

UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

American Indians, American Imperialism, and Defying Empire at Home and Abroad

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4wc7283s>

Author

Miller, Robert

Publication Date

2011

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

American Indians, American Imperialism, and Defying Empire at Home and Abroad

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

History

by

Robert David Miller

June 2010

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Clifford Trafzer, Chairperson

Dr. Rebecca Kugel

Dr. Michelle Raheja

Copyright by
Robert David Miller
2011

The Dissertation of Robert David Miller is approved:

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

Acknowledgements

Two of my chapters previously appeared in print. Chapter four is an expanded version of an article published in volume 88 of the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Spring 2010). The portion of chapter six discussing Spanish-language newspapers originated in an article I published in Volume 5 of the *Red River Valley Historical Journal* (Spring 2009). I am appreciative of both journals for giving me the opportunity to publish my work as a graduate student.

I want to thank the financial support of the Rupert Costo fund at the University of California, Riverside, for helping to fund my research trips to Oklahoma. I am thankful to my dissertation mentor, Clifford Trafzer, as he remained an enthusiastic supporter of my project throughout the entire process. He urged me to continue pursuing the project and ignore the warnings of local archivists who thought my search for American Indian responses to empire would be fruitless. I am glad I listened to his advice as my research soon started turning up fantastic materials conclusively demonstrated American Indians were analyzing American imperialism. He kept me focused on completing the dissertation and supplied me with excellent feedback on the many chapter drafts I sent to him. He always made himself available to write letters of recommendation on my behalf for research or conference funding.

The idea for this book originated in the materials courses on American Indian History I took at the University of California, Riverside, with Rebecca Kugel. I am thankful for the discussions she led in those classes as they helped me conceptualize my Native-centered focus on American empire. I also want to thank many of my colleagues

whose astute comments about American Indian History also contributed to my framing of this book. In particular, I want to thank Michael Cox, Jon Ille, K.D. Motes, and Elizabeth Von Essen as I learned a great deal from their comments in these graduate classes. I am also thankful for the feedback of Michelle Raheja as she provided a different perspective that challenged me to further my analysis of Native writings.

I am also indebted to the staffs at libraries across Oklahoma. In particular, I want to thank all those who worked the desk at the Oklahoma Historical Center as they kept me supplied with everything I needed as I examined numerous Oklahoma newspapers. In particular, I wanted to thank Laura Dronyk and Jennifer Day for tracking down several citations and sources for me after my departure from Oklahoma City. The staff managing the Western History Collections at the University of Oklahoma was particularly patient in locating my numerous requests and photocopying the materials I wanted. Delores Sumner, the Special Collections Library at Northeastern State University in Tahlequah, was also very enthusiastic about my project.

Dedication

I dedicate this book to my fiancée, Monica, and I want to thank her for her support and for remaining patient with me throughout my years of graduate school. I also want to thank my late father, David Miller, for instilling in me an interest in history that helped encourage me to pursue a career in this field. Finally, I want to thank my mother, Carolyn, for her encouragement over the years.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

American Indians, American Imperialism, and Defying Empire at Home and Abroad

by

Robert David Miller

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in History
University of California, Riverside, June 2011
Dr. Clifford Trafzer, Chairperson

At the turn of the twentieth century, American Indians defended their communities by challenging the racial and moral assumptions that buttressed Euro-American claims of superiority. Native writers understood how the rhetoric of civilization and progress cast American Indians as backward, helping to justify the federal government's violation of tribal sovereignty, the division of tribal lands, and the suppression of Native cultures. American Indians were fully cognizant of the deleterious consequences of permitting critiques of Native societies and peoples to remain unchallenged. Even Native writers who seemingly embraced the concepts of civilization and progress resisted the denigration of American Indians as they understood how anti-Indian prejudices prevented Native peoples from fully participating in American society. These Native writers recast American Indians as civilized and the equals of Euro-

Americans. Previous scholarship examined the parallels in the racial discourses and governmental policies applied to American Indians, African Americans, and colonial populations. This dissertation takes a new approach by placing American Indian conceptions of the American empire at the center of the study in order to demonstrate how Native writers utilized their understanding of the American empire to frame their interpretation of federal Indian policies. In order to bolster their critiques of the United States, Native writers referred to the newly-created overseas American empire in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines. Native critics of the American empire pointed to the treatment of newly-colonized peoples in the Pacific to condemn the United States as uncivilized and immoral. Native proponents of accommodation drew upon the creation of an American empire to convince other American Indians of the futility of resisting the United States. In addition, Native proponents of accommodation did not use the discourse of civilization and progress in the same manner as Euro-American proponents of assimilation. Instead, these American Indians drew on the language of civilization to urge Euro-Americans to treat Native communities humanely.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1	
Native Interpretations and Utilizations of Empire	12
Chapter 2	
Mocking and Rejecting Euro-American Critiques of Native Societies: Ora Eddleman Reed and Gertrude Simmons Bonnin	57
Chapter 3	
DeWitt Clinton Duncan, “The White Man’s Burden,” and the American Empire	102
Chapter 4	
The <i>Cherokee Advocate</i> and the Inevitability of Allotment	141
Chapter 5	
Debating Allotment in Indian Territory Newspapers	168
Chapter 6	
Comparing Responses to Empire at Home and Abroad	203
Conclusion	241
Bibliography	245

Introduction

In February 1899, *McClure's* published Rudyard Kipling's poem "The White Man's Burden." Americans read this poem while the United States Senate debated the Treaty of Paris. The treaty would bring peace with Spain and the annexation of the Philippine Islands. Two days before the Senate voted to ratify the Treaty of Paris, fighting erupted in the Philippines between American soldiers and Filipinos under the command of Emilio Aguinaldo, the leader of the Filipino independence movement. The Philippine War would officially last from 1899 to 1902 but sporadic fighting continued in the Philippines well into the following decade. Kipling sought to encourage the United States to take up the burden of empire even though he depicted it as a largely thankless task. Proponents of overseas expansion within the United States celebrated the Kipling's poem as it crystallized their vision of an American empire and bolstered American claims of moral superiority.

At the end of March 1899, two poems appeared within papers from Indian Territory.¹ DeWitt Clinton Duncan, a Cherokee, and his nephew, John Duncan, both wrote responses to Kipling's poem. John Duncan's poem "The Red Man's Burden" directly critiqued Kipling's poem by quoting specific phrases from it in order to raise questions about the morality of Euro-American civilization. DeWitt Clinton Duncan did not refer directly to Kipling's words in his poem "The White Man's Burden," but his poem condemned the United States for its arrogance and cast civilization as immoral for

¹ J. C. Duncan, "The Red Man's Burden," *Indian Sentinel*, 30 March 1899, 2; Too-qua-stee, "The White Man's Burden," *Indian Chieftain*, 30 March 1899, 1.

its abuse of the weak and its focus on the accumulation of wealth. DeWitt Clinton Duncan wrote his poem as a warning from God chastising Euro-Americans for their hubris and rejecting depictions of United States expansion as a manifestation of God's will. It is significant that two Native authors attacked a poem written by a British writer hoping to encourage the United States to create an overseas empire. The question of why American Indians paid attention to events taking place thousands of miles from the Cherokee Nation is at the center of this book.

The poems indicated that many Native people were cognizant of the creation of an American empire overseas. Native editors controlled a number of newspapers from Indian Territory while other publications published letters from American Indians. In addition, even papers published by missionaries or Indian boarding schools provided their readers with information about the Spanish-American War and its aftermath. Even though American Indians may have focused most of their efforts combating efforts to restrict their sovereignty, they were hardly ignorant of events elsewhere in the United States and across the world. This simple acknowledgement helps to challenge the portrayal of Native communities as overwhelmed by their interactions with the modern world at the turn of the twentieth century. American Indians not only understood what was happening outside of Indian Territory or their reservations but they were able to draw upon their knowledge of the creation of an American empire to support their conclusions about local conditions.

Native authors utilized their knowledge of the overseas American empire to further their existing critiques of the American government and its treatment of American

Indians. As such, the poems by DeWitt Clinton and John Duncan are significant as they reveal how Native writers understood the implications of expansionist rhetoric. Euro-American claims about the need to spread civilization and Christianity had already justified numerous policies that attacked Native cultures and were detrimental to the sovereignty of American Indian communities. As such, though the two poems responded to a poem calling for the creation of an overseas empire, both pieces represented an attack on the underlying justifications for federal Indian policies and the Euro-American demand for Native lands. If American Indians could undermine the justification for the creation of an American overseas empire, they would simultaneously raise questions about the morality and legality of Euro-American efforts to limit tribal sovereignty and attack their cultures.

The focus on American Indian resistance to empire at the turn of the twentieth century is important. The closing decades of the nineteenth century and the start of the twentieth century received characterization as the nadir in American Indian history; this label negates the ways in which Native people protested their treatment by the United States. Though American Indian resistance did not resemble the military conflicts of the nineteenth century or the social activism of the 1960s and 1970s, Native people were far from silent. American Indians occasionally embraced the discourse of civilization and progress making it difficult to identify their opposition. Scholars must not assume that American Indians employed these terms the same way as Euro-American proponents of assimilation. A close reading of the source material often reveals that Native authors often qualified their endorsements of civilization and progress while criticizing many

aspects of Euro-American society. American Indians adopted strategies that made sense given the restrictive policies that existed at the turn of the twentieth century.

Recent scholarship has demonstrated the resiliency of Native communities at the turn of the twentieth century. In *Wives and Husbands*, Loretta Fowler revealed Southern Arapahos cooperated with the United States government during the late nineteenth century in order to preserve valued elements of their culture, particularly their system of egalitarian gender relations. Despite the federal government's efforts to impose a Euro-American division of labor, the Arapahos continued to resist this imposition of unequal gender norms.² Similarly, David Chang demonstrated how members of the Creek Nation viewed land as essential to their national identity; the pressures of allotment at the turn of the twentieth century did not eliminate a sense of Creek nationhood but it transformed the concept from one based on land to one defined by race.³ Jeffrey Shepherd's *We Are an Indian Nation*, Jeffrey Shepherd explored how Native resistance to colonial domination facilitated the creation of a Hualapai national identity by uniting the previously independent bands of Pais into the Hualapai. This new sense of identity unified the Pais and helped them cooperate against the cultural, economic, and political attacks upon their sovereignty and independence.⁴ John Troutman's *Indian Blues* revealed how American

² Loretta Fowler, *Wives and Husbands: Gender and Age in Southern Arapaho History* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2010).

³ David Chang, *The Color of the Land: Race, Nation, and the Politics of Landownership in Oklahoma, 1832-1929* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 6-7, 75-76.

⁴ Jeffrey Shepherd, *We Are an Indian Nation: A History of the Hualapai People* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2010).

Indians resisted federal efforts to control Native music at the turn of the twentieth century while simultaneously creating opportunities for themselves.⁵

Earlier scholarship identified parallels between federal Indian policies and the creation of an overseas American empire. An article by Walter Williams helped to locate the domestic origins of United States imperialism. The article highlighted many of the similarities between the treatment of Native Americans and the policies adopted towards the Filipinos and Puerto Ricans. Frederick Hoxie's *A Final Promise* built upon Williams' article in demonstrating the parallels between the racial discourse white Americans used to describe the American Indians, America's colonial subjects, and undesired immigrants. Though 1898 remained an important date in the history of United States imperialism, the American decision to control non-white populations had long-standing precedents. The expansion of the United States across the North American continent brought it into contact with numerous peoples who came under American control unwillingly. The main fault in these otherwise important accounts was the continued focus upon policymakers. Hoxie and Williams did not include the voices of American Indians or the colonial subjects who found their islands under United States control. The need to integrate the voices of American Indians into a study of American imperialism remained a necessary task for future research.⁶

⁵ John Troutman, *Indian Blues: American Indians and the Politics of Music, 1879-1934* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009).

⁶ Frederick Hoxie, *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984); Walter Williams, "United States Indian Policy and the Debate over Philippine Annexation: Implications for the Origins of American Imperialism," *The Journal of American History* 66, no. 4 (March 1980): 810-831.

Robert Rydell also connected American Indians to United States empire through his scholarship on the various world's fairs that took place near the turn of the twentieth century. These exhibitions often contained representations of American Indians and other supposedly inferior peoples from across the globe. The organizers of these fairs and expositions, such as the Chicago World's Fair of 1893 or the Omaha World's Fair of 1898, explicitly drew connections between the nation's continental expansion and its annexation of territories in the Caribbean and the Pacific. The overseas acquisitions only marked the latest stage in the westward expansion of the Anglo-Saxon race; "the directors of the Omaha fair helped to ensure that the national debate over annexation would take place in racial terms with national policy towards the Indians as the immediate frame of reference."⁷ Consequently, many advocates of empire drew explicit comparisons with the federal government's treatment of American Indians.

Other scholars, particularly Amy Kaplan and Paul Kramer, have cautioned against equating the creation of an American empire in the Philippines with domestic issues of race and civilization. Kaplan argued drawing a direct link between domestic manifestations of empire and the policies adopted overseas "risks reproducing the teleological narrative that imperialism tells about itself."⁸ Kaplan further argued that the American empire overseas did not just draw upon Euro-American experience with

⁷ Robert Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984); Robert Rydell, "The Trans-Mississippi and International Exposition: 'To Work Out the Problem of Universal Civilization,'" *American Quarterly* 33, no. 5 (Winter 1981): 587-607.

⁸ Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 17-18.

American Indians but also drew upon the legacy of slavery and the relationship between whites and blacks.⁹ Similarly, Kramer noted that identifying the racial beliefs that guided Euro-American administrators as in the Philippines outgrowths of existing pre-existing ideologies within the United States ignores the unique social and cultural conditions Americans found in the archipelago. Kaplan and Kramer made pertinent observations about the need to avoid the description of empire as a homogenous or monolithic entity. However, this does not dismiss the necessity of examining Native conceptions of empire. Though imperial policies in the Philippines differed from governmental efforts to dismantle Indian Territory, Native writers perceived certain parallels. Witnessing American domination of other societies enabled Native writers to identify similarities that revealed a divergence between the rhetoric of the American empire and its implementation. In the end, this is not a study about the government's efforts to control Filipinos, Hawaiians, or American Indians. This study examines American Indian interpretations of the American empire and how they drew upon their conceptions of the United States and civilization to shape their responses to allotment, the dissolution of the Five Tribes, and the attempted imposition of Euro-American culture. Chapter one provides an overview of American Indian responses to the American empire, both domestically and overseas while demonstrating Native writers were aware of the creation of an American empire overseas. American Indians referenced the overseas empire to bolster their arguments regarding of their communities within the United States. The treatment of American Indians and other populations overseas provided Native authors

⁹ Kaplan, 17-18, 121-128.

with the ability to counteract Euro-American justifications for empire by casting the United States as immoral and uncivilized. The chapter also examines American Indians who participated in the creation of the overseas empire by serving with military units in Cuba or the Philippines and dealt with the implications of encountering other groups denigrated as inferior by Euro-Americans. Even Indian boarding school publications discussed the creation of an American empire. Though Euro-American teachers heavily edited these papers, students found ways to evade the censorship of their teachers to present subtle critiques of empire. Yet, American Indians were also cognizant of the racial hierarchy within the United States. As such, some American Indians allied themselves with the Democratic Party in Oklahoma in order to create a protected space for themselves within the American empire.

Chapter two examines two Native women who were active writers at the turn of the twentieth century. Ora Eddleman Reed published the *Twin Territories Magazine* and later edited the Indian Department of *Sturm's Oklahoma Magazine*. Reed's writings reveal her awareness of the deleterious impact of negative descriptions of Indian Territory and American Indians had upon Native communities. She sought to counteract these depictions by directly challenging Euro-Americans who embraced prejudicial views of American Indians. Gertrude Simmons, better known as Zitkala-Ša, also wrote extensively at the turn of the twentieth century. Previous scholarship has considered these women separately but by comparing their writings, it is possible to highlight their divergent responses to American empire. Reed utilized the discourse of civilization to

cast American Indians as worthy of inclusion in Euro-American society while Zitkala-Ša's turn of the century writings were critical of efforts to assimilate American Indians.

Chapter explores the extensive writings of DeWitt Clinton Duncan. This Cherokee author experienced the Trail of Tears as a child; for over thirty years, his letters appeared in newspapers within the Cherokee Nation, providing his views on allotment, education, and Cherokee history. Though occasionally included in anthologies of Native writers, scholars have largely refrained from analyzing Duncan's writings even though he was one of the most vociferous Native critics of federal Indian policy at the turn of the twentieth century. He repeatedly linked the treatment of American Indians to the creation of an American empire overseas and was a bold advocate of tribal sovereignty as he continually denied the right of the United States to impose policies on the Cherokee Nation. Duncan was unapologetic in his assertions of Native morality and the corrupt nature of Euro-American civilization. Duncan's writings frequently drew upon Christian imagery as he used his religion to challenge the moral legitimacy of the American empire and depict the United States as a nation obsessed with the accumulation of wealth at any cost.

Chapter four analyzes the *Cherokee Advocate* and its coverage of allotment. As the official publication of the Cherokee government, the *Advocate* provided a forum for Cherokees to debate allotment. Prior to late 1901, the *Advocate* opposed the federal government's efforts to implement allotment, but the *Advocate* shifted its editorial position in November 1901 and started to cast resistance to allotment as futile. The *Advocate* encouraged Cherokee opponents of allotment, such as the Keetoowah, to accept

the policy. Unlike Euro-American proponents of allotment, the *Advocate* did not highlight the benefits of the policy; instead, the paper focused on the futility of resistance and the necessity of providing some land for future generations of Cherokees. As such, the *Advocate*'s endorsement of allotment did not reflect the adoption of Euro-American values but the recognition of accepting allotment as the only possible solution available to the Cherokees in light of the federal government's refusal to uphold existing treaties.

Chapter five expands the analysis of newspaper coverage of allotment to several other prominent Indian Territory papers to reveal the range of viewpoints and opinions available to Native readers. Even Euro-American edited papers, particularly the *Muskogee Phoenix*, published numerous letters from Native authors. Though a majority of papers from Indian Territory eventually supported allotment, their motivations varied significantly as even within the pro-allotment camp, editors promoted allotment but refused to surrender the independence of their nations.

Chapter six provides a comparative analysis of African American and Mexican American response to the creation of an American empire. African American soldiers in the Philippines witnessed efforts to denigrate Filipinos uses derogatory terms usually employed against African Americans in the United States. As such, many African American soldiers and newspaper editors displayed empathy for Filipinos. The editors of Spanish-language newspapers were generally wealthier or at least aspired to a middle-class status. As such, they embraced their Spanish heritage, eliding any reference to Native ancestry. These editors argued the United States was following the example set by Spain in creating an overseas empire to spread Christianity and civilization. As such, the

editors of Spanish-language papers cast themselves as part of the civilizing mission and sought to differentiate themselves from recent immigrants from Mexico of Native ancestry.

Chapter 1

Native Interpretations and Utilizations of Empire

At the turn of the twentieth century, the United States attempted to reduce Native landholdings, limit Native sovereignty, and attack American Indian cultures and beliefs. Consequently, Native communities had local experiences with the power of the American empire. By reading newspapers and magazines, American Indians learned of the creation of an American empire overseas, thereby supplementing their knowledge of the United States and its treatment of populations it sought to control. Native writers drew upon this overseas empire as well as their own histories and experiences to formulate interpretations of American empire useful to their own needs. American Indians utilized their awareness of conditions overseas to challenge the moral authority of the United States by questioning whether its actions reflected those of a civilized nation. Even within the confined of Indian boarding schools, Native writers interpreted the American empire and drew conclusions that did not always match the expectations of their Euro-American teachers. Native awareness of the existence of a racial hierarchy within the American empire prompted some American Indians to seek the creation of a protected space. For example, Native writers in Oklahoma allied themselves with the Democratic Party in order to connect Native communities with the white majority and cast Euro-Americans and Indians as the rightful leaders of the new state.

Newspapers and other periodicals permitted American Indians to learn about events overseas. Though some Native publications, such as the *Indian Sentinel*, considered the creation of an American empire irrelevant, their dismissive responses to

these overseas territories indicates they were aware of world events.¹ Publications produced by missionaries and Indian boarding schools discussed the Spanish-American War and its consequences.² Due to their cognizance of the American empire, American Indians engaged in debates about it and referenced it in discussions of local issues.

American Indians participated in discussions about the governance of the territories annexed by the United States. A petition from Sallisaw, Indian Territory, signed in April 1901, called for the United States government to protect the inhabitants of Pacific Islands and other territories by outlawing the sale of firearms, opium, and other intoxicants. Such petitions calling for the extension of various American laws over new territories in the Pacific and the Caribbean were not unique. However, members of the Five Tribes signed this petition and included information about their tribal affiliations. For examples, several Cherokees signed the petition: John Ross, E.B. Evans, Mary C. Holderman, and D. E. Smallwood. At least three Creeks also signed the document: N. B. Moore, J. W. Perryman, and T. W. Perryman.³ From a humanitarian standpoint, American Indian participation in the creation of this document signified an effort to

¹ For example, the *Indian Sentinel* noted wars in the Philippines and South Africa were “not half so interesting to the Cherokees as the allotment question.” In reference to a news item about the possible capture of Emilio Aguinaldo, the leader of the Filipino independence movement, the *Sentinel* noted Aguinaldo might surrender, but “the Cherokee people will never surrender in the fight for allotment” until they received a title in fee simple to their lands. *Indian Sentinel*, 25 November 1899, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 2 December 1899.

² “Birdseye View of Havana Harbor,” *Iapi Oaye* (April 1898): 14; “The North Atlantic Squadron,” *Iapi Oaye* (April 1898): 13; “Revolving Turret for Coast Defense,” *Iapi Oaye* (May 1898): 18; “Spain’s Formidable Ship Vizcaya,” *Iapi Oaye* (April 1898): 13; “The Sixth of November,” *Indian Journal*, 26 October 1900, 3; “Twelve Inch Coast Defense Mortars,” *Iapi Oaye* (May 1898): 19.

³ Petition to United States Senate and House of Representatives, Folder 4, Box 2, Series 3, Papers of the Robertson and Worcester Families, Series 3, McFarlin Library, University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

promote the welfare of non-white populations across the Pacific Ocean. This might represent an effort to mitigate the worst influences of empire by seeking to protect these colonial populations from harm. However, the document also buttressed the notion that certain populations required the aid and guidance of outsiders. In this case, the American Indians who signed this petition identified themselves as civilizers thereby creating a privileged position for themselves within the American empire. The petition did not suggest these American Indians saw themselves as stewards of the American empire; instead, they mirrored the actions of eastern philanthropists who called attention to abuses perpetuated against American Indians. By doing so, these American Indians cast themselves as civilized and morally conscious. The inclusion of firearms on the list of prohibited items was equally important. The denial of weapons to the Filipinos would hinder their capacity to resist American control of the archipelago and thereby weaken any effort to win independence. While this stance limited Filipino efforts to fight against American control, it would, in theory, hasten the end of the conflict and thereby reduce the number of Filipino deaths.⁴

Prior to the Spanish-American War, the Creek poet and humorist, Alex Posey, published a poem in the *Muskogee Phoenix* denouncing the Spanish government for the tactics it used in Cuba. Posey signed the piece with the name of a literary persona he created for his poetry, Chinnubie Harjo. Posey often used Chinnubie Harjo to write more

⁴ Many Filipino civilians died during the Philippine War after American officers adopted a concentration policy to cut off support to the Filipino independence movement. The concentration of large numbers of Filipinos in small areas led to thousands of deaths due to unsanitary conditions, disease, and starvation. Brian Linn, *The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 154-155.

humorous pieces, but this poem, “Cuba Libre,” tackled the revolt against Spanish rule in Cuba.⁵ The poem labeled General Valeriano Weyler, the commander of Spanish forces in Cuba, as the “beast of Spain” while proclaiming “Cuba shall be free!”⁶ The poem announced that Cuba had the world’s sympathy and would be triumphant.⁷ In May 1898, Pleasant Porter, Principal Chief of the Creeks, addressed the Spanish American War while visiting Washington, D.C. Porter embraced the conflict as a moral quest, for he labeled it as “the indictment of a higher civilization against a lower civilization.”⁸ Furthermore, Porter explained, “the mission and duty of the United States, to liberate bleeding Cuba, is a glorious one, and undertaken at the behest of destiny and cannot be averted,” as the United States had a divine mission to end human suffering in Cuba.⁹ Porter cautioned the United States to treat the Spanish with respect after winning the conflict as Spain “is a mother of nations and the discoverer of America.”¹⁰ Porter

⁵ Daniel Littlefield Jr., *Alex Posey: Creek Poet, Journalist, and Humorist* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 54-55; Daniel Littlefield Jr. and Carol Petty Hunter, eds. *The Fus Fixico Letters: A Creek Humorist in Early Oklahoma* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002), 7, 12-13.

⁶ Chinnubie Harjo, “Cuba Libre,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 24 December 1896, 5. Weyler drew public attention as he adopted a concentration policy to force peasants out of the countryside and into areas the Spanish military could control. Weyler intended the policy to cut off peasant aid to the Cuban rebels, but the policy led to the starvation of many of these relocated peasants. Many in the United States denounced this policy even though American forces would adopt a similar strategy in the Philippines several years later. Ivan Musicant, *Empire by Default: The Spanish-American War and the Dawn of the American Century* (New York: Henry Holt, 1998), 67-77; Warren Zimmerman, *First Great Triumph: How Five Americans Made Their Country a World Power* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002), 248-252.

⁷ Chinnubie Harjo, “Cuba Libre,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 24 December 1896, 5.

⁸ Pleasant Porter, “A War for Liberty,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 12 May 1898, 8.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

eschewed an opportunity to draw parallels between the Spanish conquest of the Americas and Spain's efforts to subdue the Cuban independence movement.

The *Cherokee Advocate*, the official newspaper of the Cherokee Nation was critical of the Boer War as it involved an effort by the British Empire to impose its will upon a weaker power. An editorial from March 1900 chastised the British for their actions in the Boer War. The editorial conceded the British might well defeat the Boers and seize control of their natural resources and wealth, but predicted they would suffer divine judgment for their arrogance. The editorial went further and connected the actions of the British with the United States by noting, "if Uncle Sam isn't a little more careful in the future than he has been in the past year or more, in his treatment of other people, he will be pointed at as a partner of John Bull."¹¹ As this article appeared in 1900, including events of the past year would certainly point to the Philippine War, but it could also include the annexation of Hawaii, the Curtis Act, and American involvement in Puerto Rico and Cuba. The editorial thereby equated the United States with the lead imperial power at the turn of the twentieth century.

James Gregory, a Yuchi, was critical of the Boer War in South Africa.¹² In a letter to the editor published in May 1900, Gregory condemned modern society for abandoning

¹¹ *Cherokee Advocate*, 10 March 1900, 2.

¹² Critiques of the Boer War also appeared in the writings of E. L. Cookson, who contrasted the international outrage in response to British actions in South Africa with the apathetic response by Euro-Americans to the destruction of the Cherokee Nation. Similarly, a Cherokee author identified only as X. X. criticized the United States Senate for decrying the abuse of the Cubans by the Spanish and the inhabitants of Crete by the Turks because these same senators did not decry the treatment of the Cherokees. According to X. X., these senators refused to condemn the treatment of the Cherokees because unlike the abuses in Cuba and Crete, Euro-Americans would profit from the theft of Cherokee property. E. L. Cookson, "Appointed Time," *Indian Chieftain*, 12 September 1901, 2; X. X., "The Cherokees, Crete and Cuba," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 20 May 1897, 1.

Christian morality in favor of new gods: “power and gold.”¹³ Gregory believed these influences sought to redirect democratic governments “into the channels of tyranny and barbarous murders.”¹⁴ Gregory accused wealthy speculators as of “pray[ing] hard from London to New York for British victory over the Boers in the interest of God ‘gold.’” By mentioning London and New York, Gregory identified two important centers of wealth and investment, thereby critiquing early-twentieth century capitalism. In addition, the reference to individuals praying for financial profit deprived the Boer War of any moral or security justification.¹⁵ Gregory condemned war profiteers as “the lowest type of barbarians to be found on the face of the globe.”¹⁶ Though Gregory focused on the actions of the British in South Africa, his reference to New York financiers indicated he also disapproved of Americans who profited from overseas expansion. Gregory’s interpretation implied that these same individuals sought to enrich themselves from the destruction of the Cherokee Nation.

Gregory expanded his analysis to include the Philippine War, noting that the “trust man” called for the defeat of the Filipinos to force them to purchase American products. Gregory’s account of the Philippine War did not make any reference to civilization or any moral justifications for the annexation of the archipelago. Gregory speculated American capitalists desired to place a tariff on Puerto Rican goods to permit

¹³ James R. Gregory, “A New Creed,” *Wagoner Record*, 10 May 1900, 5.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

British products from Jamaica to compete and raise enough money to continue their slaughter of Dutch South Africans.¹⁷ Gregory referred to the early-twentieth century debates in the United States about the status of newly-acquired territories. Though the Americans controlled the Philippines and Puerto Rico, some American businesses did not want goods from these territories to enter the United States free from tariffs. As such, they lobbied for the retention of tariffs on these products to protect their own businesses from competition with these lower-priced imports.¹⁸

This was not Gregory's only critique of American imperialism. Two weeks later, another letter appeared in the *Wagoner Record* continuing his denunciation of the Boer War and the Philippine War. One of the debates surrounding the conflict in the Philippines centered on the question on whether constitutional rights and freedoms extended to the Philippines.¹⁹ Advocates of empire denied the United States needed to treat the Philippines identically to an American state, but Gregory disagreed. Gregory noted the acquisition of former Spanish colonies did not negate the "defined constitutional limitations of American law" by permitting the adoption of "monarchical customs."²⁰ Gregory ended his letter with a warning: "Beware! Of the British robbers and murderers. Beware! Of the fate impending that cruel power."²¹ Gregory predicted the

¹⁷ James R. Gregory, "A New Creed," *Wagoner Record*, 10 May 1900, 5.

¹⁸ Bartholomew Sparrow, *The Insular Cases and the Emergence of American Empire* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006), 1-13.

¹⁹ *Indian Journal*, 31 May 1901, 4,

²⁰ James R. Gregory, "Beware of the Breakers," *Wagoner Record*, 24 May 1900, 1.

²¹ *Ibid.*

British Empire would eventually suffer defeat and retribution for its actions. If the United States continued to seek new overseas territories, it too would suffer judgment for its actions.

Gregory called on the United States to recall its heritage and “resume the pure raiments [sic] worthy of the love of the only one and true God,” indicating Gregory viewed American involvement in overseas imperialism as an aberration in United States history.²² However, Gregory did not view the concepts of civilization and progress as necessarily positive. In a poem entitled “Nineteenth Century Finality,” Gregory devoted his first stanza to a description of warfare and empire:

Nineteen hundred and it rains fire and blood,
Fast filling up hell and the grave;
A million lives trampled in gory mud,
They kill to kill—killing to save²³

Gregory’s poem condemned the imperial violence in much of the world, including the Philippine War, the Boer War, and the Boxer Rebellion in China. The stanza cast this violence as arbitrary and capricious as Euro-Americans killed for the sake of killing. The final line of the poem proclaimed, “Science covers [Christ’s] love with shame,” revealing a cynicism regarding the ability of progress and technology to solve humanity’s problems.²⁴ Instead, civilization at the turn of the twentieth century discarded love and compassion in favor of warfare and conquest.

²² James R. Gregory, “A New Creed,” *Wagoner Record*, 10 May 1900, 5.

²³ James Gregory, “Nineteenth Century Finality,” *Wagoner Record*, 9 August 1900, 2.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

One of the main techniques American Indians used to counter the control of the United States was to deny the legitimacy of American claims to morality. Many critiques of Native societies pointed to their supposedly backward or savage nature. Efforts to transform Native societies following Euro-American norms thereby took on the appearance of legitimacy by promising to improve the lives of American Indians. However, if Native people could undermine American claims to superiority, then the United States would lose the moral authority to impose its will. Even if Euro-Americans rejected these critiques of their societies, Native authors voiced their refusal to accept the characterization of their societies as inferior. One Cherokee, who wrote using the penname Cornsilk, discussed issues of morality and spirituality. In explaining his views on philosophical truth, Cornsilk dismissed the ability of most Euro-Americans to reach “high spiritual states,” as these “western barbarians” from “the modern civilized races” were still children in their moral development.²⁵ Cornsilk directly challenged the portrayal of American Indians as children by asserting that Euro-American society was immature.²⁶ Cornsilk took issue with the portrayal of Indian Territory as crime-ridden. Cornsilk rejected this viewpoint and cast external threats to Cherokee sovereignty as greater than any criminal acts committed within the Cherokee Nation. An editorial explained that criminal gangs within Indian Territory paled in comparison “to this invincible band of about fifty thousand white men who have banded together to rob the

²⁵ Cornsilk, “The Holy State of Samadhi,” *Indian Chieftain*, 1 April 1898, 2.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

five civilized tribes.”²⁷ As such, the “armed band of robbers” mentioned in the title of the article were not bandits using the supposed lawlessness of Indian Territory to evade punishment. Instead Euro-Americans who desired Native lands were the true thieves and threats to public safety in Indian Territory.

Cornsilk continued by identifying these “Christian robbers” as “land speculators, railroad syndicates, trade corporations and other robber institutions.”²⁸ According to Cornsilk, these individuals promoted statehood for Indian Territory while hiring men to call for the division of tribal lands. Cornsilk ended his letter by expressing his hope the United States would convert “to the true religion that acknowledges all races of mankind as belonging to the common brotherhood of humanity.”²⁹ Though Cornsilk wrote this particular piece before the United States annexed the Philippines or other heavily-populated overseas territories, many reformers justified federal intervention in Native lives to encourage the adoption of Christianity.³⁰ However, if Euro-Americans were not following “the true religion,” then they had no basis for insisting American Indians abandon their cultures.³¹

William Eubanks, a Cherokee who worked as a translator for the *Cherokee Advocate*, wrote pieces critical of the United States and its treatment of the American

²⁷ Cornsilk, “Another Band of Robbers in the Indian Territory,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 9 January 1895, 2.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Louie Garland, “The Indian ‘Busk Dance,’” *The Baconian* 3, no. 2 (February 1900), 21.

³¹ Cornsilk, “Another Band of Robbers in the Indian Territory,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 9 January 1895, 2.

Indians.³² In April 1901, Eubanks wrote a letter to the *Cherokee Advocate* urging the rejection of a proposed agreement between the Cherokee Nation and the Dawes Commission, the group tasked with negotiating the division of the lands held by the Five Tribes.³³ Through primarily focused on the reasons the Cherokees should vote against the treaty, Eubanks condemned the United States for its efforts to destroy the Cherokee Nation. If the United States persisted in its course, the Americans would repeat the injustice caused by Removal, the forced expulsion of the Cherokees from their homes in the eastern United States. Such an action would stain the nation's honor, but Eubanks hinted more serious repercussions might occur. According to Eubanks, the "goddess of justice" took vengeance on Georgia for its crimes against the Cherokees by permitting General William T. Sherman's invasion of the state during the American Civil War.

³² William Eubanks, born in the Cherokee Nation in 1841, had extensive experience with the Cherokee language as eliminated one symbol from the Cherokee syllabary. Daniel Littlefield Jr. and James W. Parins, *A Biobibliography of Native American Writers, 1772-1924* (Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1981), 237.

³³ William Eubanks, "Destruction of the Cherokee People in 1901," *Cherokee Advocate*, 20 April 1901, 1. The Dawes Commission sought to negotiate deals with the Five Tribes to bring about the allotment of their lands. Allotment referred to the policy adopted under the General Allotment Act, or Dawes Act, of 1887 whereby the federal government divided up tribal landholdings into individualized holdings. Government officials and reformers believed allotment would assimilate and civilize American Indians while opening up additional lands for Euro-American settlement. As the Dawes Act did not apply to the Five Tribes, Congress authorized the creation of the Dawes Commission in 1893 to negotiate allotment. Russel Lawrence Barsh, "Progressive-Era Bureaucrats and the Unity of Twentieth-Century Indian Policy," *American Indian Quarterly* 15, no. 1 (Winter 1991): 2-5; Christine Bolt, *American Indian Policy and American Indian Reform* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1987), 86, 93, 95, 97, 100-101; Michael Coleman, "Problematic Panacea: Presbyterian Missionaries and the Allotment of Indian Lands in the Late Nineteenth Century," *Pacific Historical Review* 54, no. 2 (May 1985): 143-159; Andrew Denson, *Demanding the Cherokee Nation: Indian Autonomy and American Culture, 1830-1900* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004), 232-233; Jill Martin, "Neither Fish, Flesh, Fowl, nor Good Red Herring" The Citizenship Status of American Indians, 1830-1924," in *American Indians and U.S. Politics: A Companion Reader*, ed. John Meyer (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002), 65-67; James Mooney, *Historical Sketch of the Cherokee* (New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction, 2005), 153, 155-156; Morris Wardell, *A Political History of the Cherokee Nation* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1938), 312.

