sess., ser. 1248, p. 565.


36. Francis McCoonse to the secretary of the Interior, 29 June 1866, Donohoe and others to Martin, 24 June 1866, and Martin to Cooley, 26 June 1866, LR, Sac and Fox Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R736.


38. Edward McCoonse and others to Martin, 11 Jan. 1867, “Petition Opposing Removal from Kansas,” signed by Francis McCoonse and members of the council, 19 Jan. 1867, and Eshtonoquot (Francis McCoonse) to commissioner of Indian affairs, 8 Feb. 1867, LR, Sac and Fox Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R737.

39. For crop reports, see Wiley to Murphy, 30 July 1867, and Romig to Wiley, 31 July 1867, House Executive Documents, 40th Cong., 2d sess., ser. 1326, pp. 300–302.


41. Romig to Wolle, 1 Apr. 1868 and 2 June 1868, ibid., Items 5 and 6, MR23; Murphy to commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1 June 1868, LR, Sac and Fox Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R737.

42. “Treaty between the United States and the Swan Creek and Black River Chippewas and the Munsee or Christian Indians,” 1 June 1868, Documents
relating to the Negotiation of Ratified and Unratified Treaties with Various Indian Tribes, 1868–1869, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy-T494, R10.

43. In 1871 the United States Congress discontinued the practice of making treaties with American Indian tribes.

44. Romig to Wolle, 25 Aug. 1868 and 12 Oct. 1869, Moravian Records, Box 185, Folder 7, Item 10, and Folder 8, Item 1, MR23.


46. Romig to Brother Kampman, 7 Jan. 1870, and Romig to Wolle, 9 Aug. 1870, Moravian Records, Box 185, Folder 9, Items 1 and 4, MR23.


48. It is not clear how many Chippewas actually became Christians at this time. E. S. Rogers reports that even if a Chippewa converts to Christianity, he or she does not abandon the traditional belief system [see "Southeastern Ojibwa," 766].


51. Although the Indians did not receive patents in fee simple until 1900, individuals could sell their land before that time if they were declared competent by a court. During the 1850s and 1860s, there was much fraud connected with this process and many Indians from other tribes lost their holdings. See Grant Foreman, *The Last Trek of the Indians* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946), 228, note 3.

CHAPTER 5. THE IOWAS AND THE MISSOURI SACS

1. The Missouri Sacs are usually referred to as the Sacs and Foxes of the Missouri; this was the official United States government designation for them. Because very few Foxes ever associated with this band, however, this chapter will refer to them either as the Missouri Sacs or simply as the Sacs.

2. Charles Kappler, comp., *Indian Affairs, Laws and Treaties*, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1904), 468–469; Agent Andrew Hughes to Henry Dodge, superintendent of Indian affairs in Wisconsin, 12 May 1837, Letters Received, Great Nemaha Agency, 1848–1876, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75, National Archives, Microcopy 234, Roll 314 [hereafter cited as LR, Great Nemaha Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, [R]300–314)]. The Sacs and Iowas settled on what became known as the Great Nemaha Agency or reservation, which included lands in what later became Kansas and Nebraska. Since the two tribes settled partially in Kansas, I believe that they should be included in this story.


4. For information on Iowa culture, see Martha Royce Blaine, *The Ioway


8. See Aurey Ballard to Samuel Thompson, 28 Feb. 1837, and Samuel Irvin to Presbyterian Mission Secretary Walter Lowrie, 31 May 1841, Presbyterian Mission Letters, Box 3, Volume 1, Letter 83, and Box 8, Volume 1, Letter 71; Vaughn to Harvey, 1 June 1848, LR, Great Nemaha Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R308.


13. Diaries of Samuel M. Irvin, 1841–1848, 7 Jan. 1841, p. 5, Manuscript Division, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, Microfilm Box 89, pp. 22–23 (hereafter cited as Irvin’s Diary, with the date and page numbers); Irvin to Lowrie, 7 Feb. 1839, Presbyterian Mission Letters, Box 8, Volume 1, Letter 37.
14. The Presbyterian school building has been restored and is located near Highland, Kansas.

15. Irvin to Agent Richardson, 10 May 1843, Presbyterian Mission Letters, Box 8, Volume 1, Letter 106.


19. Irvin's Diary, 8 June 1841, p. 118.


28. Agent David Vanderslice to superintendent of Indian affairs at St. Louis, Mo., Alfred Cumming, 6 Sept. 1854, LR, Great Nemaha Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R308; Edward McKinney to Rev. Moderator Presbytery at Carlisle, n.d. [probably 1847 or 1848], Edward McKinney Collection, Manuscript Division, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.


30. Thomas L. McKenney and James Hall, The Indian Tribes of North America, with Biographical Sketches and Anecdotes of the Principal Chiefs, vol. 1 (Edinburgh, Scot.: John Grant, 1933), 301.


32. Ibid., 185.


38. Vaughn to Harvey, 1 June 1848 and 27 Oct. 1848, LR, Great Nemaha Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R308.


42. George Allen Root Collection, Potawatomi File, Manuscript Division, Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.


44. Irvin’s Diary, 5 Feb. 1842, pp. 22–23.

45. Vanderslice to Cumming, 6 Dec. 1853, LR, Great Nemaha Agency, BIA, RG75, M234, R308.
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46. Two excellent films describe in vivid fashion the lives of twentieth-century Potawatomis and Kickapoos in Kansas—see *Neshnabek: The People*, produced by Donald Stull and directed by Gene Bernofsky (Berkeley: University of California Extension Media Center, 1979, re-release, 1987), 16 mm, 30 min.; and *Return to Sovereignty: Self-Determination and the Kansas Kickapoo*, produced by Donald Stull and directed by David M. Kendall (Berkeley: University of California Extension Media Center, 1982, gen. release, 1987), VHS, 46 min.
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