During Sherman's march across the state, Union forces "reduc[ed] to ashes the homes of the Georgians built on the graves of the Cherokees" while "mingling the bones of thousands of [Georgians] with the bones of [the Cherokees they] had murdered."³⁴ According to Eubanks, this destruction was a divine punishment against Georgia for its treatment of the Cherokee people and its refusal to listen to the Cherokees' pleas for mercy. In addition, Eubanks raised the possibility this same sense of justice might castigate the United States for its determination to extirpate the Cherokee Nation. Even if the Cherokees lacked large-standing armies or earthly power, a divine presence would guide human affairs to punish those responsible for wrongdoing.

Eubanks wrote another piece in which he portrayed human history as cyclical. Early in the twentieth century, Eubanks predicted a new golden age was about to begin. During this new age, a savior would appear and guide humanity during a time of "light, peace, and purity."³⁵ This optimistic view sharply contrasted with Eubanks' interpretation of the existing age. The United States and the imperial powers of Europe were representatives of this "black age, ruled by the Dragon Star or the black demon."³⁶ As an example of the darkness of the existing age, Eubanks cited the efforts by the western powers "to dismember, loot, rob and massacre the people of the Chinese empire."³⁷ Eubanks extended these observations to the United States, noting the efforts of the

³⁴ William Eubanks, "Destruction of the Cherokee People in 1901," *Cherokee Advocate*, 20 April 1901, 1.

³⁵ William Eubanks, "The New Age," *Cherokee Advocate*, 19 January 1901, 1.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *Ibid.*

“civilized Christian intruder” to pressure Congress to open Indian Territory to outsiders, obliterate the sovereignty of the Five Tribes, “and in a manner exterminate the [American Indians] in order that their lands may be inherited by the merciful, just and upright Christian of the Dragon Star.”³⁸ Within this context, Eubanks’ reference to Euro-Americans as merciful and just was farcical as his account depicted the efforts to control Native lands as cruel and driven by greed. It is also significant that Eubanks’ two examples were China and Indian Territory as he equated the treatment of American Indians with the treatment of non-European populations abroad.

During this Golden Age, the surviving American Indians would receive praise for “refus[ing] to bend the knee to Belial.”³⁹ Belial was the name of one of the highest-ranking followers of the devil mentioned in the Bible as well as Jewish and Christian apocrypha. In equating American Indian resistance with righteousness, Eubanks thereby associated the United States with hell and the devil’s minions.⁴⁰ Eubanks forecasted a “United Nations” would replace the United States during the golden age of peace.⁴¹ However, given Eubanks’ cyclical view of time, the golden age would not last. During the golden age, people would follow a new holy text, “the interpretation of which will furnish another pretext for the worshippers of the Dragon Star to war and wrangle for

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.

land and loot and deluge the earth with the blood of the innocent.”⁴² Eubanks did not reject Christianity or religion, but he condemned interpretations of religion that permitted the abuse of other human beings. He also understood how Euro-Americans attempted to justify the extension of American power on religious or moral grounds. He sought to promote a more positive view of American Indians by challenging prevailing notions of societal development. In one piece, he wrote an account discussing the origin and early history of American Indians. Eubanks rejected historical theories that described people crossing the land bridge from Asia to North America. Instead, Eubanks pointed to Native stories identifying the Americas as their place of origin. According to Eubanks, some American Indians traveled east across the Atlantic Ocean, constructed Stonehenge, and spread their customs to Greece.⁴³ He also noted linguistic similarities between Cherokee and Hebrew, thereby connecting the Cherokees with the origins of Christianity and Judaism.⁴⁴ The primary accomplishment of Eubanks’ claims was to challenge the view that American Indians were receivers of civilization. Instead, his interpretation cast American Indians as the original authors of western civilization; as such, westerners had little justification for their denigration of Native societies as western accomplishments simply built upon American Indian achievements.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ William Eubanks, “The Red Race,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 12 January 1901, 1-2. An excerpt of this piece appeared in the *Wagoner Record* later that same month. William Eubanks, “Cherokee Legend of the Son of Man,” *Wagoner Record*, 24 January 1901, 3.

⁴⁴ William Eubanks, “Cherokee Philosophy,” *Indian Chieftain*, 3 March 1887, 2.

Another theme in Native writings highlighted the morality of American Indians and the savage nature of Euro-American civilization. For example, Edley Cookson of the Cherokees discussed the burning of living human beings. Cookson conceded that in the past some American Indians groups burned captives taken in war, but insisted these individuals were always warriors. These burnings took place at the same time as the religious wars in Europe. In contrast to the exclusive burning of warriors taken in battle, Europeans, “our present self-appointed guides, philosophers—we could say disinterested friends—tortured men, women, and children.” Cookson did not mention it, but he could have cited lynch mobs in the South that burned their victims to death. In addition, Cookson could have referenced the support that many newspapers in the South provided for lynching as a means of controlling African Americans.⁴⁵

Augustus Ivey, a Cherokee, edited several newspapers during the first decade of the twentieth century, primarily focusing on political issues, such as statehood for Indian Territory. Ivey favored combining Oklahoma and Indian Territory into a single state and chastised those who questioned the capacity of American Indians to govern themselves by accusing them of graft and fraud. Ivey explained that allowing Indian Territory to enter the Union as a separate state would turn the territory into “hell on earth, the rendezvous of sharks, pirates and freebooters from all quarters of the world, who in a

⁴⁵ E. L. Cookson, “Appointed Time,” *Indian Chieftain*, 12 September 1901, 2; Daniel Littlefield, Jr., *Seminole Burning: A Story of Racial Violence* (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1996); Rodger Streitmatter, *Voices of Revolution: The Dissident Press in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 80; Murray Wickett, *Contested Territory: Whites, Native Americans, and African Americans in Oklahoma, 1865-1907* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000), 154.

short time would ‘absorb’ the Indians’ heritage, their lands and their homes.”⁴⁶ Ivey also focused on issues of representation for he lent his support to promoting the creation of an Indian Territory exhibit at the St. Louis World’s Fair of 1904 to highlight the commercial prospects of Indian Territory. He claimed that American Indians rejected the idea of having an exhibit that identified Indian Territory as part of the so-called Wild West, reflecting an understanding of how Euro-Americans perceived native communities.⁴⁷

Ivey critiqued whites who questioned the capabilities of American Indians. In one editorial, he lambasted a white letter writer who complained that Anglo-Saxons would suffer domination from an “inferior” race. Ivey mockingly referred to the “white man’s burden” and asked why this white man even bothered to move to Indian Territory if he had such reservations about living amongst supposedly inferior people. Ivey continued, “The fact is the Cherokee people acknowledge no superiors on the face of the globe, and ‘White Citizen’s’ rot about the inferiority of the Cherokee people only shows that he is of the ‘white trash’ who have drifted in here to marry an Indian to get ‘rights.’”⁴⁸ Ivey continued to defend American Indians after Oklahoma achieved statehood by ridiculing white residents who complained about the presence of American Indians. Ivey explained that whites who thought themselves superior to American Indians should leave if they held such opinions. Ivey argued, “It’s a cinch the Indian never brought them there and we know they are not so stuck on them that they want them to stay, so why don’t they get out

⁴⁶ *Sallisaw Star*, 7 February 1903, 2.

⁴⁷ *Sallisaw Star*, 19 December 1902, 1, 2; *Sallisaw Star*, 23 January 1903, 4; *Sallisaw Star*, 7 February 1903, 2.

⁴⁸ Augustus Ivey, “O, Shame, Where is they Slush?,” *Sallisaw Star*, 27 March 1903, 2.

and go back to Possum Holler or Bosting Mounting or Pole Cat Creek and go back to making moonshine whiskey and they won't be bothered with the Indian."⁴⁹ Ivey thereby cast the whites who objected to the continued presence of American Indians as ignorant and foolish who did not bring "civilization" to Indian Territory but poverty, slothfulness, and alcoholism.

Following the annexation of the Philippines, some Native authors tried to place the Filipinos into an American Indian worldview. For example, Creek writer Charles Gibson related a historical account identifying the Filipinos as the descendents of the Mound Builders. According to Gibson, the Creeks defeated the Mound Builders in battle and drove them to Florida. At this point, the Mound Builders cut down a number of tall cedar trees and used them to create a fleet before departing for the Philippines.⁵⁰ Gibson placed the Filipinos within Creek history to explain their presence in the world. Gibson already knew about the Spanish empire in Latin American and the Caribbean, so the extension of American power in the Caribbean did not require him to reconsider his view of the world. However, the effort to explain the existence of the Filipinos may stem from a need to place them within terms Gibson understood. In a piece printed in the *Cherokee Advocate*, Gibson reiterated these claims and added that some Creeks, Choctaws, and

⁴⁹ *Indian Home and Farm*, 9 July 1910, 2.

⁵⁰ Charles Gibson, "Who are the Philipinos?," *Indian Journal*, 5 April 1901, 4. Gibson was not the only Native writer to identify linguistic connections between Filipinos and American Indians. George Washington Grayson of the Creeks visited Igorots—one of the groups of Filipinos—present at the World's Fair of 1904 in St. Louis in order to attempt to communicate with them. Grayson was unable to prove they understood American Indian languages but hoped scholars would continue the investigation. Claudio Saunt, *Black, White, and Indian: Race and the Unmaking of an American Family* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 184-185.

Cherokees accompanied the Mound Builders on their journey across the ocean, explaining the linguistic similarity between American Indian languages and languages from the Philippines.⁵¹ Gibson may also have identified a connection between the Filipinos and American Indians as he recognized that the inhabitants of the Philippines and American Indians were both targets of American efforts to obliterate their sovereignty.

Another Native writer adopted the penname Poor Lo. He was highly critical of politicians due to their ignorance of Indian Territory. In particular, Poor Lo was dismissive of Senator Morgan of Alabama who complained Oklahoma would be controlled by African Americans and “half breed Indians.”⁵² Morgan also argued the framers of the constitution were whites and “never contemplated giving American citizenship” to non whites.⁵³ Poor Lo criticized Morgan and reminded him that amendments to the constitution had broadened American citizenship even though Poor Lo conceded he too opposed the granting of suffrage to African Americans. However, Poor Lo questioned why Morgan did not have a problem with “Dago[s],” in reference to recent immigrants, from having the vote. Poor Lo concluded his letter by ridiculing Senator Morgan by suggesting “the framers of the constitution never intended that so many freaks should break into the United States Senate.”⁵⁴

⁵¹ Charles Gibson, “Gibson’s Indian Lore,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 20 August 1904, 1.

⁵² Poor Lo, “As Seen by Poor ‘Lo,’” *Indian Journal*, 20 January 1905, 4.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

Though Alex Posey generally limited editorial content during his tenure as the editor of the *Indian Journal*, he included one piece which was certainly pertinent to Euro-American concepts of American Indians.⁵⁵ Posey took issue with an unnamed ethnologist who predicted the disappearance of American Indians. Posey humorously explained that the ethnologist must have received information about “some great unforeseen calamity” that would annihilate American Indians.⁵⁶ Without a major catastrophe, Posey argued the complete destruction of American Indians would be impossible. Instead, Posey speculated the “ethnologist has been going about looking for wigwams, arrowheads and the like and not coming across many such relics, has concluded that the Indian is fast going the way of the dodo.”⁵⁷ Posey thereby critiqued Euro-American society for continuing to rely upon an imagined notion of what Native communities were rather than examining the status and accomplishments of American Indians as they existed.

DeWitt Clinton Duncan, a Cherokee who wrote under the penname Too-qua-stee, wrote extensively at the turn of the twentieth century.⁵⁸ Similar to Eubanks, Duncan compared the American empire overseas to the treatment of American Indians. Duncan undermined the American empire by attacking the United States as a nation driven by greed.⁵⁹ Duncan condemned the actions of the United States in China and the Philippines

⁵⁵ *Indian Journal*, 4 April 1902, 4.

⁵⁶ *Indian Journal*, 14 March 1902, 4.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ For an in-depth analysis of Duncan’s writings, please see chapter 3.

⁵⁹ Too-qua-stee, “Carpetbag Sermon,” *Indian Chieftain*, 6 September 1900, 2; Too-qua-stee, “Imperialism,” *Indian Chieftain*, 9 August 1900, 1; Too-qua-stee, “Truth is Mortal,” *Indian Chieftain*, 7 February 1901, 3.

by comparing American expansion overseas to the treatment of American Indians. Duncan's critiques of the American empire reflected his understanding of how Americans justified their expansion overseas by highlighting their supposed superiority and morality. Rudyard Kipling's poem, "The White Man's Burden" bolstered the arguments of the advocates of empire prompting Duncan to publish his own version of the poem less two months after Kipling's poem appeared in *McClure's*.⁶⁰

Shortly after DeWitt Clinton Duncan wrote "The White Man's Burden," his nephew, John Calhoun Duncan, wrote a poem entitled "The Red Man's Burden."⁶¹ John Duncan's poem echoed many of the sentiments found in his uncle's work, particularly in terms of its chastisement of Euro-American society. While both men challenged the assumptions present in Kipling's work, John Duncan's version was a direct response to Kipling's version of "The White Man's Burden." Structurally, John Duncan mirrored Kipling's work as both poems contained seven eight-line stanzas. John Duncan quoted from Kipling's "The White Man's Burden" in order to recast the meaning of the original poem. For example, in the second stanza, Duncan responded to Kipling's designation of the of the Filipinos as "half-devil and half-child" by retorting, "'Tis better far to be half

⁶⁰ Too-qua-stee, "The White Man's Burden," *Indian Chieftain*, 30 March 1899, 1; Warren Zimmerman, 363-366.

⁶¹ J. C. Duncan, "The Red Man's Burden," *Indian Sentinel*, 30 March 1899, 2. John Duncan's poem appeared in the *Indian Sentinel* the same day DeWitt Clinton Duncan's poem appeared in the weekly *Indian Chieftain*. However, the editor of the *Indian Chieftain* also published the *Daily Chieftain*. DeWitt Clinton Duncan's poem first appeared in the daily version of the paper on 27 March 1899. However, as John Duncan was DeWitt Clinton Duncan's nephew, it is likely they discussed Kipling's poem before each man composed his own response. Littlefield and Parins, *A Biobibliography of Native American Writers, 1772-1924* (Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1981), 46, 48.

child / Than be a devil all.”⁶² In doing so, Duncan attacked the notion of civilization by casting it as evil and connected with the devil. Duncan’s equation of Euro-American society with the devil cast the United States as immoral and worthy of eternal punishment. Within this context, labeling the Filipinos as childlike also implied they were innocent and free from the sins of civilization.

The first six lines of Duncan’s third stanza clearly denounced Rudyard Kipling’s work:

“Behold the white man’s burden
Of gold and silver bullion
Of Redmen’s scalps and broken vows
By hundreds, yes by millions.
Yes ‘fill the mouths of famine’ you,
with Bombshell and with grape⁶³

Within this stanza, Duncan labeled Euro-American society as devoted to the accumulation of wealth while emphasizing the high cost in Native lives of European colonialism. Rather than casting capitalism and the focus on economic development as a virtue, Duncan equated the pursuit of wealth with the deaths of millions of American Indians during the previous four centuries. Kipling’s poem included the line “Fill the mouth of Famine,” but Duncan interpreted the concept far differently. Rather than portraying the creation of an American empire as a means of easing suffering in the world by feeding the hungry, Duncan accused the United States of warring against the weak. As such, there was no glory in the creation of an empire.

⁶² J. C. Duncan, “The Red Man’s Burden,” *Indian Sentinel*, 30 March 1899, 2.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

Though John Duncan responded to Rudyard Kipling's assertions, he also used the poem to mock the United States for its efforts at territorial expansion. In the sixth stanza, Duncan explained the United States government desired to seize the North Pole but lacked an appropriate justification for its annexation. Duncan offered a solution by suggesting the federal government identify the North Pole as "an Indian reservation" in order to legitimize its acquisition.⁶⁴ Duncan's poem revealed his cynicism regarding the American government; though the United States government might hesitate to annex international territory or lands belonging to another powerful country, American leaders would have no qualms in seizing Indian land. Duncan's sarcastic suggestion illustrated two additional points: first, Duncan highlighted his skepticism of the rationale the United States offered for its annexation of the Philippines and other overseas territories; second, Duncan critiqued federal Indian policy by noting how many reservations existed on inhospitable lands. Through the use of hyperbole, Duncan revealed how the federal government expected American Indians to establish farms on lands ill-suited to the task.

In the final stanza, John Duncan offered an alternative course of action to the United States. Rather than taking up the white man's burden, Duncan urged Euro-Americans to return the American Indians' freedom, land, and innocence. In exchange, Euro-Americans could "return to thy British yoks [sic]."⁶⁵ Duncan's final stanza rejected any implication that American Indians benefited from their interaction with Euro-American society. Rather than casting the United States as a protector of liberty, Duncan

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

accused it of taking away the freedoms of American Indians. In addition, Duncan asked the United States to restore innocence to American Indians, implying that Native communities were free of many of the evils of civilization prior to their contact with Europeans. Finally, Duncan's call for the United States to subject itself to British rule identified Euro-Americans as unworthy of self government. Rather than spreading civilization across the globe, Euro-Americans themselves required further tutelage before they earned the right to govern their own affairs. As such, they were unworthy of creating an empire or controlling the lives of colonial populations.

The idea that Native societies derived little benefit from their engagement with Euro-Americans appeared in other writings from American Indian writers. One author, identified only as "Full Blood" explained that when Europeans arrived, "they found the natives generally not only in good physical condition, but strangers to venereal" disease and other maladies.⁶⁶ However, these salubrious conditions did not last, and American Indians soon discovered "their less virtuous visitors" introduced disease and vice. Full Blood concluded the material benefits of European colonization failed to compensate Native societies for the adoption Euro-American vices.⁶⁷ Charles Gibson echoed many of these themes. According to Gibson, American Indians were "stout and robust" while living to "ripe old age" breathing fresh air, drinking clean water, and remaining free of habits injurious to good health.⁶⁸ Gibson noted how civilization deprived American

⁶⁶ "Full Blood," "Continued," *Cherokee Advocate*, October 26, 1892, 1.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ Charles Gibson, "How the Mighty have Fallen," *Indian Journal*, 31 October 1902, 2.

Indians of their “glory” and perceived Native customs as “savagery.”⁶⁹ Euro-Americans identified harmless celebrations as ghost dances, labeled traditional games as savage customs, and punished American Indians severely for drinking even small amounts of alcohol.⁷⁰

Gibson viewed education as critical to the future of American Indians. He believed these schools spent too much time focusing on memorization rather than learning. Gibson argued schools in the Creek Nation simply taught the students to parrot English rather than understanding the meaning of the words.⁷¹ Gibson identified education reforms as crucial, as the only way “to stay the hand of our enemy” involved seizing “the education that is offered to you to fight back with.”⁷² The appropriation of Euro-American tools would permit American Indians to defend their communities against further encroachments.

Gibson harshly denounced aspects of Euro-American society, particularly its treatment of American Indians. To Euro-Americans, American Indians were “like a stray horse—everybody is wanting to use [them].”⁷³ Gibson thereby attacked Euro-Americans for denying the humanity of American Indians and viewing them as mere objects. To further this point, Gibson drew upon biblical concepts of humanity: “God made man in

⁶⁹ Charles Gibson, “His Glory Gone,” *Indian Journal*, 16 August 1901, 4.

⁷⁰ Charles Gibson, “His Glory Gone,” *Indian Journal*, 16 August 1901, 4; Charles Gibson, “Passing of the Indian’s Religion,” *Indian Journal*, 1 August 1902, 2.

⁷¹ Charles Gibson, “Education of the Indian,” *Indian Journal*, 4 April 1902, 1. Charles Gibson, “The Indian Schools,” *Indian Journal*, 13 September 1901, 7; *Indian Journal*, 13 September 1901, 4.

⁷² Charles Gibson, “An Indian Advises the Indians,” *Indian Journal*, 17 October 1902, 8.

⁷³ Charles Gibson, “Passing of the Indian’s Religion,” *Indian Journal*, 1 August 1902, 2.

his own image; is not an Indian built like other men?"⁷⁴ Gibson noted the common humanity of Euro-Americans and American Indians to challenge whites regarding their antipathy for Native rights. In continuing his biblical allusions, Gibson cast Euro-Americans as Pharaoh. The ruler of Egypt hardened his heart and refused to listen to Moses' pleas for justice and mercy on behalf of the Israelites. The biblical story recounted the ten plagues God sent against Egypt to punish it for its sins. Gibson questioned Euro-American readers and wondered whether they wanted American Indians to tell God about the abuses they suffered at the hands of the United States after they vanished from the Earth.⁷⁵

These strong positions seem contradictory as Gibson also embraced themes employed by Euro-American critics of American Indians. The *Cherokee Advocate*, the official publication of the Cherokee government, rebuked Gibson for writing stories critical of American Indians. Gibson also employed the theme of the dying Indian in his writing.⁷⁶ However Gibson's strategy was logical if one considers these stories and jokes at Native expense as a means of securing the sympathy of Euro-American readers. When addressing other American Indians, Gibson asserted the need for Native communities to protect themselves. Though he certainly wanted Euro-Americans to recognize the error of their ways, he also wanted to assure they viewed American Indians in non-threatening ways.

⁷⁴ Charles Gibson, "The Passing of the Indian," *Indian Journal*, 3 January 1902, 1.

⁷⁵ Charles Gibson, "The Passing of the Indian," *Indian Journal*, 3 January 1902, 1.

⁷⁶ Charles Gibson, "The Old Haunts by Moonlight," *Indian Journal*, 7 February 1902, 1.

The experience of American Indians in dealing with the American empire drove some members of the Five Tribes to consider leaving the country to escape the United States and its control over their lives. Charles Gibson examined the reasons many American Indians desired to depart the United States for Mexico or South America. Gibson described Mexico as a country where American Indians could “regain [their] manhood” and preserve their culture.⁷⁷ In addition, Gibson wrote about Mexico as a land “it is always summer” and American Indians could live in peace away from the a maddening crowd of office seekers and land sharks and land grabbers.”⁷⁸ Though Gibson himself did not plan to move to Mexico or South America, he revealed why the idea of leaving the United States appealed to American Indians as relocating offered the promise of escaping a government intent upon requiring American Indians to submit to Euro-American norms.⁷⁹

Jacque T. Little, self-identified as one-fourth Cherokee, wrote to the *Indian Journal* as he claimed to have a friend in South America who knew of land that was “absolutely unexplored and that land there is as fine as any on earth” while having abundant fruit and game.⁸⁰ Little also boasted that “a man with a gun and fishing tackle need be in no danger of starvation in that county.”⁸¹ Little then insisted that “all Indians

⁷⁷ Charles Gibson, “The Indian is Dissatisfied,” *Indian Journal*, 26 February 1909, 8.

⁷⁸ Charles Gibson, “The Promised Land,” *Indian Journal*, 26 September 1902, 8.

⁷⁹ Charles Gibson, “The Indian is Dissatisfied,” *Indian Journal*, 26 February 1909, 8.

⁸⁰ Jacque T. Little, “Good Country for Indians,” *Indian Journal*, 22 May 1908, 1.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

who have the welfare of their race at heart should be interested in the project,” and expressed interest in corresponding with interested parties.⁸² The lack of specific details regarding the price of land or its location raises questions about the veracity of Little’s claims. Many of the emigration plans were in fact schemes designed to rob culturally conservative Indians. After allotment, plans to relocate to Mexico or elsewhere failed as restrictions placed on the lands of these Indians prevented them from selling their property to raise the necessary funds for leaving the United States.⁸³ However, the interest in leaving the United States demonstrated how many American Indians sought to continue their preferred manner of living by putting themselves beyond the reach of the United States government.

American Indians also participated in the creation of the American empire overseas. A number of them volunteered for the Spanish American War or the Philippine War. Letters from these volunteer soldiers occasionally appeared within newspapers from Indian Territory such as the *Muskogee Phoenix*.⁸⁴ Newspapers reprinted letters from local residents in order to provide eyewitness accounts and potentially stimulate sales to friends and relatives of the authors. In some cases, it is not clear whether the letter writers were American Indian, but their views help to demonstrate the range of viewpoints

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Daniel Littlefield Jr., “Utopian Dreams of the Cherokee Fullbloods: 1890-1934,” *Journal of the West* 10 (1971), 411-421.

⁸⁴ Henry P. Adams, Letter, *Muskogee Phoenix*, 1 September 1898, 1; Joe Dannenberg, Letter, *Muskogee Phoenix*, 1 September 1898, 1; Eugene Gilmore, Letter, *Muskogee Phoenix*, 14 July 1898, 1; Eugene Gilmore, Letter, *Muskogee Phoenix*, 21 July 1898, 1; Frank McElreath, letter, *Muskogee Phoenix*, 11 August 1898, 1; Tom Meagher, Letter, *Muskogee Phoenix*, 14 July 1898, 1; Thomas Meagher, Letter, *Muskogee Phoenix*, 21 July 1898, 1; George Seaver, Letter, *Muskogee Phoenix*, 21 July 1898, 1; Theodore Stidham, Letter, 14 July 1898, 1; Claud Thompson, Letter, *Muskogee Phoenix*, 11 August 1898, 1.

available to American Indians reading these publications.⁸⁵ Similar to newspapers from other parts of the country, publications in Indian Territory emphasized the activities of units raised locally.⁸⁶

Some of the letters included a discussion of the racial status of the Filipinos, Chinese, Cubans, or Puerto Ricans. For example, the *Tahlequah Arrow* printed a letter from a Cherokee named George Candy in August 1900. In this letter, Candy repeatedly referred to the Filipinos that his unit fought as “niggers.”⁸⁷ The only other term Candy used in reference to the Filipinos was “blacks,” indicating that he identified a close racial connection between African Americans and Filipinos.⁸⁸ Candy noted that the Filipinos hit his unit’s commanding officer early in the fight, explaining “You know they shoot at an officer first of all.”⁸⁹ This description of Filipino tactics echoed earlier Euro-American

⁸⁵ Otto Kirkbride, letter, *Tahlequah Arrow*, 4 August 1900, 4; George W. Meeker, “From the Philippines,” *Indian Chieftain*, 1 March 1900, 1.

⁸⁶ Ed Culver Returns, “*Muskogee Phoenix*, 18 August 1898, 1; “More Territory Soldiers,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 28 July 1898, 1; “Our Volunteers,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 12 May 1898, 1; “The Soldier Boys,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 19 May 1898, 1.

⁸⁷ George Candy, “A Cherokee Boy in Luzon,” *Tahlequah Arrow*, 4 August 1900, 4. The transference of derogatory terms from African Americans to Filipinos occurred with regularity in the writings of American soldiers in the Philippines. For example, a collection of writings published by the Anti-Imperialist League contained multiple references to Filipinos as “niggers.” Additional letters expressed satisfaction at the opportunity to kill Filipinos while comparing them to monkeys. Soldiers who questioned the wisdom of annexing the Philippines seldom revealed sympathy for the Filipinos. Instead, many of these critics saw the supposed uncivilized nature of the Filipinos as proof that the United States should not associate itself with the archipelago. Anti-Imperialist League, *Soldiers’ Letters: Being Material for the History of a War of Criminal Aggression*, (Boston: Anti-Imperialist League, 1899), 1, 11, 13, 18; Gatewood, 197-199, 281; Richard B. Meixsel, “Camp Stotsenburg and The Army Experience in the Philippines: A Brief History,” *Bulletin of the American Historical Collection* 22, no. 3 (1994): 5-36; Natalie Ring, “Inventing the Tropical South: Race, Region, and the Colonial Model,” *Mississippi Quarterly* 56, no. 4. (2003): 619-631; Steffi San Buenaventura, “The Colors of Manifest Destiny: Filipinos and the American Other(s),” *Amerasia* 24, no. 3 (1998): 1-26.

⁸⁸ George Candy, 4.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

critiques of Indians for refusing to adhere to western-style warfare.⁹⁰ Candy did not note the irony in his comment or consider whether or not the tactic helped to achieve victories. Towards the end of his letter, Candy compared the Filipinos to animals, writing, “these niggers are just like the deer; you have to shoot them so full of lead that they can’t walk before you kill them.”⁹¹ Candy proudly described how not one of the Filipinos killed in a previous engagement escaped the bayonet.⁹²

Candy’s views echoed those voiced by other soldiers from Indian Territory. T. W. Streetman of the Thirty-Eighth Volunteer Regiment referred to “running the niggers out of the trenches,” while noting “I am positive I killed two this day and am very proud of it.”⁹³ As for the war itself, Candy did not express a clear viewpoint in this particular letter. However, he was pessimistic about the prospects of an early peace, noting, “Tell those boys who tried to enlist and failed, they had better thank their lucky stars. I think we will have scrapping here five years from now.”⁹⁴ Candy’s ambivalent statement about his experience in the war indicated that those who could not join the volunteer units avoided a difficult fight. Fred B. Duncan of the Thirty-Second United States Volunteer Infantry expressed confidence the war would end soon in a letter published at the end of

⁹⁰ Patrick Malone, *The Skulking Way of War: Technology and Tactics among the New England Indians* (New York: Madison Books, 1991), 17-24.

⁹¹ George Candy, 4.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ T. W. Streetman, “From the Philippine Islands,” *Indian Citizen*, 24 May 1900, 8.

⁹⁴ George Candy, 4.

1899 (written in late October 1899), but he too may have mistaken the shift to guerilla warfare. Fred Duncan spent most of the letter discussing the trip and the poor quality of the food and noted it compared poorly to the food available at “the Seminary.”⁹⁵

Ben Colbert, a Chickasaw, served with the Rough Riders. However, Colbert expressed contradictory views of the Cubans. A letter he mailed home appeared in the *Indian Citizen* from Atoka. In this letter, Colbert noted that after arriving in Cuba, he “lost all faith in the Cubans; they are a fraud.”⁹⁶ He expressed some compassion for their level of poverty but he blamed Cubans for the disappearance of a number of his possessions. The letter also expressed gratitude for the Spanish surrender of Santiago as he did not relish the “slaughter” that awaited the city’s continued resistance, indicating he had some level of compassion for the Spanish soldiers he fought.⁹⁷ Yet, in Colbert’s personal diary, he did not make any derogatory remarks about the Cubans. Instead, he consistently wrote about his concern for their wellbeing and their extreme poverty and hunger. Though he mentioned the loss of his belongings in his journal, he did not assign blame to the Cubans or anyone else. He also eschewed negative portrayals of African

⁹⁵ Fred B. Duncan, “From the Philippines,” *Indian Chieftain*, 7 December 1899, 2. This likely referred to the Cherokee Male Seminary.

⁹⁶ Ben Colbert, “A Letter from Santiago,” *Indian Citizen*, 4 August 1898, 4; Michelle Cooke, “Benjamin H. Colbert: Legacy of a Chickasaw Rough Rider,” *Journal of Chickasaw History and Culture* 11, no. 3 (Fall 2008): 32-46.

⁹⁷ Colbert, “A Letter from Santiago,” 4.

Americans as he described sharing a blanket with an African American soldier on the battlefield during a rainstorm.⁹⁸

William Oskison, a Cherokee and brother of writer John Oskison, was a member of the Thirty-Third United States Volunteer Infantry in the Philippines. In his account of his journey to the Philippines, he wrote, “Manila is a very interesting place, but it is very dirty, ugly, and filthy.”⁹⁹ Ed Halsell wrote two letters critical of the Chinese and the Filipinos that appeared in the *Indian Chieftain*. In a letter describing his stay in China, Halsell argued that people could survive in unsanitary conditions as “the Chinamen would all be dead” otherwise.¹⁰⁰ Halsell did not provide a positive view of other aspects of China as he explained “The filth, superstition and ignorance in China is something awful to see.”¹⁰¹ A second letter described the Filipinos as thieves.¹⁰² Halsell predicted further fighting in the Philippines as “there are not many men in the city now but lots of women and children, so I think Uncle Sam’s boys will have a good many to kill yet.”¹⁰³ Though Halsell traveled across the Pacific, he expressed little interest in doing so again as it was “hardly worth the effort.”¹⁰⁴ Yet, other soldiers from Indian Territory advocated

⁹⁸ Diary, "The Experiences Of A Redman With Roosevelt And The Rough Riders" By Ben Colbert. Spanish American War Collection, #82.66 Oklahoma Historical Society Research Division, Oklahoma City, 22, 33-34, 35-36, 42-44.

⁹⁹ William Oskison, “A Soldier’s Letter,” *Indian Chieftain*, 14 December 1899, 6.

¹⁰⁰ Ed Halsell, “No Likee Chinees,” *Indian Chieftain*, 14 December 1899, 5.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

¹⁰³ Ed Halsell, “Another Letter,” *Indian Chieftain*, 14 December 1899, 5.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

the retention of the archipelago. G. H. Seaver of the Thirty-Third Volunteer Infantry sent a letter to the *Indian Sentinel*. Seaver predicted that if the American soldiers present in the archipelago could vote on the issue, the Philippines would become a state. Seaver's view is noteworthy as he excluded the opinions of the Filipinos in favor of the relatively small number of American soldiers in the archipelago.¹⁰⁵

At least one American Indian tried to make a career for himself in the Philippines. A Creek Indian, Washington Grayson, received a commission in the Philippine constabulary service in 1903 following his graduation from the West Texas military academy of San Antonio, Texas.¹⁰⁶ Grayson's father, George Washington Grayson, took pride in his son's successful destruction of Filipino criminal organizations.¹⁰⁷ By 1909, Grayson had received promotion to the rank of captain. While on leave, Grayson visited his home, participated in a naming ceremony held at Eufaula, Oklahoma, and received a war name, Cahtea Tus-tun-uggee.¹⁰⁸ Consequently, Grayson was able to use the American empire in order to gain prestige within his Native culture.¹⁰⁹

American Indian students at boarding schools also addressed issues pertaining to the American empire even as white administrators and teachers edited and filtered student

¹⁰⁵ G. H. Seavers, "The Philippine Islands," *Indian Sentinel*, 31 March 1900, 3.

¹⁰⁶ The *Indian Journal* gave Grayson's first name as Washie, but this was a nickname. "Green Corn Dance Held this Week," *Indian Journal*, 16 July 1909, 1. "Green Corn Dance Held this Week," *Indian Journal*, 16 July 1909, 1.

¹⁰⁷ Saunt, 185.

¹⁰⁸ The short article did not make it clear if Grayson authorized the publication of his ceremonial name or if the paper had done so without his permission.

¹⁰⁹ "Worth Knowing About," *Indian's Friend* 16, no. 2 (October 1903), 8.

material to eliminate ideas inconsistent with the goal of advancing civilization. An examination of these papers frequently turns up examples of blatant censorship and outright fabrications.¹¹⁰ Boarding school publications, such as the *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower*, focused upon the need for American Indians to assimilate or acquire an education focused on manual training and agriculture. The magazine frequently republished articles from other publications covering such issues as the potential for American Indians to succeed in various industries, or the necessity of preventing American Indians from returning to their reservations, even at the cost of separating these individuals from their families.¹¹¹ The *Stock Grower* and other boarding school publications derided American Indians for questioning the morality of civilization. For

¹¹⁰ For example, the *Indian Guide* from Wyoming occasionally carried letters that students wrote. In one issue, the *Indian Guide* included letters that students wrote about their likes and dislikes, claiming that the paper included the uncorrected original. Every single letter started with the sentence "I like to go to school." In several cases, this was the only grammatically correct sentence in the entire letter, suggesting that this example of supposedly original student represented students copying the start of the letter from the board. These observations fit into many larger studies of American Indian education and boarding schools. Jacqueline Fear-Segal, *White Man's Club: Schools, Race, and the Struggle of Indian Acculturation* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007); "Little Pupil's Letters," *Indian Guide* (June 1896): 4; K. Tsianina Lomawaima and Teresa McCarty, *To Remain an Indian: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education* (New York: Teacher's College, 2006); Francis Prucha, *The Churches and the Indian Schools, 1888-1912* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979); Clifford Trafzer, Jean Keller, and Lorence Sisquoc, *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007); Carol Ward, *Native Americans in the School System: Family, Community, and Academic Achievement* (New York: Altamira Press, 2005).

¹¹¹ "Aboriginal Handicrafts," *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* 4, no. 6 (April 1904): 309-310; William Brown, "Indians Who are Helping Themselves," *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* 4, no. 6 (April 1904), 291-295; "The Canada Indian Problem," *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* (December 1903), 103; "Chief Joseph Was a Great Indian," *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* 5, no. 1 (December 1904); 37-39; "Good advice to the Indian," *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* (December 1903), 110; "Indian Schools of the North," *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* 4, no. 1 (December 1903): 82; "The Last Act of a Great Drama," *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* 4, no. 3 (January 1904), 153-154; W. J. McGee, "Model Indian School at St. Louis," *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* 4, no. 5 (March 1904), 245-246; E. L. Miller, "The Red Man as a Printer," *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* 4, no. 5 (March 1904), 242-244; "Nun-sah-tun-kah, Chief of the Osages," *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* (December 1903), 104; "The Passing Indian," *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* 5, no. 1 (December 1904): 25.

example, in March of 1902, the *Stock Grower* reprinted a letter that Harry Kohpay, an Osage, originally published in the *Osage Journal*. In the letter, Kohpay critiqued reservation life, comparing it to living in prison. Kohpay explained that these conditions made it difficult for American Indians to achieve equality with whites. The *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* chastised Kohpay for not doing enough on his own to improve conditions on the reservation.¹¹²

Boarding school publications exhibited greater enthusiasm for students whose work buttressed the assumptions of Euro-American civilization and empire. For example, the *Indian Leader*, published at the Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas, published letters from William Pollock, a Pawnee and former student from the school who joined the Rough Riders and worked as an orderly for Colonel Theodore Roosevelt. In the published letter, Pollock made few references to the Cubans themselves but he noted that would finally “get to see civilized people fight against barbarians as they term Spaniards.” Pollock saw his experience as unique as he identified himself as the only “full-blooded Indian” in his unit. The *Indian Leader* exhibited particular pride after Theodore Roosevelt lauded Pollock with praises.¹¹³

The *Indian Leader* printed other stories that provided updates on former students who volunteered to fight for the United States. For example, the paper reprinted a story from the *Kansas City Star* in which Henry Meagher, another member of the Rough

¹¹² *Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower* (March 1902): 86-88.

¹¹³ *Indian Leader*, 1 October 1898, 4; “Our Hero,” *Indian Leader*, September 1898, 2; William Pollock, “From a ‘Rough Rider,’” *Indian Leader*, September 1898, 4; William Pollock, “An Interesting Letter,” *Indian Leader*, July 1898, 1.

Riders, described the Battle of San Juan Hill and explained how he made his way to the hospital after a Spanish soldier shot him.¹¹⁴ In September of 1898, both Meagher and Pollock visited Haskell. Neither seemed particularly willing to speak about their experiences in the Spanish-American war though Meagher agreed to answer questions. Pollock briefly discussed the seriousness of war, thereby indicating that witnessing some of his fellow soldiers die may have had a lasting impact. Yet, Pollock also joked about the marksmanship of the Spanish soldiers, thereby repeating some of his earlier scorn for his opponents.¹¹⁵

In 1899, William Pollock died of pneumonia and the *Indian Leader* printed further praise of the former student. The paper described Pollock's Christian faith and cited it as one of the prime reasons for Pollock's "manly, courteous, and obedient" nature.¹¹⁶ The subsequent issue ran a front-page biography on the life of William Pollock. The biography mentioned that part of Pollock's reasons for joining the Rough Riders consisted of the opportunity it presented for Pollock to represent his race. The paper traced the fatal illness to Pollock's time in Cuba though the biography mentioned that Pollock had suffered earlier health problems that hampered his ability to pursue an artistic career. Following Pollock's death, the citizens of Pawnee raised funds to build a

¹¹⁴ "One of Our Indian Soldiers," *Indian Leader*, August 1898, 2.

¹¹⁵ "Our Honored Guests," *Indian Leader*, 1 October 1898, 2.

¹¹⁶ "William Pollock," *Indian Leader*, 15 March 1899, 3.

memorial to him. Upon the completion of the monument, the cemetery association planned to move Pollock's body from the portion reserved for Indians.¹¹⁷

The students at Haskell exhibited an awareness of the expansion of United States power overseas. At the end of the school year in 1898, Paul Armstrong wrote a class prophecy indicating what the future held for each graduating student. Several of the predictions identified students as future ministers, teachers, and housewives. Yet, the Paul Armstrong predicted that John Merriss would serve as mayor of Manila and Frank Jones would link Florida to Cuba with a "sub-marine railway."¹¹⁸ The connections that Armstrong drew to the Philippines and Cuba indicated that students at Haskell conceived of a future in which the United States would retain its overseas empire. The following year, the *Indian Leader* carried a piece that identified the continued need for skilled labor within the United States but also within its newly acquired colonies, thereby suggesting that American Indians might find opportunities within the American empire.¹¹⁹

Students at Haskell also used the events of 1898 in their academic work. In the oratorical contest of 1898, Elijah Skyman gave a speech entitled "True Greatness" that referenced the sinking of the battleship *Maine*.¹²⁰ Skyman mentioned that the following

¹¹⁷ "Rough Riders' Monument," *Indian Leader*, 6 October 1899, 4; "William Pollock," *Indian Leader*, 1 April 1899, 1, 4. Yet the *Indian Leader* did not limit its veneration of former students to soldiers. The paper printed a biography of a former student named Johnnie who fell ill and passed away while in his mid teens. The biography emphasized Johnnie's Christian faith while describing his participation in one of the World's Fairs. The biography also mentioned orations that Johnnie gave in which he lauded the benefits of "civilization" and urged American Indians to abandon their older forms of living.¹¹⁷ "Johnnie," *Indian Leader*, 25 May 1900, 1, 4.

¹¹⁸ *Indian Leader*, July 1898, 2.

¹¹⁹ James Balmer, "The Advantages of Skilled Labor," *Indian Leader*, 1 July 1899, 2.

¹²⁰ "Oratorical Contest," *Indian Leader*, May 1898, 4.

day, thirty wealthy men gathered at a New York hotel to raise relief funds for the survivors. Skyman did not praise this effort as the men were drunk. According to Skyman, “For two hours wine flowed freely and the feast itself was like the orgies in the lowest decadence of Rome.”¹²¹ Skyman emphatically stressed that the United States must not honor these actions above those of those who died or the thousands who stepped forward to volunteer for war.¹²² It was significant that Skyman, an American Indian, delivered a speech chastising Euro-American men for failing to live up to standards of morality and conduct. Skyman’s critique indicated that prestige and power within Euro-American society did not necessarily equate with civilized behavior.

A letter from James Nairn showed further examples of a complex relationship with civilization. Nairn predicted that American Indians would soon receive citizenship within the United States and “be brought into unrestricted competition with white people.”¹²³ Nairn acknowledged that American Indians needed to work hard to prepare for the coming challenges that this competition would bring. However, Nairn rejected the idea that the residents of Indian Territory lacked accomplishments of their own, for he noted that when the members of the Five Tribes arrived following Indian Removal, they built up the territory from nothing. Nairn raised this point to indicate that American Indians did not face certain extinction even as he placed their accomplishments within the

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ James Nairn, *Indian Leader*, 1 January 1899, 2.

framework of progress.¹²⁴ American Indian students at boarding schools encountered Euro-American racial expectations on a daily basis, but American Indians also interacted with prevailing racial beliefs within the political realm.

As Oklahoma's statehood neared, both Republicans and Democrats sought to garner Native support by casting their respective parties as the true friends of the American Indians while blaming all of the abuses upon their opponents.¹²⁵ Democratic-affiliated newspapers ran editorials and political cartoons warning readers that the Republican Party would prevent the extension of segregation to Oklahoma. These racial pleas did not exclude American Indians. A political cartoon from the *Indian Journal* included a caption which read "The democracy favors laws providing for separate schools, separate coaches and separate rooms for the negro race. The democratic party will lift the Indian and the white race to a plane above that to which it has fallen under republican rule."¹²⁶ In the cartoon, a black man sat next to a white woman on a train.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ For example, Alice Robertson and Paul Scarron debated each other through the pages of the *Muskogee Democrat*. Scarron encouraged American Indians to vote for the Democratic Party by blaming all of Indian Territory's problems on the Republican Party. Interestingly, Scarron also referenced the overseas empire by noting how the Republicans spent millions to the "negroes of Cuba" while depriving the Five Tribes of their lands and independence. Alice Robertson countered Scarron by insisting that all of the abuses the Five Tribes suffered came at the hands of the Democratic Party. In particular, she noted the policy of Removal from the 1830s that led to the expulsion of the Five Tribes from the eastern United States. She also countered Scarron's criticism of the Republicans for their post-Civil War policies by noting that Andrew Johnson, a Democrat, was president at the time. Scarron attempted to justify Removal by conceding it tragic outcome but casting the policy as inevitable, thereby absolving the Democrats of culpability. Alice M. Robertson, *Muskogee Democrat*, 27 September 1904, 1; Alice Robertson, "Relinquishes the Field," *Muskogee Democrat*, 29 September 1904, 1; Paul Scarron, "Additional Data," *Muskogee Democrat*, 30 September 1904, 1; Paul Scarron, "Civilizing the Indians," *Muskogee Democrat*, 1 October 1904, 1; Paul Scarron, "In Words That Burn," *Muskogee Democrat*, 26 September 1904, 1; Paul Scarron, "Paul Scarron Replies," *Muskogee Democrat*, 28 September 1904.

¹²⁶ *Indian Journal*, 31 August 1906, 2; *Indian Journal*, 5 October 1906, 4; *Indian Journal*, 19 Oct 1906, 2; Richard B. Meixsel, "Camp Stotsenburg and The Army Experience in the Philippines: A Brief

While the white woman held her infant child, the black man openly smoked a cigar in her presence.

These appeals to racial prejudice against African Americans were significant for their inclusion of American Indians as a privileged racial group within the new state of Oklahoma. However, these appeals were not solely the creation of white Democratic Party spokesmen seeking to bolster their chances of victory. Native writers also endorsed the Democratic Party and drew upon racial arguments in order to attract support. Lena Adair, a Cherokee, wrote a campaign song in 1907 to support the Democratic Party. In this song, Adair promised that Democratic control of Oklahoma would wrest power from carpetbaggers and would “fix the Jim Crow,” meaning the state would adopt segregation laws and limit African American suffrage. A later verse reinforced this line by describing what Democratic control of the new state would bring, “for the Coon we’ll have the separate Coach and School.”¹²⁷

Lena Adair identified the allies of the Republican Party as “Corporations, Coons and Carpet baggers.”¹²⁸ The term carpetbagger highlighted the influence of Southern thought in the new state of Oklahoma as the word carried negative connotations due to Reconstruction. American Indian writers regularly used the term to refer to federal officials imposing their will on Native communities and rejecting the desires of

History,” *Bulletin of the American Historical Collection* 22, no. 3 (1994): 5-36; Steffi San Buenaventura, “The Colors of Manifest Destiny: Filipinos and the American Other(s),” *Amerasia* 24, no. 3 (1998): 1-26; “Should be Democrats,” *Indian Journal*, 7 September 1906, 1.

¹²⁷ Lena Adair, “A Campaign Song,” *Muskogee Times Democrat*, 27 August 1907, 5.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

inhabitants of Indian Territory to manage their own affairs.¹²⁹ Adair's reference to corporations reflected public fears about monopolies and the control large corporations exerted over the lives of American citizens and the American government. Within this context, it was significant that Adair identified African Americans as one of the three most important problems for the new state legislature to address. Adair thereby argued Oklahoma needed to exclude, control, and supervise African Americans as they allegedly represented a dire threat to the state equivalent to the dangers posed by syndicates and political corruption.

The last verse of the song revealed Adair's vision of the racial hierarchy of Oklahoma: "White and Indian rule must ever be our watch-word / To its enemies we'll never, never yield."¹³⁰ Adair identified Euro-Americans and American Indians as the co-rulers of Oklahoma, thereby granting Native peoples a position of equality. The song did not identify Republicans as individuals with different views on policies. Instead, the song called on American Indians and whites to remain united against their "enemies." If American Indians failed to vote for the Republicans, Adair warned they would lose their equality with whites.

In 1906, the Oklahoma Democratic Committee published a short book entitled *Prominent Indians' Views of the Political Parties of the Day. Showing the Abuses the Indian has received at the Hands of the Republican Party*. This document included

¹²⁹ E. L. Cookson, "Appointed Time," *Indian Chieftain*, 12 September 1901, 2; E. L. Cookson, "Real Indian Sentiment," *Indian Journal*, 4 October 1901, 6; "The Sixth of November," *Indian Journal*, 26 October 1900, 3; George Tucker, "Will Vote with the Democrats," *Tahlequah Arrow*, 18 August 1906, 3; "We Want Home Rule," *Indian Sentinel*, 25 May 1900, 2.

¹³⁰ Adair, 5; Wickett, 180.

statements from a number of American Indian leaders explaining the reasons why American Indians should support the Democratic Party. Many of the statements blamed Republicans for the economic conditions facing Indian Territory. Several of the writers attacked the Republicans for the treatment the Five Tribes received after the Civil War.¹³¹ Thomas Hunter of the Choctaw criticized the Republican Party for defeating the Sequoyah Movement, the effort to create a separate state for Indian Territory rather than combining it with Oklahoma.¹³²

Many of the writers in the pamphlet attacked the Republican Party allegedly favoring of African Americans over American Indians. These critiqued attempted to promote American Indian support for the Democratic Party by pointing out how the Republican Party hurt Native interests by catering to African Americans. Green McCurtain attacked Secretary Hitchcock for “enrolling negro babies,” as he believed “these children have no rights, [but Hitchcock] arbitrarily forces them on us, taking thousands of dollars of our money without let or hindrance from any source.”¹³³ Green McCurtain referred to the inclusion of the children of freedmen on the Dawes Roll, as this entitled these individuals to a share of the Choctaw Nation’s resources. D.C.

¹³¹ C. D. Carter, “Some Chickasaw History,” *Prominent Indians’ Views of the Political Parties of the Day. Showing the Abuses the Indian has received at the Hands of the Republican Party* ([Oklahoma]: Oklahoma Democratic Committee, 1906), 19-20; Green McCurtain, “The Choctaw Vs. Republicanism” *Prominent Indians’ Views of the Political Parties of the Day. Showing the Abuses the Indian has received at the Hands of the Republican Party*, 3-7; Robert Owen, “A Rebuke to Republicanism,” *Prominent Indians’ Views of the Political Parties of the Day. Showing the Abuses the Indian has received at the Hands of the Republican Party*, 35.

¹³² Thomas Hunter, “Republican Misrule,” *Prominent Indians’ Views of the Political Parties of the Day. Showing the Abuses the Indian has received at the Hands of the Republican Party*, 9.

¹³³ Green McCurtain, “The Choctaw Vs. Republicanism” *Prominent Indians’ Views of the Political Parties of the Day. Showing the Abuses the Indian has received at the Hands of the Republican Party*, 5.

McCurtain wrote, “The Republican party, the boasted friend (?) of the Indian people, would and did take the Indian’s property without compensation and give it to the negroes.”¹³⁴ George W. Burris, a Chickasaw, claimed African Americans “must be taught to love ‘the grand old party’ though it be at the expense of the Indians.”¹³⁵ Burris accused the Republican Party of using the lands and resources of the Five Tribes to purchase the support of African American voters.

In recounting the Civil War, Charles D. Carter, a Chickasaw, noted the Republican Party tried to force the Chickasaws to adopt their freedmen “under the vain delusion that the negro would be elevated instead of the Indian degraded.”¹³⁶ Carter’s accusation against the Republican Party cast African Americans as inferiors to American Indians and depicted contact between African Americans and American Indians as deleterious to Native communities. As such, Carter’s arguments attempted to bolster support for the Democratic Party and segregation. Carter also asked readers, “Will you vote for the man who has attempted to debase your manhood and degrade you to the level of your former slave, who has saddled a negro on the back of every Indian of the five

¹³⁴ D. C. McCurtain, *Prominent Indians’ Views of the Political Parties of the Day. Showing the Abuses the Indian has received at the Hands of the Republican Party*, 13.

¹³⁵ George W. Burris, “The Views of a Chickasaw,” *Prominent Indians’ Views of the Political Parties of the Day. Showing the Abuses the Indian has received at the Hands of the Republican Party*, 27.

¹³⁶ C. D. Carter, “Some Chickasaw History,” *Prominent Indians’ Views of the Political Parties of the Day. Showing the Abuses the Indian has received at the Hands of the Republican Party*, 20. Charles Carter was a democrat who previously served as superintendent of Chickasaw schools in 1897. He later served in the United States Congress as a congressman from Oklahoma. Emmett Starr, *Encyclopedia of Oklahoma* (Claremore, Oklahoma: Emmet Starr, 1912; reprint, Lawton, Oklahoma: Histree, 1980), 25.

civilized tribes?”¹³⁷ Due to the usage of the word “your,” Carter’s question carried the assumption that readers of his piece owned slaves. Though the majority of members of the Five Tribes did not own slaves, Carter’s specificity revealed that he focused his attention on wealthier Chickasaws. Carter presumed these individuals would be more likely to participate in electoral politics. Carter’s question also depicted African Americans as a burden, thereby bolstering his presentation of their presence as damaging to the interests of American Indians.¹³⁸

Though the Seminoles integrated their freedmen to a greater extent than the other members of the Five Tribes, the pamphlet also included once piece from a Seminole named Benjamin Walker. Walker identified himself as a “full blood” and rebuked the Republicans because “they have treated the negro as being superior to the Indian mentally.”¹³⁹ Specifically, Walker objected to the lifting of restrictions on lands allotted to the freedmen but not all of the members of the Five Tribes. Walker rejected the notion that members of the Five Tribes were any less capable of managing their allotments than any other group of people, and the implication that American Indians were inferior to African Americans was particularly galling to him.

After statehood, these racial appeals continued to target Native voters. The *Indian Home and Farm*, a paper that targeted members of the Five Tribes by printing material in

¹³⁷ C. D. Carter, “Some Chickasaw History,” *Prominent Indians’ Views of the Political Parties of the Day. Showing the Abuses the Indian has received at the Hands of the Republican Party*, 23.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Benjamin Walker, “From a Full Blood Seminole,” *Prominent Indians’ Views of the Political Parties of the Day. Showing the Abuses the Indian has received at the Hands of the Republican Party*, 34.

English as well as the native languages of the Five Tribes, endorsed segregation during the early years of Oklahoma statehood.¹⁴⁰ The *Indian Home and Farm* supported disenfranchising African American voters while rejecting Republican claims that grandfather laws did not apply to the Five Tribes as these American Indians already possessed their own governments at the end of the Civil War. As such, they were eligible voters within their respective nations, rendering the grandfather clause irrelevant to their situation.¹⁴¹ The paper also praised African Americans who abandoned the pursuit of social equality in favor of focusing on economic development while chastising those who challenged the status quo.¹⁴² Though the paper proclaimed its political independence, its continued advocacy of segregation made it difficult for Republican candidates to obtain its support.¹⁴³

American Indians were cognizant of the creation of an American empire overseas and used their knowledge of this empire of it to support their interpretations of the United States. Native writers critical of the United States pointed to their own histories as well as the activities of the United States overseas to undermine Euro-American claims of superiority. Within the boarding schools, American Indians internalized some of the assumptions that permitted the creation of an American empire while rejecting a

¹⁴⁰ *Indian Home and Farm*, 17 March 1910, 4; *Indian Home and Farm*, 7 April 1910, 1.

¹⁴¹ "The Indian Vote," *Indian Home and Farm*, 23 July 1910, 1.

¹⁴² "Democrat 'Nigger' Paper," *Indian Home and Farm*, 6 August 1910, 1; "A Negro's Viewpoint," *Indian Home and Farm*, 23 July 1910, 1; *Indian Home and Farm*, 9 July 1910, 2; *Indian Home and Farm*, 23 July 1910, 2.

¹⁴³ *Indian Home and Farm*, 14 May 1910, 4.

complete acceptance of Euro-American culture. Politically, American Indians within Oklahoma utilized Euro-American antipathy for African Americans to create a protected space for themselves through an alliance with the Democratic Party. However, this broad survey of American Indian responses to empire requires a closer examination of key Native writers such as Ora Eddleman Reed and Gertrude Bonnin. These two women both sought to defend American Indian interests at the turn of the twentieth century but their approaches contrasted sharply.

Chapter 2 Mocking and Rejecting Euro-American Critiques of Native Societies: Ora Eddleman Reed and Gertrude Simmons

Bonnin

At the turn of the twentieth century, the depictions of Indian Territory and American Indians presented a challenge to American Indian communities. Negative portrayals of the Five Tribes helped to justify the attempted reduction of Native sovereignty, discouraged investment in Indian Territory, and prompted many Euro-Americans to make critical judgments about the capacity of American Indians. Ora Eddleman—later Ora Eddleman Reed—was a young Cherokee woman who countered these depictions, in magazines and in newspapers. She promoted Indian Territory and defended the Five Tribes by demonstrating how they met and exceeded Euro-American standards of civilization and progress. Her writings—found within the *Muskogee Evening Times*, *Twin Territories: The Indian Magazine*, and *Sturm's*—revealed her perception of the dangers posed by negative portrayals of Native people. She criticized letter writers for their prejudices and false assumptions about Native peoples. Though her notions of progress and civilization limited her capacity to provide extended critiques of American society, she effectively argued for the inclusion of American Indians. Eddleman also understood the power of imagery as indicated by her usage of photographs of American Indian women in attire Euro-Americans would consider civilized. Eddleman's usage of the concept of civilization to defend Indian Territory

differentiated her from Gertrude Simmons, a Dakota from the turn of the twentieth century better known as Zitkala-Ša. Though both women sought to cast American Indians in a positive light, Zitkala-Ša focused on undermining the moral authority of Euro-American civilization.

Born near Denton, Texas, in 1880, Ora Eddleman was the eighth of nine children of David and Mary Eddleman. She traced her Cherokee heritage through her mother's side of the family, but she also expressed pride in her father and her two uncles for their service to the Confederacy. Though Mary Eddleman and her brothers desired to move to Indian Territory and join the Cherokee Nation, it was not until 1894 that David Eddleman agreed to relocate his family from Texas to Muskogee. Three years later, the Eddlemans acquired the *Muskogee Morning Times* and soon transformed the publication into an evening paper; by the following year, they acquired access to the Associated Press service and used this to attract readership with up-to-date news on the Spanish-American War. David and Mary Eddleman placed the publication under the management of their son, George Eddleman and his cousin, Charles Daugherty. Myrta Eddleman, a daughter of David and Mary, was the business manager. While attending Henry Kendall College, Ora Eddleman worked as the society editor, reported on city news, managed the Associated Press stories, and proofread the paper. Eddleman's experience proved invaluable for her later work as editor of *Twin Territories: The Indian Magazine*. By monitoring the day's news using the Associated Press, Eddleman was familiar with the portrayals of Indian Territory and the Five Tribes elsewhere in the media. Though Eddleman identified herself as a Cherokee throughout her life, her family's involvement

with the *Muskogee Evening Times* may have cost them the opportunity to enroll as members of the Cherokee Nation; during their citizenship case, the *Muskogee Evening Times* reprinted an article critiquing the presiding judge, William M. Springer. Perhaps due to the negative portrayal, Judge Springer rejected their claim.¹

The *Muskogee Evening Times* favored the economic development of Indian Territory. To this end, the paper advocated the allotment of Indian Territory. Allotment was a federal Indian policy designed to break up the communal land holdings of American Indians by dividing up the lands between members of a particular tribe or nation; the remaining lands, referred to as the surplus, would then be available for Euro-American settlement.² The paper rejected single statehood with Oklahoma Territory, preferring to keep Indian Territory separate. Unfortunately, the stories in the *Muskogee Evening Times* seldom identified the author of these pieces, making it difficult to determine whether Ora Eddleman wrote any given article. George Eddleman was the most likely the author of these editorial pieces, but Ora Eddleman adopted similar positions in her later work. The *Muskogee Evening Times* also printed letters from Native

¹ Carolyn Foreman, *Oklahoma Imprints, 1835-1907: A History of Printing in Oklahoma before Statehood* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1936), 200-201; Karen Kilcup, *Native American Women's Writing, 1800-1924: An Anthology* (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), 350-351; Daniel Littlefield Jr., and James W. Parins, *American Indian and Alaska Native Newspapers and Periodicals, 1826-1924* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984), 263-264; Daryl Morrison, "Twin Territories: The Indian Magazine and Its Editor, Ora Eddleman Reed," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 60 (1982): 138-142; *Oklahoma Historical Society*, s.v. "Reed, Ora V. Eddleman (1880-1968)," <http://digital.library.okstate.edu/encyclopedia/entries/R/RE019.html> (accessed March 4, 2011); Ora Eddleman Reed, "Pioneer Publisher, First Daily Newspaper in Indian Territory," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 23 (Spring 1945): 36-39.

² Christine Bolt, *American Indian Policy and American Indian Reform* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1987), 86, 93, 95, 97, 100-101; Michael Coleman, "Problematic Panacea: Presbyterian Missionaries and the Allotment of Indian Lands in the Late Nineteenth Century," *Pacific Historical Review* 54, no. 2 (May 1985): 143-159; Andrew Denson, *Demanding the Cherokee Nation: Indian Autonomy and American Culture, 1830-1900* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004), 232-233.

authors; Eddleman continued this practice as editor of *Twin Territories*. Eddleman's family owned the paper until 1899 when they sold it to a man named John B. Kessler.³

The sale of the *Muskogee Evening Times* did not mark the end of the Eddleman family's involvement in the publishing business. In December 1898, the Sams Publishing Company of Muskogee produced a magazine entitled *Twin Territories: The Indian Magazine*. In these early issues, the magazine identified Walter and Myrta Sams as the editors, but Ora Eddleman indicated she was part of the initial partnership with her sister and brother-in-law. Ora Eddleman officially took over as the sole editor in April 1900, and she was likely responsible for many of the unsigned articles from the magazine's early issues. The editorial positions taken by *Twin Territories* echoed the *Muskogee Evening Times*, but George Eddleman did not work on this project, indicating that Ora probably shared many of the views her brother advocated in the *Muskogee Evening Times*. Soon after she officially took over as the editor of *Twin Territories*, Ora Eddleman became the only female member of the Territory Press Association and served on the executive committee in 1900. Three years later, Ora Eddleman was the Treasurer of the Press Association.⁴

³ "The Curtis Bill," *Muskogee Evening Times*, 7 March 1898, 2; J. R. Gregory, "Communicated," *Muskogee Evening Times*, 20 January 1898, 4; Morrison, 141; *Muskogee Evening Times*, 12 January 1898, 2; "Single Statehood," *Muskogee Evening Times*, 20 January, 1898, 1. On occasion, pieces appearing in the *Muskogee Evening Times* displayed humor suggesting that Ora Eddleman may well have written them as the tone was similar to her later writings. For example, one piece accused critics of the paper of having "more spleen than brains." Editorial, *Muskogee Evening Times*, 29 April 1898, 2.

⁴ Foreman, 237-239; Littlefield and Parins, 366-369; Morrison, 143; Esther Witcher, "Territorial Magazines," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 29 (Winter 1951-1952): 494-495.

Ora Eddleman emphasized her desire to use *Twin Territories* as a means of counteracting the “false reports and gross exaggerations” printed about American Indians and Indian Territory.⁵ She continued by explaining that she, as well as a few other territorial editors, “realized the harm that was being done to a great people and a great country,” thereby demonstrating her sensitivity to false representations that discouraged investment in Indian Territory and cast Native peoples in a negative light.⁶ Yet, challenging these derogatory views would not provide readers with an improved view of American Indians; Eddleman’s second goal required her to portray Native peoples in a positive manner and encourage Euro-American readers to accept them as civilized. Eddleman frequently published articles and letters from Native authors and Euro-Americans whose work bolstered her stated goals, even though these writers sometimes diverged from her own beliefs.⁷ *Twin Territories* helped to further the reputations of some Native writers, such as Alex Posey. Posey’s Fus Fixico letters did not appear within Indian Territory newspapers until the end of 1902; consequently, for readers outside of Indian Territory, *Twin Territories* may have provided their first exposure to his writings as they appeared within the pages of the magazine in 1899.⁸

⁵ *Twin Territories*, January 1903, 24.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Florence Crofford, “The Indian Brave’s Lament,” *Twin Territories*, July 1900, 142; “Writers of the Indian Territory,” *Twin Territories*, October 1899, 228; “Wenonah’s Lament,” *Twin Territories*, October 1899, 228.

⁸ Chinnubie Harjo, “Ode to Sequoyah,” *Twin Territories*, April 1899, 102; Daniel Littlefield Jr., *Alex Posey: Creek Poet, Journalist, and Humorist* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 6.

Eddleman defended Indian Territory against many of the charges appearing in print elsewhere in the United States in order to promote economic development within the territory. One piece noted that the healthful climate, productive land, and beautiful scenery of Indian Territory attracted white settlers. The piece predicted allotment would provide American Indians with money to improve the remainder of their holdings while simultaneously providing homes to whites. This depiction of allotment described a future beneficial to both whites and American Indians and largely ignored Native critiques of the policy. One article by J. G. Appleton, published in the March 1902 issue, claimed that the increasing population of the United States has transformed “what was fifty years ago an unexplored region of wild country” into bustling cities with large populations.⁹ Though the article described lands that included Indian Territory as “wild,” Appleton’s account placed this state of underdevelopment in the past, thereby crediting American Indians with helping to build up Indian Territory. Eddleman bolstered her defense of Indian Territory as economically prosperous by publishing photographs of commercial buildings, farms, and economic activity within *Twin Territories*, signifying that Indian Territory had everything found in the United States.¹⁰

Eddleman occasionally critiqued the economic conditions present in other states in order to promote Indian Territory. For example, one editorial compared Indian Territory to Texas and noted how Indian Territory’s southern neighbor failed to harvest its wheat crop due to its harsh treatment of laborers. Eddleman thereby suggested that

⁹ J. G. Appleton, “The Subjugation of the West,” *Twin Territories*, March 1902, 66.

¹⁰ *Twin Territories*, March 1902, 74; *Twin Territories*, October 1902, 298; *Twin Territories*, January 1903, 12.

laborers could find better treatment within Indian Territory while suggesting to farmers that they could find a docile labor force within Indian Territory. In particular, the editorial noted harsh vagrancy laws in Texas that discouraged workers. The piece ended with a rhetorical question: “This is why the laboring man hates Texas, of late years, and who blames him?”¹¹ Eddleman thereby cast the reluctance of workers to seek employment in Texas as justified due to the poor treatment they received.

The idea that Indian Territory was a lawless land filled with violent criminals was a common stereotype that Eddleman sought to counter. She acknowledged the jails held numerous prisoners, but argued that crime in Indian Territory originated from intruders, writing, “It should be remembered that this country for many years past has served as a resort for a bad class of men who could not safely remain in the states.”¹² As such, the vast majority of American Indians did not pose a threat to visitors and reports of criminal activity within Indian Territory should not cast aspersions on Native communities. Eddleman argued that increased law enforcement had already imprisoned the bulk of these criminals, thereby improving public safety.¹³

¹¹ *Twin Territories*, June 1899, 129. This would not be the last *Twin Territories* included pieces critical of Texas. In the September 1902 issue, Eddleman included a poem by Robert Harrison, the United States Clerk at Muskogee, Indian Territory, comparing heaven to Indian Territory and Texas to hell. The critique of Texas seems perplexing as Ora Eddleman spent her childhood there; however, her mother spent considerable effort convincing David Eddleman to move to Indian Territory. David Eddleman prospered in Texas, but his wife’s desire to leave indicated that at least a portion of his family did not find Texas as agreeable. Robert Paris Harrison, “Texas and Indian Territory,” *Twin Territories*, September 1902, 268-269; Kilcup, 350.

¹² *Twin Territories*, December 1899, 3.

¹³ *Ibid.*

Twin Territories also printed letters or stories supporting Eddleman's goal of showing that American Indians living in Indian Territory were intelligent. Eddleman noted that such writings were necessary to counteract the ridiculous notions the public held about Indian Territory and demonstrate that the territory was not overrun by so-called savages. These articles also included accounts of Eddleman's interactions with whites who showed acceptance for Native peoples and a willingness to learn about their capabilities.¹⁴ During its first year of publication, *Twin Territories* received many letters asking about the supposed wildness of Indian Territory. Eddleman responded by referring to these statements as "silly exhibitions of ignorance" and instructed the individuals to "read up," while urging them to "cease making fools of [themselves]."¹⁵

In reflecting upon the possibility of statehood, *Twin Territories* ran an editorial in August 1899 noting how those unfamiliar with Oklahoma Territory labeled it a "worthless desert-land" and home of the "murderous cyclone."¹⁶ In contrast, proponents of Indian Territory saw their home as "the garden spot of the earth."¹⁷ The editorial admitted that *Twin Territories* "for several good and wholesome reasons, is unequivocally opposed to single statehood," but rejected the notion that statehood with

¹⁴ "Our Meeting with Paderewski," *Twin Territories*, April 1902, 100-101; *Twin Territories*, November 1899, 234.

¹⁵ "Talking about Fakes," *Twin Territories*, August 1899, 191. As with many articles in *Twin Territories*, this piece did not identify the author. However, its tone closely matched Ora Eddleman's responses to similar questions that later appeared in her column "What the Curious Want to Know." In particular, Eddleman used the specific phrase "Read up," in one of these columns. "What the Curious Want to Know," *Twin Territories*, November 1902, 340.

¹⁶ "Will It Come to Pass," *Twin Territories*, August 1899, 173.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

Oklahoma would inevitably prove disastrous to Indian Territory.¹⁸ The editorial tried to allay the fears of Indian Territory residents by noting the abundant wheat and produce grown in Oklahoma Territory to demonstrate its economic potential. Instead, the Republican Party's prominence in Oklahoma Territory served as the primary reason for the publication's opposition to single statehood. The editorial reassured readers by noting residents of Indian Territory were aware of these dangers and would not permit carpetbag "dictators" to exert influence at the local level.¹⁹ Eddleman may have desired the promotion of both territories, but her primary concern was for Indian Territory. Her hesitation to embrace Oklahoma Territory had less to do with the quality of the land or its economic conditions than with its political orientation. Consequently, the nuanced position adopted within *Twin Territories* indicated a continued devotion to the South and the Democratic Party consistent with Eddleman's admiration for her relatives who fought in the Confederate Army during the Civil War.

In December 1900, Eddleman wrote an extended editorial critiquing the press coverage of Indian Territory. The plethora of inaccurate and misleading information "deems it an imperative duty resting upon the editors of papers and periodicals published

¹⁸ Later that year, *Twin Territories* had not dramatically altered its position as evidenced by its reference to participants in an Oklahoma statehood convention as having "a hallucination of the brain," for few residents of Indian Territory would accept such conditions. *Twin Territories*, November 1899, 233.

¹⁹ "Will It Come to Pass," *Twin Territories*, August 1899, 173. Eddleman demonstrated a growing acceptance of statehood with Oklahoma Territory by 1903. In a discussion of the debate over statehood, Eddleman argued that most inhabitants desired statehood of some form but not comment about her earlier preference for statehood separate from Oklahoma. Eddleman argued that this would be a shift for Native people used to living under a tribal government as they would now live under state law. "Territorial News," *Twin Territories*, January 1903, 33-34.

in Indian Territory, to contradict and denounce all such fabrications.”²⁰ Eddleman cautioned that though the falsehoods seemed blatantly obvious to those familiar with the truth, many undiscerning readers from the north and east did not know any better. She briefly touched on the issue of yellow journalism but dismissed its impact by crediting the public’s understanding of the yellow press’s tendency to sensationalize the news to satisfy their readers’ desire for entertainment. Eddleman did not call for the suppression of yellow journalism as “no one with any brains” would expect to find accurate information within such publications.²¹ Instead, Eddleman worried about the impact of inaccurate stories appearing in well-respected dailies and weeklies reputations because readers trusted the information in these publications as reliable.²²

Eddleman supplemented her critique of the portrayal of the Five Tribes by seeking to present American Indians as civilized and progressive. She wrote about the need of members of the Five Tribes to prepare for the future and improve their lands, meaning she viewed allotment as inevitable and necessary.²³ She also included pieces reassuring readers the American Indians would receive protection from efforts to cheat

²⁰ *Twin Territories*, December 1900, 245.

²¹ Ora Eddleman’s skepticism about the yellow press echoes scholarship urging cautious evaluations of newspapers from the turn of the twentieth century as many readers fully understood how particular papers contained little reliable information. George W. Auxier, “Middle Western Newspapers and the Spanish American War, 1895-1898,” *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 26, no. 4 (March 1940): 524-525, 531, 533; W. Joseph Campbell *Yellow Journalism: Punctuating the Myths, Defining the Legacies* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2001); George H. Douglas, *The Golden Age of the Newspaper* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1999): 110-114; Frank Luther Mott, “Newspapers in Presidential Campaigns,” *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 8, no. 3 (Autumn 1944): 348-367; Ted Curtis Smythe, *The Gilded Age Press, 1865-1900* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), 186, 189, 190-191.

²² *Twin Territories*, December 1900, 245.

²³ *Twin Territories*, January-February 1900, 22.

them of their lands.²⁴ In one editorial, *Twin Territories* noted American Indian groups did not ask the federal government to allot their lands but “the progress of civilization and the Indian’s environments are such as to force the necessity of such a course plainly upon the minds of the people.”²⁵ Through her own advocacy of allotment, Eddleman demonstrated American Indian support for a policy deemed progressive, thereby demonstrating to Euro-American audiences the capacity of American Indians to draw conclusions deemed intelligent by the wider society. Her effort to portray the Five Tribes as civilized motivated her to cast American Indians in a way that European Americans would consider progressive.

Ora Eddleman included articles by other authors that advanced her objective of casting American Indian people as civilized. *Twin Territories* published an article by Cetan Sapa, a Yankton, who valorized the efforts of his people to adapt to the encroachment of Euro-American society. In describing the interaction between his people and the surrounding Euro-American communities, Cetan Sapa wrote, “The red man has proved to his pale face brother that he is his equal in energy and ability, that he has brain-power to learn as well as any other man—in fact, that all Indians are not dead.”²⁶ Cetan Sapa’s arguments rested upon a depiction of American Indians assimilating Euro-American customs such as singing Christian hymns and living in houses. He adamantly insisted upon his tribe’s capacity to achieve equality. Cetan Sapa also expressed an

²⁴ Will Fears, “‘So Long as Grass Grows and Water Runs,’” *Twin Territories*, January 1903, 16.

²⁵ “An Important Time with the Five Civilized Tribes,” *Twin Territories*, August 1902, 418.

²⁶ Cetan Sapa, “The Yankton Sioux of South Dakota,” *Twin Territories*, August 1902, 241.

awareness of the desire of some Euro-Americans to eliminate American Indians. This acknowledgement of Euro-American hostility directed against Native peoples was the harshest critique of the dominant society. At the end of the article, Cetan Sapa acknowledged that his people continued to love and cherish their tribal customs even as they saw the need to adapt to their changing world.²⁷

In November 1902, *Twin Territories* included an article entitled “What Has the Indian to be Thankful For?” Three prominent Indians, including Charles McIntosh, a Creek Indian and attorney, gave their views on the subject. McIntosh argued civilization provided a benefit to American Indians, particularly the Five Tribes, “notwithstanding the fact that it has done away with his tribal customs.”²⁸ McIntosh’s wording indicated he did not identify the loss of Native traditions as a positive outcome, separating McIntosh from non-Native writers who perceived the destruction of Native cultures as a benefit. For McIntosh, the capability of the Five Tribes to retain their own governments for as long as they did was in itself a blessing, as was the promise of several more years of self government. McIntosh acknowledged the eventual dissolution of tribal governments but took comfort from knowing that his people could maintain their own institutions until 1906. McIntosh urged American Indians to take all they could from civilization as Euro-Americans had already taken whatever they could from Native communities.²⁹ In effect,

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ “What Has the Indian to be Thankful for?,” *Twin Territories*, November 1902, 328.

²⁹ Ibid., 329.

McIntosh called on Native peoples to make up for all of the losses they suffered at the hands of Euro-Americans.³⁰

Ora Eddleman included poetry critical of Euro-American treatment of American Indians. J. E. Wolfe was the author of one such poem entitled “The White Man Must Have Land.” The poem generally positioned the abuse of Native people as something that occurred in the past by referring to “stains” upon the nation’s history “in the centuries now past.”³¹ The third, fourth, and fifth stanzas of the poem discussed Indian Removal and focused upon the case of the Cherokees “fouly robbed of their possessions to increase the white man’s gains.”³² The sixth and final stanza connected Indian Removal with the present by concluding, “Yet the crime has been repeated, and no treaties ever stand if the Red Man’s in the way, for the White Man must have land.”³³ These final two lines depicted the seizure of Indian land as an ongoing process to satiate the demands of whites. Though not mentioned within the poem, the connection with present events would permit readers to conclude that allotment served as the latest example of Euro-American efforts to reduce Native land holdings by requiring them to dispose of supposedly surplus land. However, the poem did not suggest an alternate course of action

³⁰ Ibid., 330.

³¹ J. E. Wolf, “The White Man Must Have Land,” *Twin Territories*, August 1902, 245.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid., “The White Man Must Have Land,” *Twin Territories*, August 1902, 245. Wolfe published another poem the following year entitled “The Millennium Not Yet,” that chastised the larger society for its greed and “thirst for Conquest and for Gold.” J. E. Wolfe, “The Millennium Not Yet,” *Twin Territories*, April 1903, 123.

to prevent future exploitation and abuse of American Indians, leaving the continued dispossession of Native communities as an unfortunate evil of modern society.

Another piece critical of the treatment of American Indians came from a writer using a Creek name while claiming Anglo-Saxon and Celtic ancestry. Under the penname Iste-chule, this writer provided a short history of the interactions between Europeans and American Indians, starting with the arrival of the Spanish in Mexico. Iste-chule cast the Spanish as religious fanatics who enjoyed torturing, though the same piece expressed greater reservations about abuses committed by Anglo-Saxons. The author conceded English settlers and the United States government were little better than the Spanish, but due to the author's racial heritage, this proved a difficult admission.³⁴ However, Iste-chule admitted, "That government which has on numerous occasions pledged itself to protect the Indians and insure justice, has lifted its strong arm against them. It has held out the olive branch with one hand and assisted the invaders with the other."³⁵ After conceding the ongoing nature of the government's intransigence against American Indians, Iste-chule considered the options available to them by first dismissing open resistance as suicidal. Instead, Iste-chule counseled assimilation into "the civilization and arts of the white man."³⁶ Iste-chule pointed to the accomplishments of the Five Tribes as evidence of the capacity of American Indians to join Euro-American society, thereby echoing Eddleman's arguments. However, Iste-chule did not speculate about the

³⁴ Iste-chule, "The White Man and the Red Man," *Twin Territories*, October 1902, 286-287.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 288.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

obligations of Euro-Americans to live up to the demands of civilization or the possibility that the division of tribal lands would result in further Native land loss. Instead, the responsibility lay with American Indians to adapt to changing circumstances, reinforcing the necessity and inevitability of allotment.

Articles praising American Indians often connected with issues involving race and labor. For example, a woman named A. S. G. Forbes published an article entitled “Lace Making by Indian Women” that appeared in *Twin Territories* in November, 1902.³⁷ Employing California Indians led Forbes to develop great sympathy and fondness for her employees as “they [were] so docile, so gentle, so cheerful, so courteous, so patient,” and readily learned the art of lace making.³⁸ Forbes claimed many Euro-Americans would do well to emulate these characteristics, suggesting that she may have preferred American Indians as she considered them unlikely to protest working conditions or pay. In this sense, Forbes may have mentally compared American Indians to recent immigrants from eastern and southern Europe whose political leanings appeared suspect to middle-class Americans. Forbes concluded her article by noting “We call Indians dirty, lazy and good-for-nothing when as a matter of fact, they are, as an almost unexcepted rule, deserving, industrious, forbearing, [and] pliable” as long as they received fair treatment.³⁹ Eddleman supported this depiction of American Indians as conscientious workers but she had greater ambitions for Native peoples.

³⁷ The article originally appeared in a publication entitled *Out West* from Los Angeles, California. A. S. G. Forbes, “Lace Making by Indian Women,” *Twin Territories*, November 1902, 322.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 321.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 322.

Though Eddleman published articles by individuals discussing American Indians as wage workers, she herself promoted higher education for American Indians. For example, she received a letter from a subscriber inquiring about the feasibility of providing higher education to American Indians. Eddleman argued American Indian students who wanted to pursue higher education had the right to do so and should receive opportunities. Eddleman dismissed characterizations of American Indian students as “lazy” by attributing these examples to individual character flaws that any student, regardless of race, might possess.⁴⁰ Eddleman evaluated the potential of students based upon their abilities rather than assumed racial characteristics, while portraying American Indian students as the equals of their white counterparts. Eddleman concluded her response by predicting that the sooner higher educational opportunities were available, the sooner American Indians would prove that they could master these new academic challenges.⁴¹

Eddleman’s support for higher education prompted her to reject calls for American Indians to accept subordinate roles within American society. Her support of civilization and progress may have echoed boarding school proponents, but she critiqued the notion that American Indians needed to accept menial work. In one article, Eddleman addressed the issue of whether or not American Indians could supply wealthier white Americans with servants. While there was nothing “dishonorable in being good servants,” she believed American Indians had the potential to seek higher positions in

⁴⁰ “What the Curious Want to Know,” *Twin Territories*, December 1902, 373.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

society.⁴² Eddleman claimed American Indians—in contrast to other racial groups—had never experienced forced servitude, thereby referencing the status of African Americans. Her claim ignored the presence of slavery within some Native societies, but she might have limited her understanding to chattel slavery found on Southern plantations. Eddleman continued, “no people on earth hate bondage more intensely nor hold freedom more dear than do the Indians.”⁴³ Eddleman thereby imbued the original inhabitants of the Americas with a desire for liberty, thereby connecting American Indians with the ideals of the United States. As such, Eddleman deemed it impossible for American Indians to meet the demand for servants.⁴⁴

Several months later, Eddleman expanded upon this issue in reference to a reader’s question. She conceded training at Carlisle and other schools certainly prepared Native women to work as servants, but this was a temporary measure. She was careful to note how this experience prepared women to work and earn money during their vacations from school; she also acknowledged training would make them helpful around the home, “but it does not follow that she is fit only for a servant, and the idea that she is going to sink to that plane is very wrong.”⁴⁵ Thus, Eddleman—unlike some of the proponents of Indian education—saw menial work as a temporary position. Interestingly, Eddleman

⁴² “Will the Indian Solve the Servant Question,” *Twin Territories*, July 1902, 199.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ “What the Curious Want to Know,” *Twin Territories*, October 1902, 309.

praised Carlisle as a model of American Indian education despite its heavy emphasis on manual training.⁴⁶

Ora Eddleman occasionally wrote fictional pieces for *Twin Territories* under the pseudonym Mignon Schreiber—German for “little writer.” These stories usually featured a young, virtuous Indian woman as the protagonist and ended with her marriage to a white man. Eddleman used these stories to portray Native women as more discerning and intelligent than their Euro-American counterparts. For example, in a story entitled “The Honor of Wynoma,” a Euro-American woman named Mary Boyton rejected her son’s desire to marry an Indian woman.⁴⁷ Horton, Mary Boyton’s son, arranged for Wynoma Littleheart to visit the Boyton’s home posing as a friend of his sister. Mary Boyton—without knowing the young woman’s background—approved of the visitor, and encouraged her son to spend time with her in order to forget about the “low born Indian girl.” Ultimately, the mother learned to approve of Wynoma and her Native heritage while apologizing for her short-sightedness.⁴⁸ Mary Boyton thereby learned to accept American Indians as the equals of whites, providing a model for how Eddleman hoped Euro-Americans would include American Indians in society.

Though primarily focused on Indian Territory, *Twin Territories* commented on some international issues. Ora’s brother, George, joined one of the volunteer units—the

⁴⁶ “Book Reviews and Exchanges,” *Twin Territories*, December 1902, 376-377.

⁴⁷ [Ora Eddleman], “The Honor of Wynoma,” *Twin Territories*, November 1902, 322-325, 342-344; *Twin Territories* published stories from other authors too. These most often focused on American Indians and Indian Territory. Mabel Washbourne Anderson, “Nowita, the Sweet Singer: A Romantic Tradition of Spavinaw, Indian Territory,” *Twin Territories*, January 1903, 1-8.

⁴⁸ [Ora Eddleman], “The Honor of Wynoma,” 324.

Thirty-Third Volunteer Regiment—that fought in the Philippine War. This unit received some attention in the Indian Territory press as a number of residents—both whites and American Indians—enlisted. Several of George Eddleman’s letters home appeared in *Twin Territories*. The first letter, written in October 1899, appeared in *Twin Territories* the following month and described the voyage to Hawaii.⁴⁹ The most notable feature of George Eddleman’s account of Honolulu was a reference to a Cherokee family he found living in the city.⁵⁰ The letter did not contain George Eddleman’s thoughts on his pending involvement in the Philippine War. He made one comment about how he found Japanese worship practices “amusing,” but he did not explain why this was the case.⁵¹

In December 1899, a short news item in *Twin Territories* predicted the end of hostilities in the Philippines as Filipino forces had broken into smaller groups and scattered across the archipelago. However, this predication failed to occur as the Filipinos had merely changed tactics by eschewing large-scale engagements with American soldiers in favor of guerilla warfare. This shift in strategy enabled the Filipino resistance to last officially until 1902, though sporadic fighting continued well into the following

⁴⁹ George Eddleman, “A Soldier’s Letter,” *Twin Territories*, November 1899, 235, 240. American soldiers traveling from west coast ports to the Philippines usually stopped at Hawaii during the oceanic voyage across the Pacific. Arthur Dudden, *The American Pacific: From the Old China Trade to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 68-69; Jean Heffer, *The United States and the Pacific: History of a Frontier*, trans. W. Donald Wilson (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), 198-199.

⁵⁰ According to George Eddleman, a Cherokee woman married a white man and traveled to California during the Gold Rush. Afterwards, the couple moved to Hawaii and raised a family. The woman had not spoken Cherokee to anyone in years and hoped that some of the Cherokee members of the Thirty-Third Regiment would visit her and provide with a chance to hear her language again. George Eddleman, “A Soldier’s Letter,” 240.

⁵¹ George Eddleman, “A Soldier’s Letter,” 235.

decade. Eddleman did not express a viewpoint on the conflict itself, but her sympathies probably lay with the American soldiers due to her brother's presence with them.⁵² Further proof of her support for the Philippine War came in March 1900 when *Twin Territories* published another letter from George Eddleman. Ora Eddleman noted the frequency with which newspapers and magazines published letters from the "gallant" soldiers stationed in the Philippines.⁵³ Though public scrutiny of the war would not reach its apex until 1902, public accounts of atrocities committed by American soldiers had already appeared in print.⁵⁴ Eddleman made no mention of these charges, perhaps due to a desire to cast her brother in a favorable light.

George Eddleman wrote his second letter in December 1899 but it would not appear in print for three months. His account of the Philippine War provided a mixed perspective on the conflict. He described his first experience in combat as "great fun" and expressed no regrets about volunteering to fight in the Philippines.⁵⁵ However, he conceded having "a pretty rough time of it" while observing he and his fellow soldiers "have had enough of fighting and want to be mustered out as soon as possible."⁵⁶ Finally, he expressed reservations about writing down the number of Filipinos killed in his first

⁵² Glenn A. May, "Why the United States Won the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902," *Pacific Historical Review* 52, no. 4 (Nov. 1983): 355, 361-363, 365; *Twin Territories*, December 1899, 3.

⁵³ *Twin Territories*, December 1899, 3.

⁵⁴ Anti-Imperialist League, *Soldiers' Letters: Being Material for the History of a War of Criminal Aggression*, (Boston: Anti-Imperialist League, 1899).

⁵⁵ George Eddleman, "A Letter from the Philippines," *Twin Territories*, March 1900, 60.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

battle as he “[did not] like to think how [they] slaughtered them.”⁵⁷ Despite these reservations, George Eddleman remained proud of the accomplishments of his regiment and yearned to learn how the press covered the Thirty-Third Volunteer Regiment.

A third letter from George Eddleman appeared in the April 1900 issue of *Twin Territories*. In contrast to the previous letter, George Eddleman largely ignored accounts of recent battles, other than to inform his mother he believed her prayers saved his life during numerous fierce combats. Most of the letter described the city of Narvican. He described some of the surrounding countryside, convict gangs, and public executions.⁵⁸ The next reference to the Philippine War appeared in the July 1900 issue of *Twin Territories* as Eddleman explained that the conflict had been overshadowed by the Boer War in South Africa and the Boxer Rebellion in China. Nevertheless, Eddleman expressed her sympathy for the American soldiers as they endured the tropical heat as well as widespread “fever and disease.”⁵⁹

Eddleman’s paper also included evidence of apparent enthusiasm for the creation of an American empire overseas. In the May 1900 issue, a description of the May Day festivities in Indian Territory noted that rather than merely celebrating the spring, the day took on added importance as a celebration of the “greatest victory in naval affairs” known

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ [George] Eddleman, “From a Cherokee Soldier,” *Twin Territories*, April 1900, 86.

⁵⁹ *Twin Territories* 2, no 7 (July 1900), 136. Though a capable young woman, Eddleman used this same news item to express her thanks that, as a woman, she would not have to endure the same hardships faced by the soldiers overseas that would strain her “tender nature.” She denied that this had any reflection on the patriotism of women but held that war was inappropriate for her gender. Eddleman’s identification of warfare as outside the appropriate sphere for women indicated her intention to depict Native women as conforming to Victorian standards of behavior. Ibid., 136.

to the world, in reference to George Dewey's defeat of the Spanish squadron at Manila Bay on 1 May 1898.⁶⁰ Eddleman speculated that the restoration of peace between the United States and Spain might one day encourage the Spanish to celebrate the day with as much enthusiasm as the Americans. In theory, the Spanish would come to see Dewey's victory as a blessing in disguise, though Eddleman was nebulous in regards to the benefits the Spanish received from their defeat. Eddleman's overly-optimistic prediction might stem from her brother's participation in the occupation of Manila.⁶¹ Eddleman may also have chosen not to connect her defense of American Indians with the defense of other subject populations across the globe.

However, this did not translate into sympathy for Great Britain and its struggle against the Boers in the Transvaal. At the turn of the twentieth century, the American public opinion divided on the issue of the Boer War. Many American citizens, particularly those of Irish, German, Dutch, and Scandinavian descent favored the Boers.⁶² However, American politicians, particularly President Theodore Roosevelt, supported the British. Eddleman published two news items were critical of the British and supportive of the Boers. Eddleman explained that "a true lover of liberty" could not read the news without feeling sympathetic to the Boers or their aims.⁶³ Eddleman further postulated that

⁶⁰ May Day—Its Observance," *Twin Territories*, May 1900, 89.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Donal Lowry, "'The Boers Were the Beginning of the End?': The Wider Impact of the South African War," in *The South African War Reappraised*, ed. Donal Lowry (New York: Manchester University Press, 2000), 218-221; Donal Lowry, "'The World's No Bigger than a Krall': The South African War and International Opinion in the First Age of 'Globalization,'" in *The Impact of the South African War*, eds. David Omissi and Andrew Thompson (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 277.

⁶³ *Twin Territories*, December 1899, 3.

British arrogance led the nation's leaders to assume that no country or group of people had the courage to take on the British empire single-handedly. Eddleman's observation ignored nineteenth-century colonial conflicts, such as the Sepoy Rebellion in India. Nevertheless, Eddleman's commentary exhibited sympathy for a group of people trying to preserve their independence from a much greater military force, raising unmistakable—if unmentioned—parallels with the experiences of American Indians.⁶⁴ In the next issue, Eddleman included another news item about South Africa, noting that though badly outnumbered, the Boers were “the most stubborn, determined, and formidable enemy” the British faced in many years while predicting the resistance to British control could still shock the world's leading empire.⁶⁵ Furthermore, Eddleman noted that “justice and liberty” could, on occasion, defeat “greed and avarice.”⁶⁶ Eddleman did not apply these conclusions to the status of the Five Tribes, but this resulted from her interpretation of allotment as inevitable and economically beneficial rather than an attempt to plunder Indian Territory.

One Native writer reflected upon the experiences of the Cubans and the Filipinos to consider the history of American Indians. The author noted that as the American people considered the annexation or absorption of these two populations, “it is not beside the question to look back to another inauguration of Anglo-Saxon dominion.”⁶⁷ Al-Lu-

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁶⁵ *Twin Territories*, January-February 1899, 40.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ Al-Lu-We, “Some Phases of the Indian Question,” *Twin Territories*, March 1902, 75.

We accepted the principal of the Indian as a dying race but limited this to the so-called full blood, noting that future generations would trace their ancestry to a Native ancestor. The author echoed some of Eddleman's points about Indian Territory by writing, "When fugitives from justice, social outcasts, adventurers, all the flotsam and jetsam of civilization sought refuge in Indian Territory, they were unmolested, while their misdeeds and crimes were laid at the Indian's door."⁶⁸ This description reiterated Eddleman's point about the law-abiding nature of American Indians while pointing to the actions of intruders as the source of the problems within Indian Territory.

Eddleman's strongest defense of American Indians appeared in her regular column entitled, "What the Curious Want to Know."⁶⁹ Eddleman used this section to respond to questions about American Indians and Indian Territory. Though Ora Eddleman usually provided her readers with cordial responses, she had little patience for those who perpetuated stereotypes about American Indians and their communities. Eddleman never reprinted the original question, though she occasionally quoted from the letter when critiquing a specific comment made by a reader. Consequently, it is difficult to determine the precise wording of each question, but her tone made her responses clear. Though irritated by the anti-Native sentiments within some letters, Eddleman frequently responded with humor. For example, one letter writer questioned the young editor about the possibility of encountering cannibals in Indian Territory. Eddleman replied, "I don't know whether to advise you to come here or not. I'd rather not advise at all, for if you

⁶⁸ Ibid.,76.

⁶⁹ Alexia Kosmider, "'What the Curious Want to Know': Cherokee Writer, Ora Eddleman reed Writes Back to the Empire," *Literature and Psychology* 41, no. 4 (1995): 51-72.

should come, and the Indians here ‘ate you up,’ then you’d blame me.”⁷⁰ Eddleman’s response mocked the writer’s assumption about the presence of so-called savages in Indian Territory. In effect, Eddleman inverted European American assumptions and jokes about the supposed ignorance of Native people by casting the Euro-American letter writer as uninformed. Eddleman’s use of humor is clear through the absurdity of an individual returning from the dead to blame her for her advice.⁷¹

Eddleman frequently dealt with questions from individuals who assumed American Indians were savages and that Indian Territory was a wild frontier. For example, one letter from Decater [sic], Indiana, asked about the home of an unnamed Creek leader. In her response, Eddleman explained “I have been I the home of the gentleman, a number of times, and I didn’t have to crawl around in a dirty wigwam, either, as you suggest.”⁷² She described the Creek leader’s home filled as with books and paintings before concluding, “The stories you have read of him are truly stories—or the word might be stronger, if I weren’t a woman” indicating that Eddleman found these demeaning accounts of the Five Tribes offensive.⁷³ In referencing proper behavior for a woman, Eddleman demonstrated how individuals of Native descent still adhered to standards of behavior eastern readers would approve. She derided another letter writer for his assumptions about the supposed wildness of Indian Territory by turning his question

⁷⁰ “What the Curious Want to Know,” *Twin Territories*, November 1902, 340.

⁷¹ “What the Curious Want to Know,” *Twin Territories*, December 1900, 256.

⁷² “What the Curious Want to Know,” *Twin Territories*, January 1901, 19.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

against him. The man inquired whether it was safe to bring his wife to Indian Territory; Eddleman responded, “Yes, you are safe in bringing your wife with you—so far as I know. I am not acquainted with her, but if she doesn’t whip you, no one here will,” as long as he obeyed the law.⁷⁴ Eddleman’s response denigrated the question by shifting the focus from the danger posed by life in Indian Territory to the threat posed by the man’s wife. In addition, Eddleman’s answer suggested the man in question was weak and lived in fear of physical abuse from his spouse. Eddleman concluded another reader from Wellsville, New York, had probably read too many false stories about Indian Territory and urged the individual to read *Twin Territories* more frequently to learn the truth and avoid asking “foolish questions.”⁷⁵

The most frequent issue Eddleman dealt with in her writings involved European American men seeking to acquire Native spouses. Much of this stemmed from the division of the lands of the Five Tribes. Eddleman consistently chastised men who wrote to *Twin Territories* expecting to meet a Native woman owning an allotment. On occasion, she felt the need to remind these letter writers that *Twin Territories* was not a matrimonial service. In December 1900, Eddleman answered several letters from men interested in acquiring Native brides. Eddleman sought to portray American Indian women conforming to gender norms found in American society. As such, she rejected

⁷⁴ “What the Curious Want to Know,” *Twin Territories*, December 1900, 256.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

any depiction of American Indian women as lacking in morality or proper decorum and responded angrily to men who referred to Native women as “squaws.”⁷⁶

In her response to a man identified only as “Archie” from Haddam, Connecticut, Eddleman explained the stories he read about Native women seeking “handsome” husbands were gross fabrications by writing “the Indian girls out here have better sense than to advertise themselves in that matter.”⁷⁷ In his question, Archie proposed a visit to Indian Territory, but Eddleman used this as an opportunity to taunt the reader for his denigration of Native women: “As you suggest, you might ‘come out and look around for yourself,’ but unless you have some sense with your good looks, I won’t be responsible for the result. (b) No, please don’t send your photograph. Your description sufficed.”⁷⁸ Eddleman’s response raised questions about Archie’s intelligence while making fun of his boasts about his attractiveness. Eddleman explained her frequent writings on the subject stemmed from the seemingly endless stream of letters Native leaders received from young men and old bachelors “who haven’t brains enough to discern the truth” and believe stories published proclaiming the existence of wealthy Indian women searching for husbands.⁷⁹ Eddleman’s irritation was evident in another response: “Such questions as yours are really getting tiresome. There is no excuse for your not knowing that the Indian

⁷⁶ “What the Curious Want to Know,” *Twin Territories*, February 1902, 58; “What the Curious Want to Know,” *Twin Territories*, March 1902, 87; “What the Curious Want to Know,” *Twin Territories*, September 1902, 278.

⁷⁷ “What the Curious Want to Know,” *Twin Territories*, December 1900, 256.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ *Twin Territories*, December 1900, 245.

girls of the civilized tribes are just as modest, cultured and womanly as their white sisters, and would not think of advertising for husbands.”⁸⁰ Eddleman’s point was significant as she identified the equality of Native and Euro-American women as a fact that all intelligent and informed people already acknowledged. As such, those who continued to assume Native women did not conform to Euro-American values were foolish and ignorant. Eddleman thereby defined those who doubted the capabilities of Native women as backward while firmly identifying women from the Five Tribes as civilized.

Eddleman directed her harshest response at a man from Minnesota who claimed to have read *Twin Territories* for almost three years. Eddleman expressed disgust that this individual could read the publication for that long while still using the term “squaw” in reference to Native women.⁸¹ Eddleman chastised the individual for believing that women from the Five Tribes desired white husbands to protect and manage their allotments. Eddleman concluded her answer by writing, “Your ignorance is appalling, and your abilities for learning seem fearfully slim. Ugh! White man make Injun heap big tired.”⁸² Eddleman’s usage of a supposedly Native dialect at the end of the response served to mock the letter writer. Eddleman’s columns and writings clearly indicated her intelligence and educated background so readers would not interpret this response as her natural tone. Instead, Eddleman responded with a mock Native dialect to call attention to the spurious assumptions on the part of the letter writer.

⁸⁰ “What the Curious Want to Know,” *Twin Territories*, April 1902, 118.

⁸¹ “What the Curious Want to Know,” *Twin Territories*, August 1902, 246.

⁸² *Ibid.*

Eddleman's responses to these European American men served two functions. In defending the honor and propriety of Native women, Eddleman's responses cast them as the equals of white women. Eddleman emphasized their morality and virtue to connect them to Victorian gender norms and challenge depictions of American Indian women as an exotic other. However, Eddleman's writings also served to protect American Indian women by warding off men interested in their property.⁸³ Yet, Euro-American men were not alone in seeking Native partners, as Eddleman addressed at least two women seeking husbands from the Five Tribes.⁸⁴ Eddleman was far less sarcastic with these writers, but she still exhibited a degree of irritation. To a writer who inquired about the marital status of a specific Indian leader, Eddleman replied "He has [a wife] already and a most charming family."⁸⁵

Part of Eddleman's ability to challenge the dominant perceptions of Native women involved her inclusion of a section of the magazine alternatively entitled "Types of Indian Girls" or "Types of Indian Women." The primary distinction between the two designations was usually the marital status of the women depicted.⁸⁶ Typically this

⁸³ Morrison, 159.

⁸⁴ "What the Curious Want to Know," *Twin Territories*, April 1902, 118.

⁸⁵ "What the Curious Want to Know," *Twin Territories*, July 1902, 214.

⁸⁶ "Types of Indian Women," June 1899, 143-144; "Types of Indian Women," *Twin Territories*, July 1899, 163; "Types of Indian Girls," *Twin Territories*, September 1899, 199; "Types of Indian Girls," *Twin Territories*, October 1899, 224; "Types of Indian Girls," *Twin Territories*, February 1902, 43; "Types of Indian Girls," *Twin Territories*, March 1902, 68-69; "Types of Indian Girls," *Twin Territories*, April 1902, 102; "Types of Indian Girls," *Twin Territories*, May 1902, 126; "Types of Indian Girls," *Twin Territories*, July 1902, 204; "Types of Indian Girls," *Twin Territories*, August 1902, 232; "Type of Indian Girls," *Twin Territories*, September 1902, 259-260; "Types of Indian Girls," *Twin Territories*, October 1902, 292; "Types of Indian Girls," *Twin Territories*, February 1903, 52; "Types of Indian Women," *Twin*

section contained photographs of Native women and girls dressed in fashionable Euro-American dresses, thereby indicating that these women conformed to American ideals of femininity and decorum. However, some of these photographs depicted women wearing Native-style clothing. Though this would seem to invalidate Eddleman's objective, there are other possible motivations that would explain her actions. For example, in March 1902, *Twin Territories* contained an image of a girl named Annie wearing a Kiowa dress. The caption to the photograph placed the value of the dress at \$300. By highlighting the monetary value of certain Native clothes, the photograph indicated that Annie's family had wealth and suggested Annie only used the dress for special occasions, not everyday use.

Eddleman's usage of photography differentiated herself from Euro-American advocates of Indian boarding schools. These institutions frequently used "before and after" images to highlight the changes brought by education. Such images had their roots in the work of Dr. Thomas John Barnardo who used similar photographs to publicize his Home for Destitute Lads in Stepney Causeway, England, during the 1870s. For proponents of boarding schools, these photographs proved crucial as they provided visual evidence of the transformative process of a Euro-American education. The public that consumed these images did not consider the staged nature of these photographs or think about the ways in which school administrators purposely selected students that would provide the most striking contrasts. School officials chose the most savage looking

Territories, January 1903, 13-14; "Types of Indian Girls," *Twin Territories*, April 1903, 132; "Types of Indian Women," *Twin Territories* June 1903, 209.

individuals wearing clothing that Euro-Americans would identify as authentic. This equation of savage dress and savage behavior helped to make the after photographs seem more impressive as the students appeared wearing Euro-American clothing. From a racial standpoint, the subjects in the before images often appeared darker than their after image. A partial explanation involved the increased time that students spent indoors rather than outside. However, the photographers understood how to use lighting in order to alter the appearance of the subject's skin. Such photographs thereby suggested that assimilation and acquisition of a Euro-American education could help transform American Indians into civilized citizens while helping them to achieve or at least approximate whiteness.⁸⁷

Eddleman eschewed any approach depicting individuals in a state of savagery as she did not believe Native women required civilizing. Instead, her photographs pictured American Indian women wearing civilized dress on their own without needing Euro-Americans to uplift them.⁸⁸ Her work also contrasted with photographers who sought to capture images of Native peoples wearing traditional clothes or performing tribal dances. While these photographs may have helped to preserve knowledge of Native customs, the public interpreted these images as evidence of the uncivilized or "savage nature of American Indians. In addition, these images facilitated the question of the Plains Indians with all other tribes and nations throughout the United States. Eddleman wanted to instruct her readers outside of Indian Territory to abandon a homogenized notion of

⁸⁷ Jacqueline Fear-Segal, *White Man's Club: Schools, Race, and the Struggle of Indian Acculturation* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007), 163-168; Amelia V. Katanski, *Learning to Write "Indian": The Boarding-School Experience and American Indian Literature* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005), 23-25; Wexler, 109.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 180.

American Indians by viewing these representatives of the Five Tribes as the equals of eastern women. To this end, Eddleman frequently included short biographical sketches with these photographs stressing the club work these women performed. The references to club work connected these women with middle-class values and decorum, indicating that Ora Eddleman was not content with simply identifying American Indians as the equals of whites. She wanted Euro-American readers to view the Five Tribes as conforming to the norms of the middle class.⁸⁹

After her marriage in 1904, Eddleman Reed took a break from publishing for a year after she and her husband, Charles Leroy Reed, moved to Kansas City. However, Eddleman Reed was unhappy in Kansas City, prompting the couple to return to Muskogee in 1905 and providing her with the opportunity to continue writing for *Sturm's Statehood Magazine*—later *Sturm's Oklahoma Magazine*—Eddleman Reed edited the Indian Department during its first year of publication. Poor health forced Eddleman Reed to cease her work as editor in 1906, but she continued to write occasional articles while *Sturm's* published other pieces about American Indians.⁹⁰ In the second issue of *Sturm's*

⁸⁹ Alexia Kosmider, "Strike a Euroamerican Pose: Ora Eddleman Reed's 'Types of Indian Girls,'" *American Transcendental Quarterly* (June 1998): 110-112, 117, 119.

⁹⁰ A-Han-Ta-Ti, "Passing of Indian Names," *Sturm's Oklahoma Magazine*, November 1908, 32; O. W. Bronson, "Quanah Parker," *Sturm's Oklahoma Magazine*, December 1907, 77-81; Rosa Buell, "The Last 'Cry' of the Choctaws," *Sturm's Oklahoma Magazine*, September 1907, 12-14; Kate Pearson Burwell, "A New Era for the Osages," *Sturm's Oklahoma Magazine*, September 1906, 9-10; Kate Pearson Burwell, "The Richest People in the World," *Sturm's Statehood Magazine*, June 1906, 88-96; J.B. Dickinson, "Last Gathering of Indian Braves," *Sturm's Oklahoma Magazine*, October 1907, 95-96; Charles Gibson, "A Creek Indian Fable," *Sturm's Statehood Magazine*, October 1905, 88-90; Charles Gould, "Origin of Indian Territory Names," *Sturm's Oklahoma Magazine*, December 1907, 36-38; J. R. Gregory, "Early Creek History," *Sturm's Statehood Magazine*, October 1905, 86-87; Chinnubie Harjo, "Indian Folk Lore," *Sturm's Oklahoma Magazine*, October 1906: 91-93; O. H. Lipps, "The Navajo and His Reservation," *Sturm's Statehood Magazine*, May 1906, 82-92; Morrison, 160; A. Powe, "A Modern Push-ma-ta-ha," *Sturm's Oklahoma Magazine*, November 1906, 40-47; Mary Powers, "The Ponca Reservation

Statehood Magazine, Ora Eddleman Reed outlined her plans for the Indian Department; she desired to provide the talented literary men and women of the Five Tribes with a forum to express their views. Eddleman Reed wanted Native voices in her department to help counteract what she saw as a dearth of accurate information about American Indians. She also continued to depict American Indians as capable of adapting to the modern world with articles discussing the Euro-American styles of clothing worn by many members of the Five Tribes. This conclusion reveals her motivation for selecting many informational pieces as she wanted to preserve the knowledge of tribal elders so that it would not be lost.⁹¹

Eddleman Reed continued to hold the Five Tribes—and especially the Cherokees—in high regard. In June 1906, Eddleman Reed discussed the termination of the tribal governments for the Five Tribes and traced their histories. In describing the early history of relations between American Indians and white settlers prior to the American Revolution, Eddleman Reed described the treaties as a means of forcing Native peoples to give up their lands. Eddleman Reed did not provide specific examples but argued that American Indians only agreed to these early treaties under protest. Eddleman Reed also justified American Indian alliances with the British against the Americans as

and School,” *Sturm’s Oklahoma Magazine*, October 1906, 87-90; Charles Leroy Reed, “The Last Choctaw Chief,” *Sturm’s Oklahoma Magazine*, February 1907, 11-14; Charles Leroy Reed, “The Greatest Living Indian,” *Sturm’s Oklahoma Magazine*, January 1907, 11-16; J. L. Rogers, “Twin Moccasins—A Weird Tale,” *Sturm’s Oklahoma Magazine*, May 1911, 1; Jesse Townsend, “Indian Life Forty Years Ago,” *Sturm’s Oklahoma Magazine*, April 1911, 26-27; Jesse Townsend, “Teaching the Indian the White Man’s Way,” *Sturm’s Oklahoma Magazine*, May 1911, 28-29.

⁹¹ Ora Eddleman Reed, “Father of 90,000 Indians,” *Sturm’s Oklahoma Magazine*, July 1906, 83; Ora Eddleman Reed, “The Object of the Indian Department,” *Sturm’s Statehood Magazine*, October 1905, 83.

the only possible counterbalance to the wave of settlers pouring into their lands. Eddleman Reed also called attention to how treaties concluded between American Indians and the federal government usually promised Native communities that further modifications of existing boundaries would not be necessary. However, Eddleman Reed then blamed the continued Native unease with the persistent entrance of intruders onto their tribal lands.⁹²

In describing the pre-Removal History of the Cherokees, Eddleman Reed noted their adoption of the trappings of civilization, such as new farming techniques, material goods, and a new government based on a constitution. These descriptions served to mirror Eddleman Reed's earlier writings depicting the Five Tribes as civilized due to their adoption of European-American norms. At the end of the account, Eddleman Reed examined the allotment of Indian Territory. Though Eddleman Reed endorsed allotment in *Twin Territories*, this later article presented a somewhat more critical view. Eddleman Reed still described allotment as an inevitable process, but she described this outcome in terms of the federal government's determination to destroy the governments of the Five Tribes and secure enough surplus land for white settlers. Though Eddleman Reed did not label this as avarice similar to the desire of Georgia to seize the Cherokee Nation, it still depicted the actions of the federal government as focused on the acquisition of material wealth. Thus, the government's determination to divide the lands of the Five Tribes—not any concern about the long-term well being of Native communities—provided the

⁹² Ora Eddleman Reed, "The Dying of the Council Fires," *Sturm's Statehood Magazine*, June 1906, 81-87.

primary motivation for forcing the Five Tribes to comply with allotment. Eddleman Reed ended the piece by casting culturally conservative Indians as idealistic for their desire to live in their dreams rather than the reality of allotment.⁹³

Eddleman Reed also used her position with *Sturm's Statehood Magazine* to continue answering questions from curious readers. However, Eddleman Reed ceased her practice of rebuking letter writers she viewed as ignorant. She answered questions about prominent members of the Five Tribes, recommended books of Indian legends and stories, and supplied details about treaties between the United States and American Indians. She also answered general questions about the Five Tribes, such as the distinction between eastern and western Cherokees and the number of publications produced using the Cherokee alphabet.⁹⁴ As this was not her publication, she may have received instructions to ignore irksome questions, or she may have decided to answer only those questions she found had the potential to edify her readers.⁹⁵

Though Ora Eddleman embraced the concepts of civilization and progress to argue for the inclusion of American Indians as equal members of society, not all of her contemporaries agreed. Another Native woman, Gertrude Simmons, a Dakota better known as Zitkala-Ša, also perceived the same dangers inherent in permitting Euro-American characterizations of Native communities to remain unchallenged. While

⁹³ Ora Eddleman Reed, "The Dying of the Council Fires," *Sturm's Statehood Magazine*, June 1906, 81-87.

⁹⁴ Ora Eddleman Reed, "Queries," *Sturm's Statehood Magazine*, December 1905, 96; Ora Eddleman Reed, "Queries," *Sturm's Statehood Magazine*, February 1906, 93.

⁹⁵ Ora Eddleman Reed, "The Averted Catastrophe," *Sturm's Statehood Magazine*, April 1906, 81-89.

Eddleman primarily focused on issues of representation and Euro-American ignorance of Native accomplishments, Zitkala-Ša challenged Euro-American claims to civilization by highlighting the brutality of assimilation. Though Zitkala-Ša also sought to demonstrate the humanity of Native peoples to the American public, she rejected the necessity of embracing all elements of Euro-American society. Her writings first appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* during the first three months of 1900 while *Harper's* published several of her short stories in 1901.⁹⁶

Within the pages of *Atlantic Monthly*, Zitkala-Ša launched an attack on the boarding school system by casting it as a brutalizing force in Native lives, not a source of uplift or compassion. Her account was one of the first critical views on American Indian boarding schools publicly voiced by an American Indian. Though Zitkala-Ša adopted some elements of Euro-American autobiography, she employed only those techniques that would have the greatest impact on her readers. For example, Zitkala-Ša's writings demonstrated how her childhood experiences shaped her development as an adult.⁹⁷ Despite some similarities with Victorian literature, Zitkala-Ša "found no virtue or transcendence in the Bible, no soul sister in the kitchen where she must labor, no dashing suitor in the dazzling institutional halls."⁹⁸ Thus, Zitkala-Ša employed Euro-American literary techniques to demonstrate how her boarding school experience shaped her

⁹⁶ Alice Fisher, *The Transportation of Tradition: A Study of Zitkala Sa and Mourning Dove, Two Transitional American Indian Writers*, Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1979 (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1984), 19, 34; Katanski, 115-116.

⁹⁷ Laura Wexler, *Tender Violence: Domestic Visions in the Age of US Imperialism* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 115.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 121.

development, but rather than finding her salvation or redemption through her education, Zitkala-Ša found her ruin.

Zitkala-Ša and Ora Eddleman differed on how they portrayed their ancestry in their writings. Ora Eddleman never identified herself as a “full blood” and critiqued those who made such assertions about her background by emphasizing her mixed ancestry.⁹⁹ In contrast, Zitkala-Ša elided references to her white father; this was partially due to her reluctance to provide Euro-American readers with an excuse to credit her abilities to racial characteristics inherited from her father. In addition, she and her siblings suffered physical abuse at the hands of her father, prompting her mother to leave him and drive his memory from the minds of her children. Zitkala-Ša claimed full Sioux ancestry for herself to emphasize her pride in her Native heritage.¹⁰⁰ Zitkala-Ša understood that using her English name in her writings permitted the advocates of the boarding school system to claim that her successes and abilities stemmed from her assimilation into Euro-American society. Zitkala-Ša countered this possibility by emphasizing her Native heritage through the adoption of a Lakota name. Her action was also a symbolic rejection of Euro-American efforts to obliterate Native cultures and traditions.¹⁰¹

Zitkala-Ša resisted the efforts of Euro-American advocates of the boarding school system to co-opt her story. The *Red Man and Helper* from Carlisle Indian Industrial

⁹⁹ Kosmider, 114

¹⁰⁰ Katanski, 114-115; Deborah Welch, “Gertrude Simmons Bonnin (Zitkala-Ša): Dakota” in *The New Warriors: Native American Leaders since 1900*, ed. David Edmunds (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 36.

¹⁰¹ Katanski, 114-115.

Training School reprinted excerpts of Zitkala-Ša's writings from *Atlantic Monthly* in an effort to counter her criticism and recast her writing in a way that reflected more positively on the boarding school system.¹⁰² The republished versions censored some of the more glaring critiques of the boarding schools and sought to exert control over Zitkala-Ša's narrative. Richard Pratt, the founder of Carlisle, went to considerable lengths to craft the image that boarding schools presented to the public, prompting him to see Zitkala-Ša's writing as a threat.¹⁰³ Pratt attempted to argue that the very existence of such a memoir proved the benefits of boarding schools in that Zitkala-Ša exhibited a high level of education and writing ability. He encouraged Zitkala-Ša to show greater temperance in her writings as her experiences might not accurately represent the views of the majority of boarding school students. Zitkala-Ša rejected this criticism and insisted upon the importance of relating her own embittering experiences. Nevertheless, Pratt encouraged her to show greater appreciation and gratitude for the opportunities that boarding schools had offered her but she rebuffed these efforts. Pratt could not understand how one who had acquired an education could choose to embrace her supposedly savage roots, for he believed that the replacement of savagery with civilization would be a permanent process.¹⁰⁴

Similar to Ora Eddleman, Zitkala-Ša created a more positive identity for American Indians by challenging the labels that Euro-Americans used to denigrate Native

¹⁰² Fisher, 14.

¹⁰³ For example, there are no known photographs of the cemetery at Carlisle during the years that the school was in operation. Fear-Segal, 232.

¹⁰⁴ Katanski, 122-124.

communities. However, Zitkala-Ša did not use examples of American Indian progress or civilization to bolster her portrayals of Native peoples. Instead, her work insisted upon the moral nature of American Indians by portraying Native people as far more ethical than Euro-Americans or their civilization. For example, Zitkala-Ša recalled the rude behavior of Euro-American men, women, and children who gaped at her and other American Indian children as they rode a train eastward to attend school. Euro-American children turned around in their seats to gawk at the frightened Native boys and girls while their mothers did nothing to stop them. Zitkala-Ša labeled this scrutiny as rude and uninvited. During her years in college, Zitkala-Ša took part in debates and witnessed some of the Euro-American students jeering at her and holding up signs bearing insults. Zitkala-Ša criticized this “barbarian rudeness,” thereby casting Euro-Americans as uncivilized. These incidents raised questions about the benevolence of Euro-American society and questioned the capacity of the dominant society to accept non-whites as equals.¹⁰⁵

When she arrived at her boarding school, Zitkala-Ša suffered a terrifying experience as one of the women working there repeatedly tossed her into the air. Zitkala-Ša resented this action as it was something that her family members would never do to a young child. Her account represented a critique of Euro-American culture for permitting a practice that could turn a child into a mere “plaything.”¹⁰⁶ Through this argument, Euro-American child rearing practices appeared dehumanizing as they failed to treat the young

¹⁰⁵ Wexler, 79, 119.

¹⁰⁶ Zitkala-Ša, *American Indian Stories* (Washington D.C.: Hayworth Publishing, 1923; reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985), 50.

with any degree of respect. Though Zitkala-Ša did not explicitly label Euro-Americans as poor guardians for the young, her description is significant in its implications. Many of the arguments that justified the creation of the boarding school system relied upon the denigration of Native parents. Advocates of the schools claimed that American Indian parents did not feed or care for their children properly.¹⁰⁷ By emphasizing the proper treatment she received from her mother, Zitkala-Ša not only challenged the claims about Native parents but rejected the assumptions about the necessity of Euro-American stewardship.

Zitkala-Ša's condemnation of the immorality of Euro-American society extended to the clothing that school officials required the students to wear as she considered these garments immodest. She explained, "I looked hard at the Indian girls, who seemed not to care that they were even more immodestly dressed than I, in their tightly fitting clothes."¹⁰⁸ With this observation, Zitkala-Ša rejected assumptions about the morality of Euro-American civilization and culture by turning judgments about clothing against the colonizers. She also cast her fellow students as individuals who lost their morality and sense of shame by adopting Euro-American standards. Rather than identifying Euro-American dresses as elegant or as markers of civilization, Zitkala-Ša cast this clothing as

¹⁰⁷ American Indian children at boarding schools often experienced hunger as school administrators sought to reduce their expenses. In addition, as schools received funding based upon the number of children enrolled, students at boarding schools suffered from overcrowded facilities. These densely-packed dormitories helped to spread disease. Admittedly, many Native families sent their children to boarding schools as they could not afford to feed or clothe them properly. However, Euro-American observers blamed these conditions on the parents rather than considering the harsh economic conditions found on reservations. Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005): 35-38.

¹⁰⁸ Zitkala-Ša, 52-53.

inappropriate for revealing too much of the female body. Her arguments presented an important contrast with the reformers who sought to civilize American Indians.¹⁰⁹ While Ora Eddleman used photographs of American Indian women wearing Euro-American dresses as evidence of their femininity and refined nature, Zitkala-Ša used this same clothing as evidence of the harm caused by assimilation of Euro-American norms.

Zitkala-Ša furthered her critique of the boarding school system by highlighting the abuses perpetrated against the student population. She related one incident that happened shortly after she arrived at school. Zitkala-Ša and two of her Dakota friends, Judéwin and Thowin, were at play, falling into the snow despite the warnings of one of the employees at the school. The girls continued to play in the snow until a woman waved them into a house for punishment. Judéwin tried to assist her friend, Thowin, by instructing her to reply to anything that the woman asked by saying “no.” Unfortunately, the woman asked Judéwin whether or not she intended to obey. Judéwin’s negative answer only prompted further spanking and physical punishment. As this was the only English word that Judéwin knew, she had no choice but to continue using it in the hope

¹⁰⁹ For example, the *Indian Guide*, a boarding school publication from Wyoming, published a letter from an Indian woman suggesting that American Indians could participate in American society while simultaneously retaining their own styles of dress. The writer compared this to Christian denominations that continued to wear traditional fashions. The editors of the *Indian Guide* expressed bafflement that one who enjoyed the benefits of civilization could make such an argument and equated savage dress with savage behavior. The *Indian Guide* advocated other measures of bringing civilization to the American Indian. For example, a short piece from October of 1896 argued that the existence of a population of elk and antelope provided a barrier to the civilization of the Shoshone and Bannocks of the Jackson Hole Country. Consequently, the paper argued that the “sincere friends of the Indians” would welcome the extinction of these animals. Another editorial noted that the publication hoped to educate both the Indian and the white. While the Indian would gain knowledge of civilization, the white would learn “that there are good Indians, other than dead ones.” The editors of the *Indian Guide* did not question the “civilization” of such whites who preferred to see the Indians vanish. *Indian Guide*, October 1896, 2; *Indian Guide*, November 1896, 2; “Shall the Indian Keep His Paint and Feathers?,” *The Indian Guide*, June 1896, 1.

that she would eventually provide the necessary answer.¹¹⁰ Zitkala-Ša's account highlighted the absurdity and cruelty of forbidding newly-arrived students to communicate with the teachers and administrators in their own language. Zitkala-Ša's writings posed a particular threat to Pratt's desired public image of the boarding schools in that she not only recognized the abuses that occurred but undermined the depiction of school officials as benevolent.

In a chapter entitled "Iron Routine," Zitkala-Ša offered one of her most scathing charges against the boarding school system. She explained that each day followed a specific routine that allowed no deviation for students who felt ill. Zitkala-Ša wrote, "it was next to impossible to leave the iron routine after the civilizing machine had once begun its day's buzzing; and it was inbred in me to suffer in silence rather than to appeal to the ears of one whose open eyes could not see my pain."¹¹¹ Zitkala-Ša thereby described the boarding school system as an impersonal mechanism that cared little for the lives or wellbeing of the children. In addition, she depicted the staff at boarding schools as ignorant of the harm they caused the children under their care. Zitkala-Ša's description of the boarding schools paralleled many critiques of industrialization in that critics saw factory work as dehumanizing. In this sense, Zitkala-Ša offered a critique of American society at the turn of the twentieth century.

Supporters of the boarding school system wanted to prepare American Indians for lives of menial labor. In the context of the late nineteenth and early-twentieth century,

¹¹⁰ Zitkala-Ša, 57-61.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 66.

this meant that the young men would find work on farms, in factories or other industrial occupations while the women would find employment as domestic servants. Zitkala-Ša's description of a visit home to her reservation raised other questions about economic inequality and the limited opportunities available to American Indians. Zitkala-Ša asked her mother about her inability to install concrete or other modern "necessities." Her mother explained that her advanced age kept her from working while her son, a government clerk, had lost his job to a Euro-American man. Zitkala-Ša's discussion highlighted the poverty that many Native communities faced while demonstrating that racial discrimination restricted economic opportunities. In addition, American Indian graduates of boarding schools often had few opportunities to use the training they received as the skills they learned had already become obsolete and irrelevant.¹¹²

Zitkala-Ša's fiction also furthered her critiques of assimilation. In her short story, "The Soft-hearted Sioux," an educated Indian returned to his tribe as a missionary after embracing Euro-American norms and abandoning his own culture. The young man found his father in poor health and drove off a medicine man who was attending to him. This behavior led the tribe to ostracize the young man, abandoning him to care for his father alone. Due to his years away from his people, he never learned how to hunt and was unable to provide for his elderly father. More importantly, he could not find game animals as farmers and ranchers infringed on reservation lands with their livestock. The protagonist's desperation led him to kill one of these animals, but the rancher pursued him, leading to a fight. During the struggle, the young Indian fatally stabbed the rancher,

¹¹² Ibid., 90-91.

went to prison, and faced the death penalty for his actions. The story provided a harsh view of the federal government's efforts to assimilate American Indians by casting the graduates as outcasts upon their return to their reservations; in addition, the story highlighting the economic inequalities that hampered American Indians efforts to support themselves and their families. Thus, for Zitkala-Ša, involvement with the Euro-American economy did not bring economic development but disaster.¹¹³ Though Ora Eddleman criticized efforts to cheat American Indians of their land, she blamed these actions on unscrupulous individuals rather than identifying systemic problems in the American economy.

Both Ora Eddleman and Zitkala-Ša considered the problem of challenging harmful depictions of Native people. Through her magazine and newspaper work, Ora Eddleman cast members of the Five Tribes as civilized by showing their adherence to Euro-American norms and emphasized the economic development of Indian Territory. Ora Eddleman sought to include American Indians within American society by demonstrating their adherence to middle-class norms and values. Zitkala-Ša also sought to reshape public perceptions of American Indians, but her strategy focused on raising questions about whether Euro-Americans possessed the moral authority to judge American Indians. Though she acknowledged the value of education, Zitkala-Ša rejected the methods of coerced assimilation practiced at Indian boarding schools, linking her with other harsh Native critics of the federal government from the turn of the twentieth

¹¹³ Fisher, 15; Charles Hannon, "Zitkala-Sä and the Commercial Magazine Apparatus," in *"The Only Efficient Instrument": American Women Writers and the Periodical, 1837-1916*, eds. Aleta Feinsod Cane and Susan Alves (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2001), 185-186.

century. These lesser-known individuals, particularly DeWitt Clinton Duncan of the
Cherokees, offered a harsh rebuke to the United States government for its efforts to
impose its will on Native communities.

Chapter 3

DeWitt Clinton Duncan, “The White Man’s Burden,” and the American Empire

The Cherokee, DeWitt Clinton Duncan, was one of the most forceful Native critics of American empire, both at home and abroad. Starting in the 1870s, Duncan wrote letters appearing in Indian Territory newspapers though the bulk of his work appeared between 1895 and 1905.¹ These writings provided scathing attacks on the federal government’s efforts to break up tribal governments and allot the lands of the Five Tribes. More than most other Native writers, Duncan saw a direct connection between the assaults on Native sovereignty in Indian Territory and the extension of American authority overseas. Duncan viewed these endeavors as unconscionable; drawing upon Christian morality, Duncan condemned the United States for its immorality and greed. The writings of this lesser-known figure merit study as he consistently championed the interests of the Cherokee Nation by dismissing the negative claims that proponents of federal intervention made about Indian Territory. Duncan’s astute observations enabled him to invert the labels used to denigrate the Cherokee Nation and turn them against Euro-Americans and expose the divergence between American ideals and American policy. His writings indicated that American Indian writers could clearly

¹ Daniel Littlefield Jr., and James Parins, *A Biobibliography of Native American Writers, 1772-1924* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1981), 44-48.

identify the parallels between the federal government's treatment of American Indians and policies adopted overseas in the wake of the Spanish-American War of 1898.

Born in 1829, Dewitt Clinton Duncan was the son of John and Elizabeth Duncan. His parents named him after one of the most prominent politicians of the early nineteenth century, Dewitt Clinton. The two-time governor of New York encouraged the construction of the Erie Canal and assisted the Historical Society of New York with the creation of a history of the American Indians of that state. The naming of DeWitt Clinton Duncan occurred just over a year after the death of the famous New York politician.² In 1839, DeWitt Clinton Duncan accompanied his parents on the Trail of Tears across the Mississippi River to Indian Territory. From a young age, Duncan expressed an interest in the church as well as temperance work. His religious grounding would frame many of his arguments and critiques of the federal government.

Duncan arrived at Dartmouth in 1857 and graduated in 1861, excelling in his studies and winning the praise of his teachers.³ After his graduation, Duncan taught school at Lisbon and Littleton, New Hampshire; at Clarksville, Iowa; at Belvedere Illinois; and at Eagle, Wisconsin before he settled in Charles City, Iowa, in 1866.⁴ Duncan returned to Indian Territory intermittently over the following years. Duncan served as an instructor and later as the principal of the Cherokee Male Seminary, teaching

² Dorothe Bobbé, *De Witt Clinton* (New York: Minton, Balch, and Company, 1933); Evan Cornog, *The Birth of Empire: DeWitt Clinton and the American Experience, 1769-1828* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

³ Kathleen Garret, "Dartmouth Alumni in the Indian Territory," *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, 130

⁴ Bernd C. Peyer, ed., *American Indian Nonfiction: An Anthology of Writings, 1760s-1930s* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007), 169.

English, Greek, and Latin. He also ran for solicitor of the Saline District but lost to an individual identified as “illiterate.”⁵ In an effort to identify with culturally-conservative Cherokees, Duncan dressed in simple attire, wearing a home-spun hunting coat and beaded moccasins.⁶

In 1881, Duncan secured the position of clerk of the Citizens Court.⁷ During that same year, the Cherokees selected Duncan as their representative in Judge Isaac C. Parker’s court to defeat David L. Payne and the “Boomers” who wanted to secure Native lands by claiming homesteads within Indian Territory. Each of the Five Tribes selected a representative to hire an attorney to aid the Department of Justice prosecute Payne. The Cherokees chose Duncan as their legal representative rather than hiring an outside attorney. The court’s decision in May 1881 held that Indian Territory should not be classified as public lands open to homesteaders.⁸

During the 1890s Duncan settled permanently in Vinita within the Cherokee Nation where he continued to defend the Cherokees and Indian Territory through numerous letters he sent to newspaper editors under the pen name Too-qua-stee.⁹ Many

⁵ Garret, 130.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Twenty years later, opponents of DeWitt Clinton Duncan accused him of taking bribes while serving in this role, prompting him to respond. Duncan rejected these claims and did not refer to them again, indicating there may have been little to them. Too-qua-stee, “Defends His Name,” *Indian Chieftain*, 10 April 1902, 2.

⁸ Carl Coke Rister, *Land Hunger: David Payne and the Oklahoma Boomers* (New York: Arno Press, 1975), 90-91.

⁹ When Duncan did not use his penname, he often signed his name as D. W. C. Duncan, and people within Indian Territory knew him by these initials. Garret, 130.

of these letters appeared in the *Indian Chieftain* from Vinita. Editorially, the *Indian Chieftain* explained it did not endorse Duncan's viewpoints, but it published his letters to provide readers with alternative perspectives. The *Chieftain's* commitment to open debate won Duncan's praise for permitting the expression of an Indian point of view.¹⁰

One of the key ways in which Duncan challenged the American empire was in his presentation of an alternative view of United States history. Rather than glorifying the westward movement of Euro-American settlers, Duncan cast United States history as a series of abuses against American Indians. Throughout October 1882, Duncan presented a history of the Cherokees that appeared in weekly installments of the *Cherokee Advocate*. He depicted the United States as obsessed with obtaining Cherokee lands, prompting the Cherokees to "purchas[e] immunity against the rapacity of their white neighbors by feeding their cupidity" with land.¹¹ Duncan identified 1802 as a turning point as the United States government agreed to attach Cherokee lands to Georgia after the Cherokees agreed to give up their title to the lands. According to Duncan, Georgia accepted this arrangement and only clamored for the prompt expulsion of the Cherokees after the discovery of gold on Cherokee lands.¹² The presence of gold within the Cherokee Nation convinced Americans of all economic and political backgrounds that the Cherokees were halting progress and civilization by retaining their homelands.¹³

¹⁰ *Indian Chieftain*, 17 July 1902, 2; Too-qua-stee, "Address to Cherokees," *Indian Chieftain*, 28 March 1901, 1.

¹¹ D. W. C. Duncan, "Story of the Cherokees," *Cherokee Advocate*, 6 October 1882, 1.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

Duncan's history consistently portrayed the Cherokees as the moral party in its dealings with the federal government. In describing the invasion of whites seeking to control the gold-producing parts of the Cherokee Nation, Duncan explained the Cherokees' "only available weapon of defense was truth," indicating that armed resistance to white encroachment on their lands was impossible.¹⁴ Duncan accused many Americans of refusing to listen to Cherokee appeals to abide by existing treaties, as "they would not allow their minds to be troubled by the harrowing questions of justice."¹⁵ In other writings, Duncan reiterated this critique as he believed Euro-Americans viewed treaties as impediments to their settlement of Native lands, prompting this "lawless multitude" to demand the abrogation of these agreements.¹⁶

In discussing Removal, Duncan cast President Andrew Jackson as an individual focused on ways to remove the Cherokees from their lands while absolving the federal government of any responsibility to defend their interests. To prove that Jackson was willing to use federal power, Duncan pointed to the nullification crisis with South Carolina, indicating that Jackson could compel the states to follow federal policy when he saw fit. Duncan described the subsequent extension of Georgia's laws over the Cherokee lands as "malevolen[t]" while highlighting the extensive improvements Cherokees made to their homes and farms, thereby questioning the depiction of the Cherokee nation as

¹⁴ D. W. C. Duncan, "Story of the Cherokees," *Cherokee Advocate*, 13 October 1882, 1.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ "Too-qua-stee," "The Indian's Hard Lot," *Indian Chieftain*, 2 June 1898, 2.

undeveloped.¹⁷ Duncan also depicted the whites who took over the farms owned by the Cherokees as “savages.”¹⁸ Duncan ended his history of the Cherokees before their forced expulsion from Georgia, but the final part of his account further condemned the United States for its actions, noting “that malignant power, falsely called civilization, is to this day still at their heels demanding their room or their ruin.”¹⁹

Duncan’s discussion of Cherokee history gave him the foundation upon which he built his arguments against allotment and the federal government’s efforts to eliminate the sovereignty of the Cherokee Nation.²⁰ In 1903, Dewitt Clinton Duncan wrote his own history of allotment. Duncan tied allotment to nomadic tribes rather than the Five Tribes within Indian Territory. Duncan explained that allotment held an appeal to members of nomadic tribes because of the horrific conditions in which they found themselves during the closing decades of the nineteenth century. Duncan described the creation of reservations as a form of imprisonment that deprived American Indians of their accustomed manner of living. Though Euro-Americans provided these Indians with clothing and food, the reservations left Native communities dependent upon the mercy of outsiders. Within this context, these formerly nomadic groups accepted allotment as a means of restoring some measure of autonomy, for these American Indians believed “that

¹⁷ D. W. C. Duncan, “Story of the Cherokees,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 13 October 1882, 1; D. W. C. Duncan, “Story of the Cherokees,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 20 October 1882, 1.

¹⁸ D. W. C. Duncan, “Story of the Cherokees,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 20 October 1882, 1.

¹⁹ D. W. C. Duncan, “Story of the Cherokees,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 27 October 1882, 1.

²⁰ Too-qua-stee, Letter, *Cherokee Advocate*, 9 February 1881, 2.

their case was incapable of any further enlargement of misery.”²¹ Allotment was a policy that American Indians accepted because it provided the possibility of ameliorating deplorable conditions upon reservations; it was not an indication of American Indians whole heartedly embracing Euro-American culture.²² Duncan further contrasted the conditions facing the Plains Indians with the Five Tribes by focusing upon their armed struggles against the United States. The United States had the right under “the brutal laws of war” to dictate the terms that their former enemies received.²³ Duncan’s acknowledgement of the right of the United States to divide up the tribal lands of defeated tribes did not result in his endorsement of the policy for he identified this earlier example of allotment as a “feeble compliment [of] American civilization.”²⁴ Duncan would repeat these arguments when contrasting the fates of Filipinos, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans with the Cherokee Nation.

The apparent success of allotment amongst these Native groups encouraged western states to demand that the federal government apply a similar policy to the Five Tribes regardless of their achievements. These westerners justified their claims by noting that the Five Tribes “had no rights, however solemnly guaranteed, that the government was bound to respect,” as they were only Indians.²⁵ Unlike the Plains Indians, the Five

²¹ Too-qua-stee, “The Story of Allotment,” *Indian Chieftain*, 3 September 1903, 4.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*

Tribes had not suffered a defeat in war to the United States. Nevertheless, the Curtis Act of 1898 abrogated treaties between the United States and the Five Tribes while destroying their civil government, eliminating their laws, and threatening their ownership of tribal lands.

In discussions of allotment, Duncan was particularly critical of the Curtis Act of 1898. Charles Curtis of Kansas introduced the measure in an effort to protect the white non-citizens of Indian Territory as well as guarding poorer members of the Five Tribes from the supposed monopolization of their lands.²⁶ The law prohibited the governments of the Five Tribes from enforcing their laws, called for the permanent closure of tribal courts, and gave the Secretary of the Interior the authority to sign mineral leases and control tribal funds. The law also authorized the Dawes Commission to allot the lands of the Five Tribes after completing rolls of tribal members.²⁷ During much of 1898, Duncan was in Washington attempting to convince members of Congress to refrain from passing the Curtis Act or pursuing the forced allotment of Cherokee lands, but his delegation

²⁶ The author of the Curtis Act, Charles Curtis, received critical comments from DeWitt Clinton Duncan. In 1900, Curtis sought to amend an agreement between the Cherokee Nation and the United States government by permitting the Secretary of the Interior to issue leases for the removal of asphalt, coal, oil, gas and other valuable resources from the Cherokee Nation. Duncan accused of Curtis of trying to poison the agreement “with his little spoonful of wormwood” while seeking to compel the Cherokees to swallow this bitter agreement. Duncan explained he did not know whether Curtis originated the idea himself or whether he was following the instructions of Standard Oil Company, but Duncan predicted this scheme would cause the agreement to fail if it found inclusion in the final agreement. Duncan’s usage of the word “wormwood” to describe Curtis’ efforts to alter the proposed agreement merits further consideration. Given Duncan’s familiarity with biblical imagery, he likely would have known Wormwood was the name of a star mentioned in Revelation. When the star fell to Earth, a third of the water became bitter causing many people to die. The destructiveness of the biblical Wormwood matched Duncan’s depiction fo the impact of the Curtis Law on the Cherokee Nation. Too-qua-stee, “Curtis ‘Wormwood;’” *Indian Chieftain*, 7 June 1900, 4.

²⁷ Kent Carter, *The Dawes Commission and the Allotment of the Five Civilized Tribes, 1893-1914* (Orem, UT: Ancestry.com, 1999), 32-38.

encountered difficulties in trying to secure meetings before the appropriate committees.²⁸ In these letters, Duncan vehemently rejected the possibility of giving into the federal government's desire to break up the Cherokee Nation, proclaiming, "The loss attending stupid, cowardly, sordid, concession is far worse than the results of defeat."²⁹ Duncan first wrote a letter to Charles Curtis explaining his doubts about the inequities within the Curtis Act.³⁰

While the Senate debated the passage of the act, Duncan watched from the gallery and recorded his observations. Duncan compared the largely empty senate chamber with the "roar of excitement that attended the quarrel with Spain."³¹ A handful of Indian delegates observed the proceedings that did not include a quorum of senators as Duncan estimated that no more than half a dozen members of the upper house were in attendance. Duncan also predicted consequences for the United States for its adoption of such a policy. He told a story about the Sun attempting to cheer the Indian delegates as they filed out of the building; the Sun explained that Egypt, Greece, and Rome had behaved similarly to the United States and had subsequently collapsed. In predicting the destruction of the American Empire, Duncan rejected the optimism and confidence of Americans who saw the United States as a rising power destined to play a greater role in

²⁸ Too Qua-Stee, "'Too-qua-stee' in Washington," *Indian Chieftain*, 31 March 1898, 1; Too Qua-Stee, "'Too-qua-stee' in Washington," *Indian Chieftain*, 14 April 1898, 1; Too Qua-Stee, "'Too-qua-stee' in Washington," *Indian Chieftain*, 21 April 1898, 4; Too-qua-stee, "View of the Delegates," *Indian Chieftain*, 21 April 1898, 2.

²⁹ Too-qua-stee, "View of the Delegates," *Indian Chieftain*, 21 April 1898, 2.

³⁰ Too-qua-stee, "Too-qua-stee Writes," *Indian Chieftain*, 17 February 1898, 2.

³¹ Too-qua-stee, "Passage of the Curtis Bill," *Indian Chieftain*, 21 June 1898, 1.

global affairs. Rather than identifying the extension of American power as a continuation of Manifest Destiny, Duncan labeled the United States as a country with a bleak future as its conduct would result in a downfall “the United States cannot expect to escape.”³²

The passage of the Curtis Act did not bring an end to his criticism of the law, as he continued to denounce it for its “nonchalance” in describing the seizure of “the private property of an Indian without his consent.”³³ Duncan continued to call attention to the financial cost the Curtis Act would extract from the Cherokee Nation.³⁴ The threat of the Curtis act compelled the Cherokees to negotiate with the federal government to define the terms of the dissolution of their government and the allotment of their lands. Duncan asserted that whether the Cherokees permitted the Curtis Act to guide the division of their lands and property or ratified a new agreement with the United States, the result was the same, meaning “loss, loss, loss, all the time, loss, fleecing without end.”³⁵ As Duncan explained, circumstances only permitted the Cherokees “to lend their own aid to the consummation of wrong upon themselves” by voting for an agreement leading to the division of tribal lands.³⁶ Duncan consistently referred to proposed agreements with the

³² Ibid.

³³ Too-qua-stee, “Unjust Treatment,” *Indian Chieftain*, 1 September 1898, 1.

³⁴ Too-qua-stee, “Coercive Throughout,” *Indian Chieftain*, 6 October 1898, 1.

³⁵ Too-qua-stee, “Against a Treaty,” *Indian Chieftain*, 13 June 1901, 1.

³⁶ Ibid.

Dawes Commission as a means of robbing the Cherokees of the proper value of their lands and improvements.³⁷

Duncan labeled the actions of the federal government and the Dawes Commission as extortion and forcing the Cherokees to accept an agreement under duress.³⁸ Duncan argued that requiring the Cherokee to agree to the federal government's demands or face losing their lands anyway resulted in nothing more than legitimized robbery. Duncan contrasted the situation with the war with Spain, noting that the United States "has the right to lay down ulimata—evacuation of Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines—to which she is bound to assent ere she can have the benefits of an agreement of peace."³⁹ Duncan thereby argued that Spain, as a defeated nation, had reason to acquiesce to American demands, indicating that the United States treated the Cherokee Nation as a defeated enemy even though no such conflict had taken place. Instead, Duncan explained that the Cherokees had remained loyal to the United States, entitling them to the rights and protections offered by the country.⁴⁰ Despite these differing circumstances, the

³⁷ Too-qua-stee, "A Hard Problem Indeed," *Indian Chieftain*, 20 July 1899, 1; Too-qua-stee, "Anent the Towns," *Indian Chieftain*, 7 March 1901, 4; Too-qua-stee, "Intermarried Citizens," *Vinita Weekly Chieftain*, 19 March 1903, 6; Too-qua-stee, "Nature's Forum," *Indian Chieftain*, 8 August 1901, 1; Too-qua-stee, "Nuts to Crack," *Vinita Weekly Chieftain*, 8 January 1903, 4; Too-qua-stee, "Surplus Lands of Cherokees," *Vinita Weekly Chieftain*, 19 November 1903, 1; Too-qua-stee, "The Agreements," *Indian Chieftain*, 26 January 1899, 1; Too-qua-stee, "The Mineral Outrage," *Indian Chieftain*, 25 August 1898, 1; Too-qua-stee, "The Townlot Problem," *Indian Chieftain*, 24 February 1898, 4; Too-qua-stee, "The Town Lots," *Indian Chieftain*, 20 October 1898; Too-qua-stee, "Too Much Surplus," *Daily Chieftain*, 31 May 1900, 1; Too-qua-stee, "Too-qua-stee's Criticisms," *Indian Chieftain*, 8 September 1898, 2; Too-qua-stee, "Too-qua-stee on the Agreement," *Indian Chieftain*, 19 January 1899, 2; Too-qua-stee, "Townsite Matter Discussed," *Indian Chieftain*, 15 September 1898, 2; Too-qua-stee, "Unjust Tyranny," *Daily Chieftain*, 1 June 1900, 1; Too-qua-stee, "Why Make a Treaty?," *Indian Chieftain*, 6 June 1901, 1.

³⁸ Too-qua-stee, "Indian Treaties," *Indian Chieftain*, 3 November 1898, 1.

³⁹ Too-qua-stee, "No Remedy Probable," *Indian Chieftain*, 13 October 1898, 1.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

Dawes Commission explained “they had not come to discuss with us the questions of rights, but simply tell us what the government required,” thereby revealing the negotiations to be a farce.⁴¹ As Duncan noted, fair negotiations required that both parties retain the right to decline an agreement without facing penalties for doing so.⁴²

Duncan challenged the stated purpose of allotment by explaining that the Curtis Bill has “reduced them to the condition (in a legal sense) of a mere band of strolling savages, nay a herd of prone cattle.”⁴³ The Curtis Bill would not build up or ‘civilize’ the Cherokees but “pull down, undo, and annihilate” their accomplishments. Similarly, Duncan challenged the goals and the methods of the Dawes Commission. Duncan explained that a true agreement must include “liberty of thought and action on the part of the contracting parties; and that, in the case of a failure to agree, each party is to leave the other unmolested in the same position in which he found himself.”⁴⁴ Instead, the federal government threatened to deprive the Cherokees of their lands by force if the Cherokees refused to concede the desired territory. These proceedings did not resemble negotiations but represented a legalized robbery.

Duncan described the elimination of the Nation’s courts and institutions under the Curtis Act as a policy that would create lawlessness within the Cherokee Nation. This particular argument challenged public perceptions of Indian Territory as chaotic and

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Too-qua-stee, “The Curtis Law is a Calamity,” *Indian Chieftain*, 29 September 1898, 1.

⁴⁴ Too-qua-stee, “No remedy Probable,” *Indian Chieftain*, 13 Oct 1898, 1; Too-qua-stee, “Unjust Agreement,” *Indian Chieftain*, 1 Sept 1898, 1.

requiring the intervention of the federal government. Instead, Duncan labeled the proposed interference as the true source of lawlessness. Duncan furthered his attack by explaining that the elimination of Cherokee laws invalidated all of the marriages conducted between citizens of the Cherokee Nation, as the Curtis law “bastardizes our children, and reduces all the noble fathers and mothers of our country to the moral condition of pimps and prostitutes.”⁴⁵ Duncan was clear that the existence of immorality within the Cherokee Nation resulted from federal violations of Native sovereignty.

In other letters, Duncan questioned the existence of monopolies within the Cherokee Nation. Duncan explained that the Dawes Commission believed that severalty would protect culturally conservative Cherokees from the capriciousness of the wealthier members of the Nation who possessed large estates. Duncan rejected this paternalism by noting that few Cherokees expressed any concerns about monopolies within Indian Territory. Though certain Cherokees controlled larger estates, all of the Cherokees had access to as much land as they wished to use in a location of their choosing.⁴⁶ Duncan

⁴⁵ Too-qua-stee, “Evils of the Curtis Bill,” *Indian Chieftain*, 21 July 1898, 2. This particular statement drew a harsh response from Robert Owen, a Cherokee and a senator from Oklahoma from 1907 through 1925. Owen dismissed Duncan’s conclusions, noting, “Such sentiments are not only improvident and apparently the language of violent passion.” Robert Owen, “Evils of the Curtis Bill,” *Indian Chieftain*, 28 July 1898, 2.

⁴⁶ This argument contrasted with Duncan’s earlier opposition to the creation of large enclosures within the Cherokee Nation. Three years later, Duncan attacked the avarice of individuals whose large fenced holdings prevented other Cherokees from making a home for themselves within the western parts of the Cherokee Nation. Similar to critics of the Cherokee system of land tenure, Duncan labeled these individuals as “monopolists,” but he drew different conclusions. Rather than arguing for a division of tribal lands, Duncan called for the revision of Cherokee laws to permit the Nation’s courts to defend the rights of all Cherokees to access land. Duncan attacked those holding large estates as he argued their retention of more lands than they needed would cause the poor to “be compelled to cancel their loyalty to our ancestral land system, and turn for relief to the white man’s plan of land in severalty.” Duncan’s proposed solutions involved legislating a limit to the acreage one Cherokee could claim and insisting that individuals could only claim land they themselves used thereby eliminating the leasing of land to non-Cherokees. Individuals could enlarge their holdings by renting land from other Cherokees or by claiming unused land. However,

took this critique further by postulating about how the Curtis act and allotment would serve to open Indian Territory up to the large-scale monopolies that existed elsewhere in the United States.⁴⁷ In addition, Duncan noted that a wealthy minority owned the vast majority of land within most states and questioned why the government should treat Indian Territory any differently than these states.⁴⁸ Five years after the passage of the Curtis Act, Duncan acknowledged that the claims about monopolistic practices served as the best excuse for the federal government's intervention. After disposing of the so-called monopolies within Indian Territory, "the monopolist with which the Indians had then to deal with was no less a personage than the government of the United States."⁴⁹ Thus, the Cherokees replaced their own supposedly monopolistic system with an even more powerful monopoly.⁵⁰

those who made use of these unclaimed lands would pay a tax to the Cherokee Nation for doing so. The reasons for Duncan's shift in opinion are unclear. However, Duncan may have put aside his criticisms of the Cherokee Nation in order to challenge the far greater threat posed by the federal government's attempts to impose control over Indian Territory. Too-qua-stee, "Allotment," *Indian Chieftain*, 5 September 1895, 4.

⁴⁷ Too-qua-stee, "Too-qua-stee's Criticisms," *Indian Chieftain*, 8 September 1898, 2.

⁴⁸ D. W. C. Duncan, "The Statehood of the Indian Territory," *Cherokee Advocate*, 16 March 1883, 1.

⁴⁹ Too-qua-stee, "The Story of Allotment," *Indian Chieftain*, 3 September 1903, 4.

⁵⁰ Duncan charged allotment with seeking to separate American Indians from their mineral rights as he notes that the distribution of land in severalty did not extend to any minerals beneath the surface. Duncan accused the federal government of separating the mineral rights from allotments in order to permit a handful of speculators and monopolists to control resources that should remain under Cherokee control. Duncan also critiqued the control that mineral leases prevented the Cherokees from maintaining economic self-sufficiency by requiring them to purchase useful materials such as coal rather than having the capacity to secure what they needed. Too-qua-stee, "The Mineral Outrage," *Indian Chieftain*, 25 August 1898, 1; Too-qua-stee, "Too-qua-stee's Criticisms," *Indian Chieftain*, 8 September 1898, 2.

Though Duncan emphasized with other tribes and nations, he pointed to the achievements of the Cherokee Nation to reject the federal government's intervention.⁵¹ He used the Cherokees' status to label the United States as immoral for seeking to seize its holdings. For example, Duncan explained the Cherokees economic advancements were irrelevant as they had been "branded with the name of 'Indian' and consequently fall within the category of booty for 'progressive civilization.'"⁵² Duncan further explained "the greed of civilization has become so firmly habituated" that Euro-Americans were capable of seizing lands if they could "show that it has no owner but Indians."⁵³ Duncan rejected Euro-American efforts to control Cherokee lands by insisting upon the sovereignty of his Nation.

Duncan rebuked federal efforts to dismantle the Cherokee Nation as he argued it had a greater political footing than any state in the Union. The foundation of the

⁵¹ During the 1870s, Duncan was critical of the federal government's treatment of the Plains Indians. In late July, 1876, Duncan wrote a letter analyzing a recent report on conditions at the Red Cloud and Spotted Tail Agencies. In this report, General Vandever—probably the Civil War Veteran and Indian Agent William Vandever—blamed the conflicts between whites and the Lakota on the "aggressive whites and especially the soldiers."⁵¹ General Vandever claimed that the Native groups would have caused no trouble if the government respected treaties and allowed these communities to live in peace. However, the desire for gold and the soldiers' "desire for military glory" precipitated the trespass upon Native lands. Duncan expressed disappointment with the remainder of the report as Vandever claimed the white intruders were too numerous for effective expulsion. As such, Vandever advocated the removal of the Indians instead, but Duncan sarcastically credited the general with "recommend[ing] that the soldiers do not kill more than is actually necessary to secure the whites in their ill-gotten possessions." In another letter published in the closing months of 1876, Duncan connected Euro-American efforts to control the Black Hills with Cherokee Removal. The war against the Plains Indians was but a more blatant repetition of what had already taken place. These writers identified a corrupt minority within the United States as responsible for the abuse of American Indians, thereby suggesting that a majority of Americans desired to treat Native communities with respect. [DeWitt Clinton Duncan], Letter, *Cherokee Advocate*, 22 July 1876, 2; Too-quaste, "Our Indian Policy," *Cherokee Advocate*, 21 October 1876, 2.

⁵² Too-quaste, "Strikes the Keynote," *Indian Chieftain*, 14 June 1900, 4.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

Cherokee Nation preceded the creation of the United States or a Congress “to question its existence or to prescribe to it terms of survival.”⁵⁴ As the United States grew, federal officials saw the need of negotiating with the Cherokee Nation to procure more land, but these proceedings or the subsequent treaties were unnecessary for establishing the political sovereignty of the Cherokee Nation. These treaties conceded that the Cherokees had preexisting rights as a sovereign Native nation independent of any authority granted by the United States government. Duncan contended Congress could expel or eliminate an existing state through a legislative action because Congress had previously called these states into being; however, the Cherokee Nation did not derive its sovereignty, authority, or existence from the United States Congress. Consequently, the United States could only eliminate Cherokee sovereignty through warfare and the conquest of the Cherokee people. Thus, the right of the Cherokees to self-government remained inviolable and the Cherokees should remain as secure in their communal property as American citizens were in their individual property.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Too-qua-stee, “Cannot Be Abolished,” *Indian Chieftain*, 24 November 1898, 1.

⁵⁵ Too-qua-stee, “Cannot Be Abolished,” *Indian Chieftain*, 24 November 1898, 1; Too-qua-stee, Letter, *Cherokee Advocate*, 28 September 1881, 2. Duncan occasionally addressed the federal government’s treatment of other American Indian groups. In particular, Duncan noted how a case at the United States district court in Muskogee ignored existing treaties between the Creek Nation and the federal government by restricting tribal sovereignty. Duncan contended that the court had far exceeded its authority as the Creeks did not derive their sovereignty from any treaty or relationship with the United States government. The Creek Nation was an independent and sovereign political body prior to the founding of the United States; its independence did not rest upon any right granted by the United States. Thus, the courts did not have the right to abrogate treaty rights. Duncan also noted that the Creeks had twice purchased territory from the United States and that these transactions nullified any future American claim to the acquired lands. Duncan cited the Louisiana Purchase of the early nineteenth century. Though France possessed sovereignty over the territory, it sold its interest to the United States; Duncan noted that the French never returned to dispute American control of the purchased lands as it no longer held any interest or sovereignty over them. Once the United States had purchased the Louisiana Territory, it secured sovereignty over the lands in question. Too-qua-stee, “An Opinion Reviewed,” *Indian Chieftain*, 29 December 1898, 1.

Duncan defended his fellow Cherokees who continued to defy the federal government's plan for Indian Territory. In one letter to the editor from 1902, he described a Fourth of July speech by Mr. Hastings that lambasted "croakers" for obstructing the development of the Cherokee Nation.⁵⁶ These croakers rejected allotment and insisted that the United States abide by the treaties it signed with the Five Tribes. Duncan turned to the history of the United States to undermine the rejection of criticism by citing the American Revolution. Duncan explained that while under the rule of Great Britain, American colonists protested their treatment and policies that they viewed as unjust, even as wealthy merchants and political figures defended the king. Duncan then identified George Washington and Thomas Jefferson as croakers in the eyes of loyalists, thereby linking advocates of Cherokee sovereignty with men considered American heroes by Euro-Americans.⁵⁷

Though Duncan ardently defended the right of the Cherokee Nation to continue its existence, he conceded Congress had the earthly power necessary to abrogate treaties. Yet, Duncan clearly distinguished the capability of Congress to impose its will from moral authority. Duncan warned Congress that not "until the poles of the moral universe have been inverted, and wrong becomes right" would it have any ethical justification for its actions.⁵⁸ Duncan also recited the numerous land cessions that the Cherokees had already made to the United States that granted nothing to the Cherokee Nation "but a

⁵⁶ Too-qua-stee, "Who are the Croakers," *Indian Chieftain*, 17 July 1902, 1.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ Too-qua-stee, "Indian Treaties," *Indian Chieftain*, 3 November 1898, 1.

transient smile of ungrateful satisfaction, and a wretched little volume of false promises called treaties.”⁵⁹ He insisted that if allotment needed to take place, the treaty of 1866 and the Cherokee constitution already defined the necessary process. If followed, the earlier allotment plan would give the Cherokee greater control over the disposition of their lands. At the very least, Duncan demanded that the federal government negotiate a plan that would win the assent of Cherokee voters. If the Cherokee government tried to pass the agreement without giving members a chance to vote would result in treason.⁶⁰ When the *Tahlequah Sentinel* argued that the national council could ratify any agreement through the passage of a law, Duncan referred to the paper as “that little prince of political hypocrisy and journalistic imbecility.”⁶¹

Duncan responded critics who chastised him for complaining about the treatment of the Cherokee Nation without offering any alternatives. In one specific letter, Duncan answered these charges by identifying his own ideas about how the federal government should have treated the Cherokee Nation.⁶² The primary idea was the federal government

⁵⁹ Too-qua-stee, “The Indian’s Hard Lot,” *Indian Chieftain*, 2 June 1898, 2.

⁶⁰ Too-qua-stee, “Anent the Agreement,” *Indian Chieftain*, 30 November 1899, 1; Too-qua-stee, “Hark, from the Tomb,” *Indian Chieftain*, 2 March 1899, 2; Too-qua-stee, “No Agreement,” *Indian Chieftain*, 30 November 1899, 2.

⁶¹ Too-qua-stee, “Anent the Agreement,” *Indian Chieftain*, 30 November 1899, 1. Duncan may have mistaken the name of the *Indian Sentinel* published in Tahlequah. The Cherokee editor of the *Sentinel*, Jefferson Parks, opposed the Curtis Act but endorsed the division of tribal lands under terms more favorable to the Cherokee Nation. As a supporter of the Downing Party, the party viewed as progressive due to its support of allotment, Parks used his editorials to attack Duncan and his affiliation with the National Party on multiple occasions. *Indian Sentinel*, 26 January 1899, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 9 February 1899, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 16 September 1899, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 3 February 1900, 2; Daniel Littlefield Jr. and James Parins, *American Indian and Alaska Native Newspapers and Periodicals, 1826-1924* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984), 228-229. *Indian Sentinel*, 26 January 1899, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 9 February 1899, 2.

⁶² Too-qua-stee, “Conscience Set Aside,” *Indian Chieftain*, 18 August 1898, 2.

“should have observed and enforced, instead of over-riding our Indian treaties.”⁶³ In addition, Duncan believed that Euro-Americans would have achieved their objective of opening up Cherokee lands without relying on coercion. Duncan pointed to the Cherokee practice of adoption whereby the Nation allowed non-members to enter and secure the blessings of the Nation for themselves. Duncan contended that if the federal government had not interfered, all of the issues facing the Cherokee Nation would have been solved internally without violating morality or sullyng the reputation of the United States.⁶⁴

Duncan mocked those who critiqued Indian Territory for its supposed lack of civilization. In 1881, an editorial appeared in *Wheeler's Independent* from Forth Smith, Arkansas, chastising American Indians for their failure to civilize despite three-hundred years of effort on the part of the government.⁶⁵ Duncan undermined the assertion by questioning the competency of the United States as a civilizing force if it could not bring civilization to American Indians after several centuries. Duncan agreed the United States government completely failed to civilize any Indians but argued thousands of Indians managed to civilize themselves in spite of the government's incompetence. The government's failure to civilize American Indians originated in its failure to uphold treaties, its wars of aggression against Native peoples, and its cruel treatment of Native communities.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ D. W. C. Duncan, Letter, *Cherokee Advocate*, 31 August 1881, 2.

Duncan illustrated his point by describing a hypothetical scenario in which “Sitting Bull should charge into Fort Smith with a band of his mounted cavalry, sack the town and burn it, gut the office off Wheeler’s Independent, capture the editors, bind them hand and foot,” and then haul them to “a small plot of ground called a reservation” before surrounding them with troops.⁶⁶ Once these prisoners cried for a return to their homes, the military would inform them their views were “simply a tempest of feeling that has no foundation in real affliction” before confining the editors *Wheeler’s Independent* until they starved to death or succumbed to disease. Duncan’s letter cast reservations as bleak prisons that failed to uplift or benefit their inhabitants while highlighting critics of American Indians as heartless for their lack of sympathy. Furthermore, Duncan’s interpretation of reservation cast them as death camps as the demise of those living there was the ultimate result of confinement.⁶⁷

Duncan paid close attention to discussions of Indian policy appearing within newspapers across the country. In early 1883, Duncan responded to a piece from the *New York Herald* written by General Nathan Reaves. Duncan found it perplexing that Reaves confessed the government had broken at least twenty-two treaties with the Cherokee Nation and considered the dissolution of the Cherokee Nation and the division of its lands as the only possible solution.⁶⁸ Duncan argued the continued problems the Cherokees faced grew out of the violation of existing treaties, indicating the termination of the

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ D. W. C. D., “The Reaves Letter Again,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 26 January 1883, 2.

government's treaty responsibilities would not solve any problems.⁶⁹ Reaves also argued the Cherokees should have their affairs settled first due to his perception of their status as the most developed Native nation. Duncan questioned this explanation, noting the Cherokees were the leaders among American Indians and "rais[ed] the voice of alarm in tones louder and shriller than any other tribe," whenever they identified any effort to abuse or rob their nation.⁷⁰ Duncan argued "there is nothing on earth so inconvenient and annoying to a wrong-doer as the lusty outcries of the poor wretch whom he has outraged," suggesting that efforts to dissolve the Cherokee Nation aimed to eliminate a harsh and facilitated the elimination of other Native governments.⁷¹

Duncan cautioned the Cherokees not to resort to violence as this would provide the government with "with a pretext for adding chains and imprisonment to the wrongs which she has already heaped upon us."⁷² The Cherokees had an obligation to provide the federal government with "overt obedience," but noted "the government has no constitutional control over the exercise of our intellectual faculties."⁷³ Though the Cherokees may have lost the bulk of their land, Duncan insisted that his people not relinquish their self-respect and their identities. Duncan connected the Curtis Act and the Dawes Commission to the tactics used to drive the Cherokees from Georgia during the

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Too-qua-stee, "Address to Cherokees," *Indian Chieftain*, 28 March 1901, 1.

⁷³ Ibid.

1830s as both Removal and allotment relied upon coercion and the government's efforts to secure Indian lands for white settlement.⁷⁴ Though Duncan linked the Curtis Act and allotment to the forced exile of the Cherokee Nation from Georgia, he identified the federal government's policies at the turn of the twentieth century as even more destructive. Though Cherokees suffered and died while on the Trail of Tears, the United States did not prevent the Cherokees from reestablishing their own government upon their arrival in Indian Territory. By contrast, the express purpose of the Curtis Act was the destruction of tribal governments and independence.⁷⁵

Though Duncan eschewed violence as a means of resisting the Euro-American encroachment upon Cherokee lands, he lambasted the federal government and the greed of civilization within his letters. In a poem entitled "The Dying Nation," Duncan wrote:

Thus rotting Pestilence, and Art, and Might,
moonlight orgies o' ver thy children's bones,
To honor civilization, hands unite
And dance the music of their dying grounds.⁷⁶

Duncan cast the United States as a country that not only deprived American Indians of their lands but relished in the destruction of Native communities. These lines revealed Duncan's conviction that the United States government repeatedly broke its word and took advantage of the Cherokees and the Five Tribes. Duncan continued,

⁷⁴ Too-qua-stee, "The \$4,000,000 Claim," *Indian Chieftain*, 28 September 1899, 3; Too-qua-stee, "The Methods of 1835," *Indian Chieftain*, 21 September 1899, 1.

⁷⁵ Too-qua-stee, "Address to Cherokees," *Indian Chieftain*, 28 March 1901, 1.

⁷⁶ Too-qua-stee, "The Dying Nation," *Indian Chieftain*, 27 April 1899, 3

writing civilization was at work “with savage means, the rifle, sword, and dirk.”⁷⁷ With this line, Duncan inverted the Euro-American understanding of civilization by identifying the savage methods employed by the United States government to force its will upon American Indians. Duncan closed this poem by portraying the Cherokee Nation as an innocent victim of civilization’s cruelty:

Dear Cherokee nation, with the right to live,
Art dead and gone; they life was meanly priced;
Thy room to civilization hadst to give,
And so did Socrates and Jesus Christ.⁷⁸

Duncan noted that the destruction of the Cherokee Nation involved the elimination of a political entity that had every moral right to continue its existence. In another twist of Euro-American rhetoric, Duncan connected the Cherokee Nation with Jesus Christ, labeling American Indians, not Euro-Americans as righteous and innocent. Finally, Duncan’s poem criticized Cherokees who embraced Euro-American civilization as “ape[ing] the white man’s heartless ways.”⁷⁹

Even Duncan’s earliest writings raised questions about the nature of civilization and called into question claims of Euro-American superiority. Duncan consistently defined true civilization as a respect for law and justice rather than economic achievement and power. As Duncan noted in a letter published in 1876, “civilization is a

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Rauna Kuokkanen, “After-Native Nations and Narrations in the Work of DeWitt Clinton Duncan (Too-qua-stee), Charles A. Eastman (Ohiyesa) and E. Pauline Johnson,” *Indigenous Nations Studies Journal* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2000): 58; Too-qua-stee, “The Dying Nation,” *Indian Chieftain*, 27 April 1899, 3. Kuokkanen believed Duncan directed the poem at non-Cherokees to demonstrate the damage caused by federal efforts to destroy the Cherokee Nation.

demon whose only attribute is selfishness and whose only object is self-gratification. It has destroyed countless thousands of our people without cause,” but whites have universally denied any responsibility for what has happened by continually shifting culpability to others.⁸⁰ It is unclear whether Duncan viewed the majority of Euro-Americans as guilty of the destruction of Native societies, but restricted his praise of Euro-Americans by calling on the “Quakers and all good people” to pray for Native communities.⁸¹ Another letter from 1878 denied the connection between economic development and civilization, noting the construction of railroads did not signify the presence of morality or virtue “but only the godless achievements of a remorseless money power.”⁸² Duncan insisted that Native opposition to railroads did not stem from a rejection of the invention itself but rather the complete disregard for Native sovereignty and the refusal of railroad corporations to compensate Indian Territory for the right to pass its railroads through the Indian Nations.⁸³

One of Duncan’s poems, entitled “A Vision of the End,” described the end of time, predicting that though corporations, trusts, and nations would pass away, ambition and greed would remain. Though “all the monsters ever bred / In civilization’s womb” had fallen, greed and ambition remained “because they could not die.”⁸⁴ Greed continued

⁸⁰ Too-qua-stee, “Our Indian Policy,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 21 October 1876, 2.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² Too-qua-stee, Letter, *Cherokee Advocate*, 19 October 1878, 2.

⁸³ D. W. C. Duncan, Letter, *Cherokee Advocate*, 31 August 1881, 2.

⁸⁴ Too-qua-stee, “A Vision of the End,” *Indian Chieftain*, 3 August 1899, 2.

to devour everything in sight but focused upon oil, coal, and land capable of supporting cities “as lounging plats for idleness.”⁸⁵ Greed also desired “anything the Indians used to have.”⁸⁶ Civilization’s continued focus on acquiring wealth would condemn the remnants of humanity to living in moral “filth.”⁸⁷ The same greed that drove Euro-Americans to seize Native lands would eventually destroy society itself. Consequently, reformers who desired to inculcate American Indians with the desire for individual wealth were spreading a destructive ideology.

Duncan’s analysis of the failings of Euro-American society led him to consider the different ways in which whites and Indians discussed their conflicts. According to Duncan, American Indians examined “the subject from the elevated standpoint of abstract truth,” while whites “ignore[d] the conscience, the decalogue, and the gospel” in order to determine which solution was the most financially profitable.⁸⁸ Duncan argued that whites chastised American Indians not for failing to behave in a moral way, but for failing to behave as a “white man.”⁸⁹ Thus, Euro-Americans defined civilized behavior as acting in a manner similar to Euro-Americans rather than embracing moral principles.

In order to bolster his critiques of Euro-American society, Duncan examined the creation of the overseas American empire. Duncan noted the extension of American

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ D. W. C. D., “The Reaves Letter Again,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 26 January 1883, 2.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

authority over Native communities and overseas did not result in a similar expansion of constitutional protections. Duncan explained that while the United States flag flew over the Pacific and Cuba, the Constitution “is still halting and limping along the coasts of the Atlantic and the Pacific.”⁹⁰ In a humorous story, Duncan described Mr. Flag and Mrs. Constitution having a fierce argument at the Arkansas border, prompting the couple to divorce. Mr. Flag continued into Indian Territory but Mrs. Constitution remained in Arkansas.⁹¹ This comical story highlights Duncan’s identification of a significant gap between the extension of American power and the protections offered by the Constitution. In a letter from October of 1900, Duncan noted the numerous broken treaties with American Indians that the United States justified on the grounds of “public necessities.”⁹² In his letter, Duncan compared the United States government to Satan, who promised Eve that she would profit from eating of the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden. However, as soon as Eve ate the fruit, the devil “notified her that his sooty kingdom had been suddenly betided by a certain class of ‘public necessities’ which rendered it inconvenient, nay counter to the ‘public interests’ of his infernal dominions to carry out his agreement.”⁹³ Duncan explained that only his “satanic majesty” could dare to treat an innocent or unsuspecting party in such a manner.⁹⁴

⁹⁰ Too-qua-stee, “Flag and Constitution,” *Indian Chieftain*, 5 July 1900, 4.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² Too-qua-stee, “Violated Treaties,” *Indian Chieftain*. 25 October 1900, 1.

⁹³ *Ibid.*

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

Duncan's most incisive denunciation of the American empire appeared in 1899. In February that year, Rudyard Kipling published a poem in *McClure's* entitled "The White Man's Burden" to urge the United States to take up the burden of empire by annexing the Philippines in the wake of the Spanish-American War. Kipling's poem cast the management as a thankless task that would win the Americans the scorn of their imperial subjects. Nevertheless, Kipling depicted the burden of empire as a necessary task. Proponents of empire within the United States reacted enthusiastically to the poem and boasted about the moral superiority and destiny of their country.⁹⁵ Less than two months after Kipling's poem appeared in print, Duncan published a response in the *Chieftain* also entitled "The White Man's Burden." The existence of this poem indicated Duncan understood the importance of Kipling's ideas for the justification of an American empire.⁹⁶

In his poem, "The White Man's Burden," Duncan questioned the assumptions that buttressed the American Empire, both within Indian Territory and in the American empire overseas. Though Rudyard Kipling's poem of the same name urged Americans to take up the thankless task of spreading civilization, Duncan's poem served as a warning to whites. He employed the style of Old Testament writers to chastise whites for their pride and demonstrate how the accomplishments of civilization paled in comparison to

⁹⁵ Warren Zimmerman, *First Great Triumph: How Five Americans Made Their Country a World Power* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002), 363-366.

⁹⁶ Too-qua-stee, "The White Man's Burden," *Indian Chieftain*, 30 March 1899, 1.

the power of the almighty.⁹⁷ Writing as God, Duncan observed “The red man, and the black, whom fate debars / From Whited temples, see me in the stars; / With tom-tom do me more accepted praise / Than pealing organs on stated days.” Duncan rejected Euro-American claims regarding their favored status as instruments of God’s will Indians by noting that heartfelt Native worship surpassed the facade of spirituality practiced by whites. This viewpoint directly contradicted the arguments that justified the extension of American power overseas in order to spread Christianity and civilization. If the United States did not possess the moral authority that proponents of territorial expansion described, then American claims about the nation’s divine role in the world were dubious at best.

Duncan condemned the United States government for abandoning morality in favor of might alone. Speaking as God, Duncan proclaimed:

Go tell those white men, I, the Lord of hosts,
Have marked their high presumption, heard their boasts
Observe their laws; their government is might
Enthroned to rule, instead of perfect right.
Could I have taught them such gross heresy,
As ‘Greatest good to greatest number be?’
Has shipwrecked crew, with gnawing famine pressed,
A right to slaughter one to feed the rest?
Should just minorities be made to yield
That wrong majorities may be upheld?

⁹⁷ Duncan continually drew upon Christianity to question the moral claim of Euro-Americans to impose their will upon Native societies. In one letter from 1876 discussing Indian policy, Duncan explained that Euro-American claims about the Christian justifications for their actions fell flat as “Indians have always failed to see anything in the teachings of Christ” to justify the power whites wielded against Native communities. Though Duncan acknowledged that a higher power might grant special privileges to favored peoples based on their morality, he questioned whether whites had any claim to such benefits. Duncan pointed to the frequent accounts of violence found within the white press to highlight the depravity of Euro-American society while accusing it of inconsistency in its treatment of American Indians. Too-qua-stee, “Our Indian Policy,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 21 October 1876, 2.

In nature, is not this the rule that brutes
Observe in settling up their fierce disputes?
Why should the greater number have their way,
But for the power to make the less obey?⁹⁸

Duncan's words undercut the claims that Euro-Americans used to justify their involvement in the lives of American Indians. He denied justice formed the foundation for the American empire. Instead, the American empire preyed on the weak for the benefit of the powerful. The reference to "just minorities" clearly applies to American Indians struggling to protect their homes from the overwhelming numbers of whites trying to obtain Native lands.⁹⁹ Duncan rejected all of the justifications Euro-Americans advanced for the destruction of the Five Tribes as a veneer protecting their true motivation. In short, Euro-Americans sought to acquire Native lands because they were more powerful and could use force or the threat of force to compel American Indians to accede to their demands. These were not the actions of a morally enlightened nation but the abuse of superior strengths by "brutes."¹⁰⁰ Duncan's poem appeared shortly after the outbreak of the Philippine War, indicating that this conflict also informed the Cherokee's opinion. In the case of the Philippines, Duncan cast the Filipinos' desire for independence as irrelevant to Euro-Americans who wanted to use the archipelago to advance their commercial interests in East Asia.

Duncan also addressed the tenuous connection between technology and morality:

The art of printing, too, is all my own,

⁹⁸ Too-qua-stee, "The White Man's Burden," *Indian Chieftain*, 30 March 1899, 1.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

Lo! Every foot of living thing had shown,
(I ordered so) as long as time had run,
How easily the printing job was done;
Yet time's last grain of sand had well-nigh sped
Ere their dull wit these signs correctly read;
Ere Gutenberg, by chance, could take the hint,
And fumbling set a thought in clumsy print.

In this passage, Duncan gave the credit for Euro-American inventions to God, thereby depriving whites of the ability to boast about their inventiveness. Rather than casting Gutenberg as a brilliant inventor, Duncan depicted him as a hapless bungler who discovered the printing press by mere chance. These lines also placed a higher power in charge of the running of the world, depriving Euro-Americans of the ability to claim they managed the globe. As such, Duncan's poem indicated Euro-Americans did not possess moral, intellectual, or religious superiority over American Indians, Filipinos, or any other group. Instead, Euro-Americans only possessed superior military strength. Duncan concluded his poem and compared the American empire to a simple tool. Though God may have used the United States to accomplish certain objectives, the country was not central to divine plans. As such, Duncan warned Euro-Americans to abandon their hubris or they would be "hurled and smashed to pieces on the ground" for being like a glass that was no longer useful.¹⁰¹

In the summer of 1900, Duncan discussed the United States involvement in the Boxer Rebellion in China. The paper lamented the abandonment of George Washington's policy of avoiding foreign entanglements. More importantly, Duncan directly connected the experiences of the Chinese and the Cherokee, noting, "The little Cherokee republic

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

was an easy delicious morsel, but China was too big a bug for convenient swallowing.”¹⁰² Another letter attacked “carpet baggers” who traveled to America’s new possessions in order to exploit United States domination. Duncan defined these carpetbaggers as “the offspring of conquest and colonization, and follows as closely in the track of conquering armies as a wolf on the heels of carnage.”¹⁰³ Territories such as Puerto Rico, the Philippines, China, and the Cherokee Nation would provide President McKinley with a “dumping ground” for his followers to receive political patronage, while the indigineous population would remain marginalized and excluded from the management of their own affairs. Duncan pointed to China, noting that as the missionaries had long since lost the goodwill of the Chinese people, “the only thing that can be done with [them] is to exterminate [them] as was done with the American Indian, and then plant the Christian cross, like the Mohammedan crescent, in human blood.”¹⁰⁴ Duncan’s description of the American involvement in Hawaii was equally critical. Duncan praised the first generation of missionaries for their selfless devotion to the Hawaiian people but he noted that the offspring of these Christians who pursued their own economic interests and conspired “with trust kings and demagogues” from the United States to overthrow and humiliate Hawaii’s queen.¹⁰⁵ Duncan thereby rejected any arguments that justified the extension of American power overseas as benevolent.

¹⁰² Too-qua-stee, “Imperialism,” *Indian Chieftain*, 9 August 1900, 1.

¹⁰³ Too-qua-stee, “Carpetbag Sermon,” *Indian Chieftain*, 6 September 1900, 2.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

Another poem highlighted Duncan's cynicism regarding the viability of justice and morality in human affairs. His poem, entitled "Truth is Mortal," depicted truth as a weak and dying concept, destroyed by those in authority. His poem cited Emilio Aguinaldo, Oceola, Sitting Bull, and Crazy Snake as individuals who understood that truth was "lost in an eternal sleep," as humankind destroyed it upon its birth. All of these were individuals who opposed the efforts of the United States government to control the political and economic futures of their people. Duncan also indicated that these non-white individuals understood the truth as they faced the brutality of civilization. Of the three individuals, three were American Indians, but Duncan's inclusion of Emilio Aguinaldo, the leader of the Filipino independence movement, indicated Duncan's equation of the extension of federal power over tribes and nations with the annexation of territories overseas. The only truth that existed was "a sneak / That crouching licks the hand of power."¹⁰⁶ From Duncan's point of view, Euro-American society abandoned any pretense of adopting moral policies in favor of justifying the enrichment of the United States at the expense of American Indians and colonial subjects in the Caribbean and the Pacific.

Though Duncan critiqued the application of federal Indian policies to other colonial populations, he also noted the capacity of the United States to respect the rights of outsiders when it suited American interests. The inability of American Indians to vote rendered their opinions and the justness of their cause irrelevant to the members of

¹⁰⁶ Too-qua-stee, "Truth is Mortal," *Indian Chieftain*, 7 February 1901, 3.

Congress.¹⁰⁷ Duncan illustrated this point by discussing how every other group had the power to travel to Washington to seek redress or express their views. As American citizens held the right to vote, legislators needed to show proper attention or risk losing support in the next election. Visitors from Europe could draw upon the support of their home governments for support. In addition, foreigners could travel to the United States, purchase land, and then live upon this property without having to admit outsiders. Though the Cherokees held title to their Nation in fee simple, the United States government did not defend the right of Cherokees to exclude non-citizens, thereby diminishing the property rights of the Nation.¹⁰⁸ Though the federal government identified property rights as inalienable, this same protection did not apply to the Cherokees.

According to Duncan, guests from the “islands of ocean” received greater care for these individuals return to their homes “loaded with gifts.”¹⁰⁹ Even when noting the superior treatment granted these visitors from distant islands, Duncan identified an important feature of the imperial project for he wrote that Euro-American civilization “parad[ed these guests] as a proud trophy of its own missionary benevolence.”¹¹⁰ Euro-Americans did not value Hawaiians, Filipinos, Cubans, and others for their own merits

¹⁰⁷ Too-qua-stee, “Coercive Throughout,” *Indian Chieftain*, 6 October 1898, 1; Too-qua-stee, “Evils of the Curtis Bill,” *Indian Chieftain*, 21 July 1898, 2.

¹⁰⁸ Too-qua-stee, “The Indian’s Hard Lot,” *Indian Chieftain*, 2 June 1898, 2; Too-qua-stee, “Townsite Matter Discussed,” *Indian Chieftain*, 15 September 1898, 2.

¹⁰⁹ Too-qua-stee, “The Indian’s Hard Lot,” *Indian Chieftain*, 2 June 1898, 2.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

but for their capacity to demonstrate the morality of the United States. In the context of the turn of the twentieth century, this benevolent face of empire helped to justify the extension of American power and the annexation of islands and their inhabitants.¹¹¹

Duncan noted the willingness of the United States to denounce wrongs committed by other countries without acknowledging its own failings. In the summer of 1898, Duncan observed American “shed rivers of tears over the downfall of Poland, while “w[ee]ping] bitterly over the woes of Hungary,” and devoted the nation’s naval forces to the liberation of Cuba from Spanish oppression.¹¹² In contrast, members of Congress were indifferent to the plight of the Cherokees and the violation of treaties.¹¹³ Duncan undermined the justifications of the Spanish-American War by arguing the United States only embraced morality when it was convenient to do so. IN the case of American Indians, Americans would have to renounce their desire to obtain Native lands. As this moral position would deprive Euro-Americans of wealth, they were unwilling to defend existing treaties.

In a poem entitled “Thanksgiving,” Duncan questioned the benevolence and the morality of the American empire. Early in the poem, Duncan wrote “We’re apt to give to God the praise / That’s only due the Devil.” These lines indicated that Duncan believed

¹¹¹ Duncan rejected the potential of Euro-Americans to employ American Indian peoples in a similar fashion for he noted that those in Washington viewed these guests as “an indictment rather than a compliment.” The presence of these native visitors reminded legislators of the failure of the United States government to live up to its treaty obligations Yet, this visual reminder was not sufficient to prevent federal officials from demanding further concessions from American Indians regardless of the justness of their complaints. Too-qua-stee, “The Indian’s Hard Lot,” *Indian Chieftain*, 2 June 1898, 2.

¹¹² Too-qua-stee, “Admission of the Government’s Bad Faith with the Cherokees,” *Indian Chieftain*, 7 July 1898, 2.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

Americans were viewing some of their more questionable actions as moral and praiseworthy. Duncan's next stanza clarified his criticism:

Our cannon thunder 'round the world,
And make the nations tremble;
We march to church; with flags unfurled,
To thank God, we assemble.¹¹⁴

Duncan condemned Euro-Americans for transforming Christianity into a justification for conquest and the abuse of American Indians and colonial populations across the ocean. In addition, Duncan told of Americans bringing flags with them to church, indicating a fusion of patriotism and religion. Rather than expressing gratitude for peace, prosperity or health, Americans thanked God the fear other nations had of the United States.

Duncan's next stanza further illustrated his critique of the American empire:

But who can say the victory won,
Has come to us a blessing;
And not a wrong ourselves have done,
Good conscience sore distressing?¹¹⁵

The victory that Duncan referred to might be the American pacification of the Philippines as most of the opposition to the United States ended by 1902. It is also possible that Duncan intended a broader definition of victory by referring to the creation of an American empire. Both interpretations indicated that Duncan did not view the extension of American authority as a benefit for the United States. Duncan repeatedly castigated the United States for efforts to impose its will on American Indians through

¹¹⁴ Too-qua-stee, "Thanksgiving," *Indian Chieftain*, 24 November 1904, 4.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*

coercive means; instead, Duncan wanted the federal government to abide by its agreements and rely upon justice and morality to guide its actions.

Duncan wrote about the education of Native students throughout his life. Though he remained committed to the capabilities of Cherokee students, Duncan's views grew increasingly cynical as he witnessed the federal government's continued attempts to eliminate the Cherokee Nation. One of Duncan's earliest published letters appeared in the *Cherokee Advocate* in 1873 and advocated the teaching of English to Cherokee children. He promoted English as he found its vast quantity of words provided scholars with the capacity for greater precision than found in the Cherokee language. However, this defense of English did not necessarily equate with a rejection of Cherokee culture and tradition. Duncan's later writings on education stressed his desire for the preservation of the Cherokee language as well as the defense of the Cherokee Nation.¹¹⁶ For example, Duncan argued that rather than constructing a stone monument to honor Sequoyah, the inventor of the Cherokee syllabary, the Cherokee Nation should fund the completion of a Cherokee-English dictionary and a book of Cherokee grammar.¹¹⁷ As such, Duncan's promotion of English demonstrated a desire to prepare Cherokees to interact with American society and avoid efforts to swindle them.

In a critique of federal Indian policy that extended beyond Indian Territory, Duncan attacked the system of Indian education, thereby echoing better known critics

¹¹⁶ D. W. C. Duncan, "Communicated," *Cherokee Advocate*, 23 August 1873, 2; Devon Mihesuah, *Cultivating the Rosebuds: The Education of Women at the Cherokee Female Seminary, 1851-1919* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 81; Scott Riney, *The Rapid City Indian School* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), 9, 74.

¹¹⁷ Too-qua-stee, "Monument to Sequoyah," *Indian Chieftain*, 9 March 1899, 1.

such as Zitkala-Sa. Duncan challenged the foundations of the Indian educational system by noting that it “proceed[ed] on the theory that for an Indian youth to become educated, it is necessary for him to cease to be Indian and be, in all the essential elements of his nature, transformed into a white man.” The end result of this education was the creation of a rift between educated Indians and the other members of their tribes or nations. These educated Indians lost any pride for their heritage and only maintained their remaining ties for personal gain, thereby exhibiting their assimilation of Euro-American values. Duncan condemned this style of education for inculcated feelings of revulsion and disgust within educated Indians for their tribes and thereby diminished if not destroyed their trust in their parents.¹¹⁸ To assuage his critics who complained that he only discussed the failings of the United States, Duncan acknowledged that the Dawes Severalty Act succeeded in “educating the mind of the American Indian into an abiding sense of skepticism as to the honor...of the white man’s civilization.”¹¹⁹ Though Duncan did not attend Indian boarding schools, his own education outside of Indian Territory helped him to understand the alienation that separated educated American Indians from their tribes or nations.

Duncan further explained that from the standpoint of tribes and nations, the most useful graduates were those who “without scruple or criticism, have conformed to the innocent and congenial customs of their people,” while introducing their people to the most useful aspects of Euro-American civilization through their un-intrusive example.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ Riney, 139, 192; Too-qua-stee , “Indian Education,” *Indian Chieftain*, 31 August 1899, 2.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

Yet, the federal government viewed these students as failures or “reprobates” due to their refusal to reject their culture in its entirety. “Education is not domestication.¹²¹ Any process of human culture which severs the tie between the educated man and community to which he owes his natural allegiances, is monstrous” while the idea that one “alienated and traitorized by training” could return to their people and perform useful service was foolish.¹²²

By early 1903, Duncan’s views on education changed to an extent as he started to favor a more rudimentary education that provided Cherokees with the skills they needed to provide for themselves and their families. Duncan argued that beyond “reading, writing, and the four fundamental rules in mathematics, there is but little in the entire scope of scholastic training that has any practical bearing upon the concerns of this mortal life.”¹²³ These comments are significant given Duncan’s high level of education, his fluency in multiple languages, and his familiarity with literature. Duncan’s view of education was not the equivalent of boarding school advocates who restricted academic opportunities due to doubts about the intellectual ability of Native students. Duncan clearly believed American Indians were just as capable of succeeding academically as whites, but by the early-twentieth century he questioned the value of an academic education. Instead, Duncan questioned the need for American Indian students to acquire

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Michael Coleman, *American Indian Children at School, 1850-1930* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1993), 178-182; Too-qua-stee, “Indian Education,” *Indian Chieftain*, 31 August 1899, 2.

¹²³ Too-qua-stee, “Skill is Education,” *Indian Chieftain*, 1 January 1903, 1.

an education to assimilate into a society that did not view Native people as equals. In this context, manual training represented an effort to provide American Indians with the skills they needed to earn a living while avoiding the racial prejudices of Euro-Americans.¹²⁴

DeWitt Clinton Duncan was one of the most vocal Native critics of the United States at the turn of the twentieth century. As a survivor of the Trail of Tears, he identified the efforts to dismantle the Five Tribes as the latest in a series of attacks on Native sovereignty. Duncan saw the creation of an American empire as the extension of these assaults on American Indians to other groups across the ocean. Duncan rejected Euro-American claims of superiority and cast American civilization as an immoral force devoted to the accumulation of wealth at the expense of the weak. This condemnation of the United States framed Duncan's rejection of allotment. Yet, allotment was a complex issue for the Five Tribes. The *Cherokee Advocate*, the official publication of the Cherokee Nation, initially opposed allotment, but after 1901, the *Advocate* urged the Cherokees to accept the policy for the good of the Nation and their children.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

Chapter 4

The *Cherokee Advocate* and the Inevitability of Allotment

The Cherokees resisted coming to an agreement with the Dawes Commission longer than any of the other Five Tribes, even as the Tribal Council recognized the need for eventual allotment and sought to carry out the policy on its own terms.¹ Though Cherokee leaders grew more accepting of allotment, it was not until the passage of the Curtis Act of 1898 that the Cherokees came under significant pressure to reach an agreement with the government. Many Cherokees recognized that the Curtis Act served as a manufactured threat to force the Nation to accept allotments, but their leaders increasingly counseled cooperation with the federal government.² As the official mouthpiece of the Cherokee government, the *Cherokee Advocate*, a bilingual newspaper,

¹ Though the *Cherokee Advocate* showed some acceptance of allotment during the early 1890s, the appointment of the Dawes Commission initially encouraged greater Cherokee resistance to allotment. Subsequently, divisions appeared within the tribal leadership and Cherokees such as Thomas Buffington, Dennis Bushyhead, and E. C. Boudinot started to advocate allotment during the middle of the 1890s. In addition, though the Five Tribes initially stood together in rejecting allotment, by the start of 1898, only the Cherokee continued to reject the policy. Andrew Denson, *Demanding the Cherokee Nation: Indian Autonomy and American Culture, 1830-1900* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004), 232, 239-241; Stanley Hoig, *The Cherokees and Their Chiefs: In the Wake of Empire* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1998), 256-258; Tom Holm, "Indian Lobbyists: Cherokee Opposition to the Allotment of Tribal Lands," *American Indian Quarterly* 5, no. 2 (May 1979): 124-130; Morris Wardell, *A Political History of the Cherokee Nation* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1938), 320-333.

² The Cherokee negotiated three allotment treaties with the United States government. Though the National Council agreed to a deal in 1899, Congress failed to approve it as it left too much authority in the hands of the Cherokees. The Cherokee themselves rejected an agreement from 1901. Finally, both Congress and the Cherokee people accepted a third agreement negotiated in 1902, even as the Cherokees experienced increased levels of coercion. Accordingly, the *Advocate* endorsed the first treaty, urged the rejection of the 1901 treaty, and supported the third and final treaty. The *Advocate* accepted the need to form a new agreement with the government but it did not believe the Cherokee should accept "any old treaty." *Cherokee Advocate*, 11 August 1900, 2; "What the Treaty Does," *Cherokee Advocate*, 11 April 1901, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 14 December 1901, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 21 December 1901, 2; Denson, 232, 239-241; Hoig, 256-258; Holm, "Indian Lobbyists: Cherokee Opposition to the Allotment of Tribal Lands," 124-130; Wardell, 320-333.

defended allotment and the Dawes Commission after the closing months of 1901. Prior to the end of 1901, the *Advocate*'s editors were more critical of the policy and published the letters from Cherokees critical of allotment. Editors of the newspaper tried to identify common ground with its readers to convince them of the need to accept land in severalty.³ The editors of the *Advocate* argued that resistance to allotment accomplished nothing while cooperation prevented the Cherokees from losing their lands completely. Along with its resignation to allotment, the *Advocate* advised its readers to retain their lands by refusing to sell them to Euro-American speculators. The *Advocate* trusted the Dawes Commission, even as it remained opposed to immediate statehood. Though the *Advocate* urged Cherokees to accept allotment, most of its editorials specifically targeted the culturally conservative members of the community. These "full bloods" generally opposed allotment and resisted the efforts of the Dawes Commission to enroll all the members of the Cherokee Nation.⁴

³ For the years under consideration, William Loeser, George Butler, and Wiley Melton served as the editors of the *Cherokee Advocate*. Loeser, a former business manager of the *Advocate*, edited the publication from November 1899 through November 1901. From November 1901 through November 1903, Butler, a half Cherokee, took control of the paper. Though he did not possess fluency in Cherokee himself, Butler thought it important to keep all members of the Cherokee Nation informed of current events, leading him to include more than a page in Cherokee in each edition. Butler generally took strong editorial stances and lambasted the critics of American Indians. Melton, the final editor of the *Advocate*, worked on the paper until it ceased publication in March of 1906. He consistently printed two pages in Cherokee in each edition as he perceived the *Advocate* as one of the few sources of information available to the "fullbloods." Daniel Littlefield Jr., and James Parins, *American Indian and Alaska Native Newspapers and Periodicals, 1826-1924* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984), 72.

⁴ This chapter uses the term "full bloods" to refer to culturally conservative members of the Cherokee Nation though the term still carries problematic assumptions as it presumes cultural beliefs have a biological component. The term ignores the broad spectrum of possibilities that fall between the adoption of Euro-American culture and the preservation of a traditional Cherokee culture. Nevertheless, the chapter uses the term in reference to the editorials appearing in the *Cherokee Advocate* as the paper frequently targeted its editorials at those it labeled as "full bloods."

Once the Cherokee tribal council ceased to exist in 1906, the *Advocate* halted its publication as it lost its source of funding. Each issue of the *Cherokee Advocate* contained both English and Cherokee sections. The Cherokee portion generally provided translations of articles from the paper's previous English edition. Its status as the political mouthpiece for particular Cherokee leaders did not represent an abnormal practice at the turn of the twentieth century.⁵ Many newspaper editors from across the United States openly affiliated themselves with political parties even as a growing majority of editors took independent stances. Yet, even partisan leanings did not lead to a strict adherence to a party line. Regional interests allowed partisan papers to express opinions divergent from their respective political parties. In the case of the *Advocate*, the paper remained directly connected to the Tribal Council, so it lacked the same opportunity for editorial independence. Cherokee leaders used the *Advocate* to convince the Nation to acquiesce to allotment as the only means of averting the destructive impact of the Curtis Act. These goals explained the editors' determination to place the paper in the hands of all tribal members. In short, the editors saw their task as helping the Cherokee "to accept the situation and prepare to live under the white man's government."⁶

The *Advocate's* status as a defender of the Cherokee Nation was not without precedent. Before the United States expelled the Cherokees from the eastern United

⁵ Joseph Campbell, *Yellow Journalism: Puncturing the Myths, Defining the Legacies* (Westport CT: Praeger, 2001); George H. Douglas, *The Golden Age of the Newspaper* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 110-114; Ted Curtis Smythe, *The Gilded Age Press* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), 186-193; 203-205.

⁶ Angie Debo, *And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940), 8; "Indian Papers," *Cherokee Advocate*, 13 October 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 3 February 1906, 2.

States, the *Cherokee Phoenix* defended the interests of the Cherokees living in Georgia. During the early decades of the nineteenth century, Cherokee delegates to Washington learned about the importance of the press by reading newspapers. During much of the nineteenth century, newspapers frequently had overtly partisan leanings and their editors used these publications to advance the causes of particular candidates or political parties. Consequently, the Cherokees concluded they too could use the printed word to defend their interests and seek to contest the portrayal of their people.⁷ Elias Boudinot argued for the creation of a Cherokee newspaper to promote the continued protection of the federal government and the portrayal of the Cherokees as a model for other American Indians to emulate.⁸ The *Phoenix* served to describe the achievements of the Cherokees in education and religion in order to demonstrate the capability of the Cherokees to accept “civilization.”⁹ In turn, this would demonstrate the capacity of all Native peoples to adopt Euro-American customs

The *Phoenix* openly advocated against Removal. The Cherokees already relied upon their representatives in Washington to oppose policies inimical to their interests but the *Phoenix* provided them with a means of communicating with others on a weekly basis and alerting the public to their concerns in order to garner support. They also saw the

⁷ Cullen Joe Holland, “The Cherokee Indian Newspapers, 1828-1906: The Tribal Voice of a People in Transition” (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1956), 36-37; Theda Perdue, ed., *Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996), 87-89; Phillip Round, *Removable Type: Histories of the Book in Indian Country, 1663-1880* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 132-140.

⁸ Holland., 39.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 43.

Phoenix as a means of combating falsehood about their economic development or culture. This permitted the Cherokees to respond to accusations and defamatory accounts in a timely manner.¹⁰ The *Phoenix* protested Removal by publishing accounts of poor quality of land and sparse resources found in the west.¹¹ This served to alert outsiders of Cherokee opposition and dissuaded members of the Cherokee Nation from embracing the abandonment of their homes.

After the Cherokee Nation reestablished itself within Indian Territory, its leaders continued to understand the power of the printed word. The opening of Oklahoma Territory led to an explosion of new papers advocating allotment. During the 1890s, the growing population in the Cherokee Nation led to the establishment of over fifty new papers, most owned by non-Cherokees. Though few of these papers lasted more than a year, they overwhelmed the *Advocate*, the *Indian Chieftain*, and the *Indian Arrow* as publications endorsing the right of the Cherokees to refuse to give up their lands.¹²

During the mid 1890s, the *Advocate* resisted allotment by refuting charges against the Cherokee Nation. The *Advocate*'s editorials and its correspondents resisted allotment as a policy for which the Cherokees were not ready.¹³ The paper highlighted the poverty in surrounding states to deflect criticism of the unequal distribution of wealth within the Nation. It also pointed out that the "full bloods" did not require public assistance, except

¹⁰ Ibid., 55, 141. There are indications that the advocacy of the *Phoenix* helped to transform Cherokee Removal into a major political issue by building support for the Cherokees. Ibid., 141-142

¹¹ Ibid., 156

¹² Ibid., 499.

¹³ Ibid., 507.

during years of extreme drought.¹⁴ The *Advocate* also pointed to corruption and profligate spending in nearby states to diminish the importance of such charges against the Nation.¹⁵ The *Advocate* countered challenges of lawlessness by reporting crimes from the states and pointing to Coxey's army as evidence of the inequality of American society, thereby contrasting conditions with those found in the Five Tribes.¹⁶ Opposition to allotment was significant enough during the 1890s that editors included personal disclaimers when publishing articles from individuals favoring the policy.¹⁷

Prior to 1901, the *Cherokee Advocate* generally expressed a more critical view of allotment while calling for all of the members of the Nation to resist a repeat of the treatment the Cherokees suffered in Georgia. An editorial from 1895 called on all Cherokees—including adopted citizens—to resist intruders and efforts and display loyalty to the Cherokee constitution.¹⁸ In April 1901, the Cherokees voted on a second agreement negotiated with the Dawes Commission. Though the Cherokees approved the first agreement in January 1899, Congress rejected the agreement by failing to ratify it before the deadline. The Cherokees ultimately rejected the second agreement. In the month prior to the second vote, the *Advocate* printed several letters attacking the agreement and allotment while largely ignoring pro-allotment Cherokees.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 508.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 509.

¹⁶ *Cherokee Advocate*, 19 January 1901, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 2 March 1901, 2; Holland, 510

¹⁷ Holland, 509.

¹⁸ "Constitution," *Cherokee Advocate*, 10 July 1895, 2.

William Eubanks, a translator for the *Advocate*, wrote one of these critical pieces that appeared on the front page on 20 April 1901.¹⁹ Eubanks labeled the agreement as the “death warrant” of the Cherokee Nation and voiced his opposition to it as he did not think it was in the best interests of the Cherokees as he believed it would transfer Cherokee lands to railroad corporations.²⁰ Eubanks dismissed missionaries and reformers who supported the agreement as he implied railroad companies promised bribes for their cooperation.²¹ Eubanks then drew on the story of the Garden of Eden to illustrate his fears of the treaty. He acknowledged the missionaries taught American Indians about how Adam and Eve learned of good and evil by eating the forbidden fruit. Upon realizing they were naked, Adam and Eve expressed shame; however, in the case of the Cherokees, once they learned about good and evil from the Americans, they recognized their nakedness as their Nation “[was] stripped of everything [they] had.”²²

E.C. Alberty also printed a letter calling for Cherokees to reject the treaty in April 1901. He predicted passage of the agreement would forever destroy Cherokee title to their lands; he dismissed the threat posed by the Curtis Act by proclaiming it unconstitutional and predicting its ultimate defeat in the courts. He called on voters to defend their homes and reminded readers, “there is no other place we can find as much

¹⁹ William Eubanks, “Destruction of the Cherokee People in 1901,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 20 April 1901, 1.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*

pleasure and such facilities for progress or success as right here in this grand old Cherokee Nation.”²³

The rejection of allotment by culturally conservative Cherokees connected with their historical distrust for the “mixed bloods,” as evidenced by the origins of the Keetoowah Society. Conservative Cherokees founded the organization in 1859 to counteract the secessionist efforts of wealthier, slave-holding Cherokees and to preserve their religious practices and beliefs. In part, the Keetoowah sided with the Union during the Civil War to uphold the existing treaties of 1828, 1833, and 1835 between the federal government and the Cherokee Nation. The desire to maintain existing treaties shaped the response of Keetoowah members to allotment at the turn of the twentieth century. Advocates for the Keetoowah explained that members viewed their treaties as sacred and inviolable while drawing parallels to how Euro-Americans viewed the United States Constitution.²⁴

In a resolution passed in November of 1900, the Keetoowah objected to the distribution of tribal lands to those who were not the “true owners” of the Cherokee Nation. The resolution contended that intermarried whites and the freedmen possessed civil and political rights but “they ha[d] no right or title whatever to the lands or other common property of the Cherokees and they w[ould] never be entitled to participate in a final division of the same.” The Keetoowah challenged the propriety of allotment by

²³ E. C. Albert, “To the Cherokee People,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 20 April 1901, 2.

²⁴ Kathrine Mae Evans, “‘For the Generations to Follow’: Traditional Cherokee History of the Twentieth Century” (M.A. thesis, Arizona State University, 1990), 29-30; Robert K. Thomas, “The Origin and Development of the Redbird Smith Movement” (M.A. thesis, University of Arizona, 1953), 59-62.

noting that existing treaties and the Cherokee Constitution defined the Cherokee Nation as common property, thereby precluding the possibility of any land cessions. Finally, the resolution contained an appeal to the federal government urging it to protect and preserve the rights of the Cherokees and repair the damage caused by “unconstitutional laws.” This plea demonstrated the faith that conservative Cherokees still retained in regards to the American government but the resolution concluded by explaining that the Keetoowah would not accept their enrollment by the Dawes Commission except under protest.²⁵

The inability of the Keetoowah to halt the negotiation of a new agreement between the federal government and the Cherokee Nation prompted members to resist enrollment by hiding in the mountains. The federal government responded by issuing warrants for some of the Cherokees who refused to cooperate with the Dawes Commission, leading to the imprisonment of members of the Keetoowah Society. The government relied upon informants to procure the names of holdouts in order to enroll them without their knowledge or consent. Though the Keetoowah eventually fractionalized over the issue of allotment, the majority remained committed to opposing the policy. Consequently, the editors of the *Cherokee Advocate* needed to allay the suspicions of the Keetoowah in order to promote the acceptance of allotment.²⁶

²⁵ “Resolution Protesting the Implications of the Dawes Commission’s Preparation of the Rolls of the Cherokee Nation,” 28, November 1900, Indians of North America, Series 2, Box 2, Folder 4, McFarlin Library, University of Tulsa.

²⁶ Kent Carter, *The Dawes Commission and the Allotment of the Five Civilized Tribes, 1893-1914* (Orem, UT: Ancestry.com, 1999), 115-116; Thomas, 145-147, 154-156. Conservative Cherokees rejected the idea of enrollment since they did not desire the allotment of Cherokee lands. They resisted the idea of allotting tribal lands to Cherokees of mixed parentage or whites who married into the Nation. Interestingly, reformers believed that the policy of allotment would help the “full bloods,” despite the continued resistance. Redbird Smith formed the Nighthawk Keetoowah as he believed the federal government should not force conservative Cherokees to integrate into United States society so soon. In addition, he lamented

In order to convince all Cherokees of the need for allotment, the *Advocate* attempted to create a sense of solidarity with readers who hesitated to endorse the dissolution of tribal lands. Despite its critique of resistance to allotment, the *Advocate* defended the Keetoowah in an attempt to win their support. The *Advocate* described the Keetoowah Society as a social organization that provided mutual protection while denying that members murdered those who accepted their allotments. The editors of the *Advocate* criticized reporters who wrote negative stories about the Keetoowah while explaining that members did not care whether or not their neighbors filed their paperwork with the Dawes Commission. Instead, the Keetoowah merely wanted their views on allotment given equal respect. The editors of the *Advocate* thereby demonstrated sympathy for the Keetoowah, representing an attempt to garner their trust.²⁷

The *Advocate* repeatedly mentioned its preference to retain a tribal government while simultaneously emphasizing its patriotism for the Cherokee Nation. The paper explained that once the Tribal Council halted work in 1906, the joy that the Nation experienced from having its own government would remain but a memory.

Consequently, the editors of the *Advocate* conceded that the years following the termination of the Cherokee government would deprive the Cherokees of their independence and a source of pride. Yet, this restricted sovereignty was not the only difficulty that the Cherokee Nation would face. The *Advocate* predicted that thieves and

allotment's contribution to the destruction of Cherokee spiritual practices; Redbird Smith sought to rectify this by reintroducing ceremonial dances. Furthermore, he wanted the United States government to honor its treaty obligations. Redbird Smith remained opposed to allotment until 1910 when he realized that further resistance would accomplish nothing. Wardell, 326.

²⁷ *Cherokee Advocate*, 20 June 1903, 2.

liars would attempt to cheat conservative Cherokees of their lands using “glittering things” to entice them to sign deleterious contracts.²⁸ In making these points, the editors of the *Advocate* emphasized their concern for the future of all Cherokees and highlighted their support of existing institutions.

Editorials conceded that requiring culturally-conservative Cherokees to abandon their traditions and values created hardships and promised a future that would challenge and “discourage” many tribal members. The *Advocate* claimed that Euro-Americans never tried to retain supposedly outdated traditions in order to claim that other populations had to sacrifice their cultures in the name of progress. The *Advocate* did not endorse the abandonment of Cherokee traditions out of a hatred of those values but argued that Cherokees had little choice in the matter.²⁹ Yet, the *Advocate* saw hope in the future when “happiness will once more knock at our doors.”³⁰ The *Advocate* predicted that allotment would have a deleterious impact in the short term but after a period of years, Cherokees would improve their material positions significantly. In arguing that the benefits of allotment would not accrue to the Cherokees for many years, the *Advocate* did not echo the reformers that extolled the transformative benefits of private ownership. Instead, the editors of the *Advocate* focused upon the dangers of resistance and the need for the Cherokees to adapt to a changing world.

²⁸ *Cherokee Advocate*, 1 February 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 31 May 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 21 June 1902, 2

²⁹ *Cherokee Advocate*, 26 April 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 2 August 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 30 August 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 14 March 1903, 2.

³⁰ *Cherokee Advocate*, 4 January 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 1 February 1902, 2.

The *Cherokee Advocate* highlighted the inevitability of allotment in order to convince Cherokees opposed to allotment that their resistance would not prove fruitful. Editors for the paper centered on the impossibility of expecting the United States to keep its word. In order to build this argument, the *Advocate* referred to the creation of an American Empire overseas by noting the broken promises given to the Filipinos and the Cubans. In particular, the American presence in Cuba following the Spanish-American War interested the *Advocate*. The paper discussed the debates about whether the United States should retain Cuba despite the country's pledge in the Teller Amendment that it would not seek annexation. The willingness of the United States government to consider abandoning its word provided a lesson for the *Advocate's* readers. The *Advocate* wanted the Cherokees to understand that members of the United States government looked upon its agreements with the Nation as revocable. Though the Cherokees might view treaties as sacred and inviolable, the United States government did not share that interpretation. Consequently, the *Advocate* considered those who doubted government's intention to enforce the Curtis Act of 1898 as foolish. In addition, the Supreme Court case of *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock* of 1903 indicated that nothing would stop Congress from abrogating its earlier agreements with American Indians. For these reasons, the *Advocate* defended the Tribal Council's decision to negotiate with the federal government.³¹ Yet, the *Advocate's* editors did not explore the contradiction in their argument. If the United States willingly abrogated its earlier treaties with the Cherokees, the Nation had little assurance that it

³¹ *Cherokee Advocate*, 9 June 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 23 June 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 2 March 1901, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 1 February 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 5 April 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 17 January 1903, 2.

would not do so again in the future. However, such an interpretation would not help the Tribal Council convince reluctant tribal members that allotment provided the best available option. Consequently, the *Advocate* discussed the certainty that the United States would violate current treaties rather than acknowledging the possibility that the government might renege on future agreements.

The *Cherokee Advocate* furthered its qualified support of allotment by highlighting the futility of resistance. One editorial exclaimed, “Don’t you know that a few hundred people can’t do anything with 75 million!”³² These sentiments reflected feelings of resignation. Even if the Cherokees did not see allotment as an advantageous policy, the Nation lacked the power to resist the federal government. Other editorials specifically mentioned the fate of the Filipinos following the Philippine War of 1899-1902. If seven million Filipinos could not wrest their independence from the United States, then a few thousand Cherokees faced even bleaker prospects. The *Advocate* explained “The Philippinoes [sic] objected also but this is all they could do.”³³ In other words, the *Advocate* considered armed Filipino resistance against the United States as irrelevant due to its inability to change United States policies. Similarly, the *Advocate* observed the failure of the Cubans to prevent the United States from constructing a naval base at Guantanamo Bay. Resistance to the Dawes Commission would only result in

³² *Cherokee Advocate*, 5 April 1902, 2.

³³ *Cherokee Advocate*, 15 February 1902, 2.

humiliation and possible imprisonment while failing to halt the allotment of Cherokee lands. Armed resistance could only end in the extermination of the Cherokee Nation.³⁴

The editors of the *Advocate* were pessimistic about the feasibility of alternatives to cooperation with the Dawes Commission, leading to the publication of editorials critiquing potential courses of action. For example, during the 1890s a number of Cherokees considered moving to Mexico rather than accepting allotment. The plan appealed to culturally conservative members of many different tribes, including the Cherokees. The *Advocate*, though claiming to remain neutral on the issue, provided evidence to dissuade individuals considering such a move. The paper argued that Mexico's hot climate would make the task of growing food much more difficult. The paper noted the brutality of Mexican soldiers who massacred women and children while neglecting to mention instances of American atrocities committed against Native people within the United States. In addition, the paper explained that relocating to Mexico would require the Cherokee to learn Spanish. Most importantly, the paper cast doubts on the assumption that Mexico would permit the Cherokees to hold land collectively or form tribal governments. The *Advocate* thereby demonstrated that the Cherokees would derive no benefit from a move to Mexico as all of the supposed advantages of the proposal were illusory. Lastly, the *Advocate* noted that any plan to relocate a portion of the Cherokee Nation to Mexico would further divide the Cherokees. This scattering of tribal members

³⁴ *Cherokee Advocate*, 22 March 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 26 April 1902, 2.

would make it harder for the Cherokees to resist further encroachments on their lands by avaricious Euro-Americans.³⁵

The *Cherokee Advocate* explored the intransigence of Euro-Americans by printing numerous stories, editorials, and reprinted articles that questioned non-Native morality. The *Advocate* highlighted stories describing the abuses Euro-American land speculators committed against the Cherokees, while explaining that whites occupied their time devising new ways to rob American Indians of their land. The *Advocate* challenged two local newspapers, the *Purcell Register* and the *Minco Minstrel*, to explain what their editors would think if American Indians squatted on white lands and then demanded that the government divide the territory. The *Advocate* criticized other local newspapers, including the *Muskogee Phoenix* and the *Vinita Chieftain*, when they disparaged American Indians. The *Advocate's* editors also addressed negative press from major cities such as Philadelphia. One editorial turned the issue of civilization against the Euro-Americans by noting that those who denied the abilities and accomplishments of American Indians must themselves lack civilization. The *Advocate* charged Euro-American newspapers with exaggerating the reports of problems within Indian Territory in order to justify further governmental intervention on the pretext of maintaining law and order while buttressing policies inimical to Cherokee interests. The paper admitted that in the future, greedy whites might still find a way to rob the Cherokee of their allotted lands as many Euro-Americans regarded American Indian property as "lawful

³⁵ *Cherokee Advocate*, 28 June 1902, 2; "Emigration Scheme," *Cherokee Advocate*, 30 April 1898, 1; "Interesting Letters," *Cherokee Advocate*, 16 April 1898, 1, 2; Daniel Littlefield Jr., "Utopian Dreams of the Cherokee Fullbloods: 1890-1934," *Journal of the West* 10 (1971): 407, 414; "That Emigration Scheme," *The Cherokee Advocate*, 2 April 1898, 2; Mooney, 157-158.

prey.” The greed of whites required the Cherokees to turn to the federal government as one of the few institutions that offered any protection.³⁶

The *Cherokee Advocate* explained that while allotment may not provide an ideal solution for the Nation, it still reserved some land for the Cherokees. Despite the risks, the *Advocate* urged the Cherokees to take their allotments because the failure to do so would have serious consequences. The *Advocate* predicted that if the Cherokees continued their present course, “it would not be long before all [the land] would be gone.”³⁷ In another editorial, the *Advocate* lamented that though “nothing would please [the editors] better than to be able to hold [Cherokee] lands in common,” the continuation of such an arrangement would lead to the complete alienation of tribal holdings.³⁸ The *Advocate* explained that if the Cherokee Nation accepted the division of tribal lands during the 1880s, each member would have received 500 acres. Under the proposed allotment, each Cherokee would receive eighty acres; the *Advocate* predicted that waiting for another decade would reduce that portion to twenty acres per tribal member.³⁹ Thus, the *Advocate*’s arguments for immediate acceptance of allotment rested upon the

³⁶ “Our People’s Future,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 10 May 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 10 July 1895; *Cherokee Advocate*, 20 September 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 10 January 1903, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 28 February 1903, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 7 March 1903, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 2 May 1903, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 13 January 1906, 1; *Cherokee Advocate*, 10 February 1906, 2; “Indian Territory Libeled,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 23 June 1900, 1; “White Man’s Avarice Toward the Indian,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 7 June 1902, 2.

³⁷ *Cherokee Advocate*, 21 June 1902, 2.

³⁸ *Cherokee Advocate*, 14 June 1902, 2.

³⁹ *Cherokee Advocate*, 19 April 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 26 April 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 31 May 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 22 November 1902, 2; “First Blood for Cherokees,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 3 January 1903, 2.

consequences of continued resistance to the policy rather than any positive attributes of the proposal.

The *Advocate* urged Cherokees to embrace allotment for the good of their children. Even if individuals had serious doubts, the *Advocate* explained that they had an obligation to accept the policy for their children who had no choice in the matter. If these parents failed to do so, they would take the blame for destroying the economic future of their children by consigning them to poverty. The *Advocate* also spoke about the wives of tribal members, imploring Cherokee men to consider their future well being. Allotment would provide Cherokee women with a secure retirement after years of hard work. The *Advocate* claimed that allotment would give parents sufficient financial resources to send their children to college to further their education.⁴⁰ In short, the paper challenged critics of allotment to put the good of their families ahead of their pride and their own misgivings. The *Advocate* built on the theme of responsibility by speculating that allotment would most benefit the Cherokees who currently owned the least amount of property. In addition, the paper claimed that under their present situation, most Cherokees derived absolutely no benefit from tribal lands. With allotment, however, each Cherokee would receive a just amount.⁴¹

Beyond encouraging conservative Cherokees to support allotment, the *Advocate* also described what Cherokees should do with their land in order to preserve their economic future. Specifically, the *Advocate* implored its readers to refrain from selling

⁴⁰ *Cherokee Advocate*, 8 December 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 22 March, 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 26 April 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 2 August 1902, 2.

⁴¹ *Cherokee Advocate*, 14 March, 1903, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 18 July 1903, 2.

their land. The paper warned “fullbloods” that selling their lands would bring “poverty and misery” to their families.⁴² The *Advocate* published accounts of Cherokees who made poor land deals to highlight the dangers facing the nation. For example, one story explained that Mrs. Alex Wolf received less for selling her land than many neighbors secured for leasing their holdings. The *Advocate* cautioned that once the Cherokees sold their allotments, they would receive no more land and it would be too late to correct their mistake. With the allotment of tribal holdings, the Cherokee no longer had access to public domain lands. The *Advocate* urged its readers to watch out for the “schemers, grafters, [and] robbers of every kind and description,” who sought to steal their lands.⁴³ Lastly, the *Advocate* provided advice for any Cherokees determined to sell their land. The *Advocate* explained that if the Cherokees could wait before selling their land, they would receive a higher price.⁴⁴

The *Advocate* referred to a biblical story to prove its contention regarding the selling of allotments. The *Advocate* pointed to the account of Esau and Jacob. Esau, the eldest son of Isaac, had the rightful claim to his father’s property. However, Esau sold his birthright to Jacob for a stew to satisfy his hunger after returning from a hunt. Just as Esau sold his inheritance for temporary gain, the *Advocate* urged its readers to avoid selling their lands for momentary riches. The *Advocate* promised that the retention of allotted lands would grant the Cherokee material wealth in the future when they would

⁴² *Cherokee Advocate*, 31 May 1902, 2.

⁴³ *Cherokee Advocate*, 24 February 1906.

⁴⁴ *Cherokee Advocate*, 18 October 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 2 July 1904, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 16 July 1904, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 27 January 1906, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 24 February 1906.

possess orchards, vineyards, and tobacco. In another biblical allusion, the *Advocate* compared this future wealth to the “milk and honey” of Canaan, the land that the ancient Israelites believed God had promised to them. The *Advocate* did not extend the analogy to explain just who or what it was that guaranteed the Cherokees access to this land of “milk and honey.”⁴⁵

The *Advocate* did not make use of several arguments at its disposal which could have addressed the issues of Cherokee land tenure and Cherokee labor. In one editorial, the *Advocate* explained Cherokees “have been too willing to let [whites] assume the white man’s burden.” The wording of this quotation held two different meanings. The phrase “the white man’s burden” was also the name of a poem Rudyard Kipling published urging the United States to take up the responsibility of empire in 1899. On this level, the quotation cast an irreverent light on the Euro-American belief in the civilizing mission.⁴⁶ However, the *Advocate* also included the quote to describe the “white man’s burden” of physical labor. The editorial implored the Cherokee to cease their denigration of manual labor. Instead, the Cherokees should adopt Euro-American forms of farming and labor in order to help the Nation prosper.⁴⁷ In making these claims, the *Advocate* largely accepted Euro-American misconceptions of Native farming. Specifically, the

⁴⁵ *Cherokee Advocate*, 30 August 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 20 December 1902, 2.

⁴⁶ Interestingly, during Queen Victoria’s Jubilee, Kipling drafted what became “The White Man’s Burden,” but he shelved it as its tone did not match the celebratory mood of the occasion. Instead, his poem depicted empire as a burden or even a service which whites needed to perform for ungrateful populations. Kipling revisited the poem while the United States debated whether or not it should annex the Philippines. Harry Ricketts, *Rudyard Kipling: A Life* (New York: Carroll and Graf Publishers, 2000), 231-233.

⁴⁷ *Cherokee Advocate*, 30 August 1902, 2.

Advocate tacitly endorsed the Euro-American interpretation of Cherokee farming practices as communal. Though the Nation retained the title to Cherokee lands, individual members had usufruct rights and controlled the disposition of any improvements they made to the land. Consequently, the Cherokee system of land tenure did not resemble a communal system in which everyone received an equal share of the produce regardless of work performed. Reformers had no reason to introduce severalty to the Cherokee in order to promote a system of individual rewards as Cherokees already had incentives to improve their lands. Consequently, the *Advocate* neglected an opportunity to defend the Cherokee Nation from charges that reformers leveled against many Native people. However, such an editorial stance may have jeopardized the endorsement of allotment.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Though many whites claimed that American Indians needed individualized land holdings to encourage them to manage their land more effectively ignored crucial points. Native farming practices often produced more than sufficient food for a given community. For example, the supposedly subsistence-level farming of American Indians near Jamestown and Plymouth helped to keep early-seventeenth century settlers alive. Another misconception about American Indians is that they did not manage or make use of their environments. Such notions helped whites justify their seizure of native lands as they claimed that whites would make use of the land. The turn of the twentieth century would also see the rise of the notion that nature must remain pristine and devoid of any sign of human habitation. This new conception of nature helped to bring about the removal of American Indians from national parks in order to preserve the “wilderness.” In terms of the Cherokee, Khaled Bloom demonstrates that the depiction of the Nation as communal is inaccurate. Though the Cherokee Nation itself retained title to the land, members could control any portion of the land that they settled and improved. Furthermore, Cherokees could sell their improved land to other members of the Nation or pass their holdings onto their children. If a Cherokee abandoned a plot of land in favor of a new claim somewhere else within the Nation’s territory, the abandoned land reverted to the control of the tribe. Consequently, Cherokee land practices gave usufruct rights to each member and permitted them to control and manage the land they improved. These land policies tended to limit the size of Cherokee holdings to what one family could successfully farm. Some Cherokee managed to expand their holdings significantly by hiring workers to farm additional territory. Cherokees needed to hire whites from nearby states as the system of land tenure prevented the employment of other tribal members who could claim their own farm. Legally, Cherokees could employ these outsiders as workers but not lease to them. However, many of the Cherokees who wanted to expand their holdings leased to the white outsiders anyway and lied about the status of these individuals. The efforts of the Tribal Council to control this flood of whites seeking leases largely failed. Yet, by the 1890s, even many of the smaller land holders within the Cherokee Nation became landlords. Khaled Bloom, “An American Tragedy of the Commons: Land and Labor in the Cherokee Nation, 1870-1900,” *Agriculture History* 76, no. 3 (Summer 2002): 497-523; G. E. Condra, “Opening of the Indian Territory,” *Bulletin of the American Geographic Society* 39, no. 6 (1907): 323-324; Mark Spence, *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian*

Despite its ambivalent view of allotment, the *Advocate* spoke highly of the Dawes Commission.⁴⁹ The paper repeatedly argued that the Cherokees had nothing to fear from the Dawes Commission, claiming “the Government is not going to take one dollar from [the Cherokee] wrongfully.”⁵⁰ Stories presented accounts of Secretary Ethan Hitchcock defending American Indians from the exploitation of unscrupulous whites. The *Advocate* shielded Hitchcock from his detractors, claiming that his critics despised the Secretary of the Interior “because he will not set down and see defenseless Indians robbed left and right.”⁵¹ The *Advocate* praised President William McKinley for using his veto to stop a bill that would have devastated the economic interests of the Navajo. The editors explained that McKinley’s stance required courage as he had to resist the economic interests of the “syndicates” attempting to exploit Navajo lands. The *Advocate* later praised President Theodore Roosevelt as friend and protector of American Indian

Removal and the Making of the National Parks (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Thomas Wessel, “Agriculture, Indians, and American History,” *Agricultural History* 50, no. 1 (January 1976): 9-11.

⁴⁹ Wardell, 326.

⁵⁰ *Cherokee Advocate*, 15 March 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 22 March 1902, 2. To buttress its claim that the Cherokees could trust the government, the *Advocate* pointed to its long history of loyalty. Yet, these claims of loyalty stemmed from a distortion of the Nation’s history. In an editorial, the *Advocate* portrayed the Cherokees as friends of the United States by citing the aid rendered to the Americans during the revolution. The piece claimed that the Cherokees had never taken up arms against the United States. The *Advocate* explained that tribal members who supported the Confederacy during the Civil War represented only a small minority of the Cherokee people. This depiction of Cherokee history ignored the significant divisions that the Civil War created within the Nation. In addition, the sanitized history neglected the reasons why a portion of the Cherokee Nation sided with the Confederacy. Specifically, slave-holding Cherokees would tend to gravitate towards the Confederacy. In addition, the Cherokee Nation had little reason to show loyalty to a government that had uprooted it from its ancestral home less than twenty-five years before the outbreak of the Civil War. *Cherokee Advocate*, 22 February 1902, 2.

⁵¹ *Cherokee Advocate*, 20 September 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 25 July 1903, 2; “Their Homes Saved by Secretary Hitchcock,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 4 October 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 10 February 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 15 October 1904, 2; Debo, 61. In an editorial from 1895, the *Cherokee Advocate* referred to a white critic of the Dawes Commission as a “jackass.” *Cherokee Advocate*, 10 July 1895, 2.

interests who would ensure that every Cherokee citizen received the appropriate share of land. The *Advocate* demonstrated its support by offering advice to the Dawes Commission to aid it in its efforts to enroll the Cherokee. One editorial suggested that the Commission enlist the help of prominent Cherokee to persuade reluctant tribal members to add their names to the Dawes Roll.⁵²

In addition to portraying the Dawes Commission as honest, the *Advocate* trusted the Commission's efforts to weed out "leeches" that could not provide proof of their citizenship. The *Advocate* expected that the Dawes Roll would reveal the presence of many intruders within the Cherokee Nation posing as tribal members in an attempt to acquire land. This trust furthered the *Advocate*'s support for the Dawes Commission. As of 1 November 1902, the Dawes Commission rejected over seventeen hundred applicants for Cherokee membership. Ethan Hitchcock, Secretary of the Interior, only intervened in seven of these cases. The *Advocate* explained that the Dawes Commission gained an understanding of the troubles that the Cherokee Nation faced in trying to prevent illegal citizenship claims. The *Advocate* frequently used humor to mock those it viewed as spurious applicants. For example, the *Advocate* singled out the Dawson family for barely having enough Cherokee blood "to sustain a flea." Another editorial noted that many applicants waited many years before they suddenly realized that they possessed Cherokee ancestry. The *Advocate* anticipated that the Dawes Commission would locate some

⁵² *Cherokee Advocate*, 14 December 1901, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 12 May 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 15 March 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 22 March 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 5 April 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 21 May 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 22 March 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 23 August 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 20 September 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 13 December 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 28 February 1903, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 7 March 1903, 2.

individuals who genuinely deserved inclusion on the tribal roll, but explained that such persons would represent a minority of disputed applicants. The *Advocate* considered this work important enough that it labeled any citizen who impeded the work of the Dawes Commission as a traitor to the Cherokee Nation. The paper admitted that the requirement to share Cherokee land with adopted tribal members would reduce the amount of land available for other tribal citizens. However, the *Advocate* attempted to remain neutral on whether adopted tribal members should receive lands but wished that adopted whites would take the matter to court and bring about a permanent resolution of the issue.⁵³

The *Advocate* criticized tribal members who advised conservative Cherokees to reject allotment. The *Advocate* demanded that these advisors correct their mistake and use their influence to enroll as many Cherokees as possible. The *Advocate* challenged the sincerity of tribal members who allegedly enrolled their own names while simultaneously asking others to resist. If these defiant Cherokees ended up without land, the blame would fall upon the advisors who encouraged their opposition to the Dawes Commission. The *Advocate* asked those who refused to enroll to consider the reasons why their advisors signed themselves up for allotment while counseling others to resist.⁵⁴ The *Advocate* expressed the greatest frustration with tribal members who helped to defraud American Indians as the paper considered this worse than the actions of predatory whites. The paper

⁵³ *Cherokee Advocate*, 21 July 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 8 September 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 6 October 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 8 December 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 4 January 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 18 October 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 1 November 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 28 February 1903, 2.

⁵⁴ *Cherokee Advocate*, 1 February 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 22 March 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 26 April 1902, 2.

also expressed anger with American Indians who disparaged their communities in front of white Americans. For example, Charles Gibson of the Creek drew the *Advocate*'s ire on several occasions. Gibson frequently wrote pieces for the *Indian Journal* from Eufaula providing political commentary and information on Creek history and culture. In one issue, Gibson related a hypothetical story about two children who were sent to town to run errands. Gibson claimed that the white child would always complete his task and then return home while the Indian child would get drunk and end up in jail. The *Advocate* wished that Gibson would use his talents to encourage and support American Indians rather than degrading them to win favor with Euro-American readers. The *Advocate* devoted particular attention to individuals, such as Gibson, as they could harm American Indians by reinforcing Euro-American stereotypes that justified government intrusion into their lives.⁵⁵

Though the *Advocate* ultimately endorsed allotment, its editors generally remained wary of statehood.⁵⁶ The *Advocate* explained that Congress could demonstrate its compassion for Indian Territory's inhabitants by postponing the creation of a territorial government until the American Indians faced more favorable conditions. In addition, the *Advocate* critiqued the efforts to rename the Indian Territory without the

⁵⁵ *Cherokee Advocate*, 10 July 1895; *Cherokee Advocate*, 17 November 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 13 April 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 19 April 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 28 March 1902, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 31 May 1902, 2; "The Difference," *Cherokee Advocate*, 6 September 1902, 2; Daniel Littlefield Jr., and James Parins, *A Biobibliography of Native American Writers, 1772-1924* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1981), 60-67.

⁵⁶ Melton, the final editor of the *Advocate* endorsed the Sequoyah Constitution of 1905 rather than the plans to combine Indian Territory with Oklahoma Territory. Butler and Loeser, however, took editorial stances critical of statehood. Littlefield and Parins, 72.

consent of its residents. The editors compared the situation to a neighbor demanding to name the firstborn child of a young couple. The *Advocate* condemned the “half breeds” that actively pursued statehood for their own economic benefit. The *Advocate* sought to delay statehood so that conservative Cherokees could have a longer period of governmental protection before they had to compete openly with whites. The *Advocate* argued that under statehood, whites would take advantage of these individuals. The *Advocate* quoted Senator El Wright who explained that some in Oklahoma desired statehood with the Indian Territory as the former Oklahoma Territory would dominate the new state politically. Second, the added population would permit Oklahoma to acquire additional representation even as it controlled the political future of Indian Territory. Another editorial explained that the residents of Indian Territory did not want to pay taxes to benefit the people of Oklahoma. In making this argument, the *Advocate* referred to Oklahoma’s significant debt; merging Oklahoma Territory with Indian Territory would make the Cherokees responsible for the debt of their neighbors. While the *Advocate* realized that the Indian Territory would make the transition to statehood at some point, it hoped that this would not involve fusion with Oklahoma.⁵⁷

In addition to its fears regarding statehood, the *Cherokee Advocate* defended the right of the Nation to maintain political unity even after the dissolution of its government. Euro-American papers chastised the *Advocate*, claiming that the Cherokees planned to sell their votes to the highest bidder. The *Advocate* countered these charges by explaining

⁵⁷ *Cherokee Advocate*, 12 May 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 19 May 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 13 October 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 29 October 1900, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 16 November 1901, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 14 December 1901, 2; *Cherokee Advocate*, 24 May 1902, 2.

that if Euro-Americans had the right to band themselves together in political parties, then the Cherokees possessed such a right as well. Lastly, the *Advocate* pointed to the numbers of whites dedicated to overwhelming the Cherokee. The *Advocate* argued that the Cherokees needed to vote as a unit in order to preserve and protect themselves. If Euro-Americans treated Cherokees with respect and stopped trying to cheat them of their lands, then the Nation would not need to take such measures. Without tribal unity, the *Advocate* feared that statehood would prove even more dangerous to the Cherokee.⁵⁸

With the termination of the Cherokee tribal government in 1906, the *Advocate* ceased publication. In its final issue, the editors reflected upon their efforts to help the “full bloods.” The editorial claimed that the paper gave its best effort to convince them of the inevitable changes coming to the Cherokee and Indian Territory. The piece also claimed that their efforts to tell the truth about the conditions facing the Cherokee people only met with denunciations from critics within the Nation. Just as the *Advocate* charged opponents of allotment with betraying the good of the tribe, critics of allotment portrayed the paper’s editors as traitors. The editorial claimed detractors of the *Advocate* did not heed the warnings of the paper, doubting that the United States would follow through on its stated purpose of allotting tribal lands and eliminating tribal governments. The *Advocate* sympathized with its doubters and accepted them as sincere. Nevertheless, the paper lamented the refusal of many tribal members to heed its warnings about the future. The paper reminded its readers that it provided ample warning that the United States government did not bluff about its intention to divide tribal lands. The editorial reiterated

⁵⁸ *Cherokee Advocate*, 1 March 1902, 2.

the plea for the Cherokee to retain their allotted lands and resist the temptation to sell. Finally, the *Advocate* urged its readers to “show to the world that you are not a lot of good for nothing Indians.”⁵⁹

In the early twentieth century, the *Cherokee Advocate* consistently urged its readers to come to terms with allotment. Most of its arguments focused upon the necessity rather than the benefits of such a policy. The paper described the certainty of unilateral government action, the futility of resistance, and the need to preserve at least some Cherokee lands. These arguments frequently exposed contradictions, as the *Advocate*'s editorials required a belief that the federal government would protect individual allotments more successfully than it preserved tribal holdings. The *Advocate* praised the efforts of the Dawes Commission for this group's efforts would help eliminate non-Cherokees from the tribal rolls. Though the *Advocate*'s positions reflected the views of the Tribal Council, the paper still has utility for scholarship as it highlighted the efforts of Cherokee leaders to win the support of their people.

⁵⁹ “To the Cherokee People,” *Cherokee Advocate*, 3 March 1906, 2.

Chapter 5

Debating Allotment in Indian Territory Newspapers

Though many of the papers from Indian Territory endorsed allotment, the motivations for doing so varied. Even though Euro-Americans edited some of these prominent papers, they explicitly targeted Native readers by publishing material about the Five Tribes. In addition, members of the Five Tribes frequently used these papers as a public forum to challenge or endorse allotment. Even within pages of stridently pro-allotment publications such as the *Muskogee Phoenix*, harsh critiques from Native writers appeared. Consequently, examining these papers helps to reveal the arguments American Indians read and debated in regards to allotment. In the case of the *Muskogee Phoenix*, the paper's consistent reiteration of the needs of white residents of Indian Territory won it the enmity of American Indians opposed to allotment. The *Indian Sentinel* from Tahlequah, the *Indian Citizen* from Atoka, and the *Indian Journal* from Muskogee each endorsed allotment but generally defended the interests of American Indians. As such, the though a majority of Indian Territory papers endorsed allotment in some form, there was no uniformity of opinion in regards to Native sovereignty.

Throughout the 1890s, the *Muskogee Phoenix* promoted allotment and insisted the division of tribal lands was inevitable as it had the support of both Republicans and Democrats.¹ The *Phoenix* claimed that it wanted to serve its Native readers by advocating allotment as the solution to real or perceived problems in Indian Territory.

¹ *Muskogee Phoenix*, 17 November 1892, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 20 March 1895, 2.

The *Phoenix* urged its Native readers to accept allotment for their own benefit and to secure the greatest profit from their lands. The *Phoenix* also claimed that an honest appraisal of public opinion in Indian Territory would reveal a clear majority of the Five Tribes desired allotment and statehood. Allotment would protect the members of the Five Tribes from the monopolization of lands by a few wealthy members.² Unlike most Native writers, the Euro-American editors of the *Muskogee Phoenix* repeatedly advocated for the protection of the property rights and investment of the white residents of Indian Territory, arguing that it was the capital and hard work of these individuals that enriched the territory and brought wealth to the Native inhabitants.³

The *Muskogee Phoenix* consistently focused on the economic development of Indian Territory. Even when it published editorials defending American Indians, these statements served to encourage investment.⁴ For example, the *Phoenix* urged the Five Tribes to construct their own exhibit at the World's Fair of 1893. The exhibit would dispel public perceptions of the Five Tribes as backward, assuaging the fears of potential investors.⁵ Similarly, the *Phoenix* also took issue with characterizations of American Indians as lazy; the *Phoenix* pointed out that Native hunting and gathering practices

² "Allotment is coming," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 11 August 1892, 4; "Advantages of Allotment," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 13 November 1890, 4; "Cherokee Views," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 19 March 1891, 4; "Let the Councilmen Heed," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 10 September 1891, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 21 May 1891, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 7 July 1892, 4; "Once Again," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 4 December 1890, 4.

³ "The Chic. and Choc. Treaty," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 29 April 1897, 4; "Choctaw Agreement," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 7 January 1897, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 20 August 1891, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 29 April 1897, 4; "Once Again," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 4 December 1890, 4; "Vote for the Man," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 2 July 1891, 4.

⁴ "Let Us Have Peace," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 22 December 1892, 4.

⁵ *Muskogee Phoenix*, 13 October 1892, 4.

involved a great deal of time and labor. However, the *Phoenix* did not call for American Indians to retain their traditional pursuits. Instead, the *Phoenix* urged patience with American Indians as they transitioned from their previous patterns of work and subsistence to Euro-American conceptions of intensive agriculture and business.⁶

The *Phoenix* generally critiqued stories accusing Indian Territory of being lawless and possessing a crime rate far in excess of the surrounding states.⁷ The *Phoenix* denounced these stories as sensationalistic and labeled them as slanderous to the law-abiding residents of Indian Territory.⁸ Instead, the *Phoenix* called for Native people to receive greater independence while supporting the termination of per capita payments.⁹ The *Muskogee Phoenix* pointed to lynch mobs, gangs, and murderers present in other states in order to deny that violent crimes were unique to Indian Territory.¹⁰

In late 1895, the Dawes Commission released a report critical of conditions in Indian Territory. The Dawes Commission repeated many of the charges it made in a report from 1894, particularly in terms of the crime rate in Indian Territory. The Dawes Commission believed conditions in Indian Territory justified the abrogation of treaties in

⁶ “Are Indians Lazy?,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 21 May 1891, 4.

⁷ “Coming Home to Roost,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 23 October 1890, 4; “Indian Country,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 3 May 1893, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 12 January 1893, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 26 January 1893, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 22 August 1895, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 14 November 1895, 4.

⁸ *Muskogee Phoenix*, 13 November 1890, 4; “Slanderous,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 5 February 1891, 4.

⁹ “Are the Indians Rich?,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 6 August 1891, 4; “Money Changing Hands,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 22 January 1891, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 3 April 1890, 4.

¹⁰ “Is Crime on the Increase?,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 18 June 1896, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 25 February 1892, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 12 January 1893, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 9 February 1893, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 7 November 1895, 4; *Muskogee Phoenix*, 15 July 1897, 4; “The New Orleans Riot,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 19 March 1891, 4.

order to provide the white residents of Indian Territory with a political voice.¹¹ The *Phoenix* disagreed with some of the statements and conclusions of the Dawes Commission's report but it supported the plan to change the governmental system of the Five Tribes.¹² Though the *Phoenix* expressed skepticism about the 257 reported murders during the previous year, the paper conceded killings were common.¹³ An editorial stated, "It is with a feeling of sorrow rather than of humiliation that we bow our head and acknowledge that the bloody record of the past twelve months belies our claims and refutes our boasts."¹⁴ The *Muskogee Phoenix*'s support for the Dawes Commission enabled the paper to ignore its previous portrayal of Indian Territory as safe and prosperous. Though the *Phoenix* usually interpreted accounts of lawlessness in Indian Territory as a threat to commercial development, the paper endorsed this report as a means of furthering allotment and the dissolution of tribal governments.¹⁵

The *Phoenix* dismissed Native desires to retain their governments and communal land tenure and accused the Five Tribes of opposing "encroachments made for their benefit."¹⁶ This argument implied the members of the Five Tribes lacked the capacity to

¹¹ Kent Carter, *The Dawes Commission and the Allotment of the Five Civilized Tribes, 1893-1914* (Orem, Utah: Ancestry.com, 1999), 10; Angie Debo, *The Rise and Fall of the Choctaw Republic* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1934), 252.

¹² "That Commission Report," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 9 January 1896, 4.

¹³ "That Commission Report," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 9 January 1896, 4.

¹⁴ "Homicides in the Territory," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 10 September 1896, 4.

¹⁵ "That Commission Report," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 9 January 1896, 4; "Homicides in the Territory," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 10 September 1896, 4.

¹⁶ "Obstinate Backwardness is Not Patriotism," *Muskogee Phoenix*, 22 May 1890, 4.

act in their own best interest. Euro-American demand for Native land would lead to allotment regardless of what American Indians desired, thereby requiring the Five Tribes to take steps to secure title to their lands. In addition, the *Phoenix* cast the removal of intruders from Indian Territory as impossible due to the “aggressive” nature of these whites.¹⁷ The *Phoenix* used these arguments to cast Native opposition to allotment as meaningless in order to discourage resistance, attract Eastern capital, and permit the further economic development of Indian Territory.¹⁸ Another editorial conceded that many conservative Cherokees continued to resist efforts to dissolve their government. The *Phoenix* expressed astonishment for the Cherokees’ preference for “the old forms, old ideas, old customs and old laws that have characterized the weakness and frailty of their nationality for the past half century.”¹⁹ As such, the *Phoenix* failed to consider why Cherokees desired to retain their own government.

The *Muskogee Phoenix* urged the Five Tribes to embrace progress and abandon their focus on the past, which the paper dismissed as “an unhealthy sentimentality.”²⁰ The *Phoenix* blamed the racial animosity American Indians held for whites as a factor limiting their embrace of allotment. The paper urged the members of the Five Tribes to avoid permitting past grievances—however deplorable—to “blind them to the interests of

¹⁷ “Let Us Have Peace,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 22 December 1892, 4.

¹⁸ *Muskogee Phoenix*, 12 June 1890, 4; “Must Rome Fall,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 3 July 1890, 4. Though both the *Cherokee Advocate* and the *Muskogee Phoenix* focused upon the futility of resistance, the *Phoenix* sought to defeat Native opposition for commercial development, not the well-being of American Indians.

¹⁹ “The Full-Blood Cherokees,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 3 June 1897, 4.

²⁰ “An Awakening,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 15 December 1892, 4.

their country, themselves and their children.”²¹ The paper conceded that history provided American Indians with ample reasons to distrust the United States but denied these past abuses justified impeding the allotment of the Five Tribes.²² The *Phoenix* derided Native sovereignty and chastised the federal government for not requiring American Indians to assimilate.²³ Furthermore, the *Phoenix* dismissed the possibility that members of the Five Tribes would leave the United States for Mexico or any other country in the western hemisphere as “bosh.”²⁴ The paper conceded some older Indians might desire to flee and “enjoy the semi-barbarous existence of primeval days,” but was skeptical these individuals would carry out their plan.²⁵

Though other papers took pro-allotment positions, the *Phoenix* drew harsher criticism from other Indian Territory papers. Competing editors charged the *Muskogee Phoenix* with seizing any opportunity to ridicule American Indians.²⁶ These critiques stemmed, in part, from the tendency of the *Phoenix* to cast American Indians as ignorant of their own best interests.²⁷ In addition, the *Phoenix*’s coverage of allotment sparked a protest from Creek Indians. Representatives from across the Creek Nation gathered and

²¹ *Muskogee Phoenix*, 29 December 1892, 4.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ “Uncle Sam to Blame,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 12 August 1897, 4.

²⁴ *Muskogee Phoenix*, 29 July 1897, 4.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Indian Sentinel*, 27 April 1899, 2.

²⁷ *Muskogee Phoenix*, 3 July 1890, 4.

endorsed a petition asking the *Phoenix* to desist its publication of dubious claims regarding the Creeks and allotment:

“WHEREAS, The paper known as MUSKOGEE PHOENIX, edited by a non-citizen, in conflict with the wishes of the full-blood Creek Indians, advocates the allotment system and often misrepresents us of our interests and preference. Therefore
Be It Resolved, That it is the sense of this convention, consisting of delegates from every town of the Muskogee nation that the full bloods do not wish to entertain any proposition that tends to change the status of our government, and respectfully ask the above named party to restrain such advocaiton [sic] and misrepresentation.”²⁸

The *Phoenix* reprinted this petition and responded to its charges in an editorial.

The *Phoenix* denied that it misrepresented the “political views of a single full-blood Indian citizen.”²⁹ Though conceding that many members of the Five Tribes had no interest in abandoning their political status or their system of land tenure, the *Phoenix* maintained that tribal governments and communal land holding were ultimately harmful to the Five Tribes and interfered with economic development.³⁰ This was not the last time the *Phoenix* received criticisms for its stance on allotment. In 1895, Rev. W. P. Blake wrote a letter to the *Phoenix* arguing that allotment would enable courts and lawyers to defraud the Five Tribes of their lands. Blake contended, “Recent efforts in Oklahoma emphasize the intimation, that as soon as the laws of the whites prevail, continuous efforts will multiple to find imaginary reason for taking from the Indian all he has.”³¹

²⁸ “Full-Blood’s Resolution,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 25 January 1894, 4.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ W. P. Blake, “Is this [illegible] Settled?,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 24 October 1895, 8.

Blake pointed to the history of interactions between American Indians and the United States to argue that few Euro-Americans who had the best interest of Native communities at heart would enter Indian Territory after allotment.³²

The *Muskogee Phoenix* attempted to rebut these charges with a lengthy editorial. The *Phoenix* denied informing Indians that “they must treat with the government.”³³ The same editorial depicted the termination of the holding of land in common as inevitable, thereby forcing the Five Tribes to determine how the change should occur.³⁴ The *Phoenix* did not explain how depicting allotment as inevitable gave the Five Tribes any options other than cooperation with the federal government and its efforts to divide tribal lands. The *Phoenix* rejected Blake’s conclusions about the negative consequences of allotment by accusing Blake of having a “vivid imagination.”³⁵ According to the *Phoenix*, the racial prejudice of whites against American Indians was irrelevant as both groups were equal before the law. In addition, if Blake’s assertions were true, then Christian civilization was “worthless and a school of dishonesty.”³⁶ The *Phoenix* could not accept this worldview and reiterated its support for allotment by providing a list of benefits that would accrue to members of the Five Tribes.³⁷

³² Ibid.

³³ “Mr. Blake’s Mistaken Theory,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 24 October 1895, 4.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

Though the editors of the *Muskogee Phoenix* printed letters from both American Indians and Euro-Americans endorsing allotment. The letters frequently echoed the sentiment that the policy was advantageous and inevitable, thereby necessitating cooperation.³⁸ For example, Dick Neal, a Cherokee, depicted the Cherokee Nation as a haven for monopoly, and argued that “creating wealth by robbing the poor is practiced in all civilized countries but none more according to size than in the Cherokee Nation.”³⁹ Neal cast monopolies within the Choctaw Nation as a greater threat than monopolies and trusts created elsewhere in the United States. Neal predicted allotment would protect the property rights of Cherokee citizens and free the Nation from monopolies and other “such relics of barbarism.”⁴⁰ Neal also accused opponents of allotment of looking to the past and desiring a “return to the days of eating acorns.”⁴¹ Another author identified as Span supported allotment as “the only salvation for the common people in securing to themselves permanent homes” and the best chance of limiting the power of monopoly in Indian Territory.⁴² Span conceded previous generations of American Indians had the right

³⁸ R. C. Childers, “Communication from R. C. Childers,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 8 February 1894, 8; C. G., “Arguments for Allotment,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 23 June 1892, 1, 8; Dick Neal, “Reason and Treason,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 30 April 1891, 1; Observer, “The Crisis in the Indian Territory,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 12 February 1891, 1; Robert Owen, “The Cherokee Outlet,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 22 October 1892, 8. Observer may be the penname of an unknown Cherokee author. A Cherokee author using the same penname published articles in the *Cherokee Advocate* during the late 1870s. Littlefield citation here.

³⁹ Dick Neal, “Mr. Neal Speaks,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 27 October 1892, 8.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Span, “Canadian Heard From,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 13 October 1892, 1

to distrust whites but argued both whites and American Indians had “grown wiser” thereby justifying continued Native cooperation.⁴³

The pro-allotment writers in the *Phoenix* occasionally justified the policy in ways that the *Phoenix* rejected. One Creek author, identified only as “An Indian” wrote a letter to the *Muskogee Phoenix* denouncing the heavy taxes paid by American Indians.⁴⁴ Each year, the Five Tribes received annuity payments and placed these funds into their national treasuries. The author advocated the distribution of this money through per capita payments and labeled the retention of these funds by the tribal councils as a form of taxation. An Indian argued these taxes lacked “justice and equity.”⁴⁵ As larger families would receive more money via per capita payments, An Indian argued these taxes placed an undue burden on poor families as they lost access to greater sums of money. Consequently, he promoted the allotment of tribal lands and the equitable division of the nation’s funds and resources.⁴⁶ Two weeks later, a second letter from “An Indian” reiterated many of the same points, while suggesting opponents of allotment had ulterior economic motives.⁴⁷ These views contradicted the *Phoenix* due to its opposition to per capita payments even though An Indian’s plan would undermine the power of tribal governments by depriving them of necessary funds.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ An Indian, “Two Vital Questions,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 6 October 1892, 1; Daniel Littlefield, Jr. and James Parins, *A Bibliography of Native American Writers, 1772-1924* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1981), 192.

⁴⁵ An Indian, “Two Vital Questions,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 6 October 1892, 1.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ An Indian, “Taxation and Allotment,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 20 October 1892, 1.

Ben Watkins of the Choctaws addressed the issue of taxation among the Choctaws.⁴⁸ Similar to An Indian, Ben Watkins defined money paid to the Choctaw Nation as a tax if the government did not distribute it as a per capita payment. Watkins added a racial component to his argument by noting funds supported schools for the children of Choctaw freedmen. As Choctaw freedmen did not receive per capita payments, Watkins contended these individuals paid no taxes to support these schools. Though Watkins assured readers he “entertain[ed] no ill will whatever toward the colored man,” he wanted to call attention to the expenditure of Choctaw funds to educate the Choctaw freedmen.⁴⁹ Watkins noted poorer Choctaws tended to live in isolated areas, thereby limiting their access to the nation’s schools. As such, Watkins attempted to build resentment against the freedmen in order to bolster Choctaw opposition to taxes.⁵⁰ Watkins and An Indian were among the few Native voices to deride Native sovereignty openly in their writings by calling for measures that would deprive tribal governments of needed funds.

Native writers critical of allotment also published their viewpoints in the *Muskogee Phoenix*. An author identified as “Indian” explained allotment would place American Indians into contact with “the professional land shark” in an uneven contest. In the end, the members of the Five Tribes would only find homelessness.⁵¹ A Creek writer,

⁴⁸ Ben Watkins, “Two Vital Questions,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 3 November 1892, 1.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Indian, “The Situation,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 3 May 1894, 1.

writing under the name Echo-Hutka, submitted a letter supporting statehood for Indian Territory and rejecting allotment. The author saw this approach as the only possible way of continuing to hold land in common. Echo-Hutka acknowledged that intruders and some tribal members controlled vast portions of Indian Territory, but believed only a state government would have the power and authority necessary to halt these practices without fundamentally altering communal land tenure. Furthermore, the creation of a state government would “do away with that Federal supervision which is often as great a curse to us as it is a blessing.”⁵² Consequently, Echo-Hutka saw statehood as a means of maintaining sovereignty by limiting federal authority over the lives of American Indians.

The *Phoenix*, as well as other Indian Territory papers frequently carried letters from Reverend Walter Duncan, a brother of DeWitt Clinton Duncan.⁵³ Duncan challenged the assertion that those opposed to allotment were stubborn, explaining he was “defending the rights of his people.”⁵⁴ Duncan recast stubbornness as a positive trait by labeling the American colonists as stubborn in their refusal to submit to King George III of England. The refusal to capitulate to outside interests made American colonists heroes in United States history and transformed Native opponents of allotment into patriots.⁵⁵ Duncan opposed statehood as he feared the overwhelming number of whites

⁵² Echo-Hutka, “State of Columbia,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 23 April 1891, 1.

⁵³ W. A. Duncan, “Cherokee Bonds,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 31 August 1893, 1; W. A. Duncan, “From Delegate Duncan,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 22 December 1894, 2; W. A. Duncan, “Senator Platt on the Treaties,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 26 July 1894, 1; Walter A. Duncan, “Worship in Washington,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 30 August 1894, 8.

⁵⁴ W. A. Duncan, “Home Scraps,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 16 February 1893, 8.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

would drown out American Indian voters.⁵⁶ As such, members of the Five Tribes would find themselves unable to access the authority of the state to protect their interests while the white population “would doubtless legislate to suit themselves in every respect.”⁵⁷

Walter Duncan admitted the system of taxation within the Five Tribes placed an unequal burden on the poorest members of society. However, Duncan denied this served to justify allotment as the National Council held the power to ameliorate these conditions by creating a more equitable tax system. Duncan rejected allotment as the logical solution for the Cherokees’ problems. According to Duncan, the Cherokee practice of holding “title to land in common is the only safety for” poorer members of the Nation.⁵⁸ Duncan countered the optimistic portrayals of allotment by analyzing land tenure within the United States, writing, “Under [the Euro-American] system of private property in lands, we daily see thousands and even millions who to-day do not own a foot of land, and, in all likelihood, never own any.”⁵⁹ Duncan thereby cast the division of tribal lands as dangerous to the wellbeing of American Indians by noting the extreme poverty of Euro-Americans.

Walter Duncan challenged the understanding of progress by asserting Euro-Americans would eventually “have ‘progressed’ so far as to embrace” the holding of land

⁵⁶ W. A. Duncan, “Home Rule and Statehood,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 2 March 1893, 8.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ W. A. Duncan, “Allotment,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 1 December 1892, 8.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

in common.⁶⁰ He questioned whether “the million of landless, homeless, poor who are to-day struggling for life among the grinding wheels of the unfeeling machine, and clamoring for bread at the doors of their masters” thought holding land in severalty was moral.⁶¹ Duncan contended the wealthy and powerful maintained their capitalistic system to generate wealth and “look[ed] on the poor as pertaining to a lower order of creatures only to be tolerated.”⁶² Consequently, Duncan depicted allotment as an enemy to progress and justice due to the probability it would produce economic inequality. By portraying the economic system of the United States as harmful to poor Americans, Duncan echoed reformers who expressed concern about the fate of traditional American Indians. Just as missionaries and government officials believed American Indians needed to adopt Euro-American norms in order to prosper, Duncan argued poor Americans would thrive under a system of communal land tenure.

James W. Duncan, a Cherokee, made arguments similar to those articulated by Walter Duncan.⁶³ James Duncan pointed to a higher level of economic equality within the Cherokee Nation as a key motivation for the retention of land tenure in common. Holding lands in common prevented the Cherokee Nation from housing “neither paupers nor millionaires.”⁶⁴ If the Five Tribes had allotted their lands after settling in Indian Territory,

⁶⁰ W. A. Duncan, “In the Great Debate,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 2 November 1893, 8.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ Despite the same last name, James Duncan was not related to Walter or DeWitt Clinton Duncan.

⁶⁴ James W. Duncan, “Our Land Tenure,” *Indian Chieftain*, 25 April 1892, 2.

conservative and progressive Cherokees would have lived their lives as “hirelings or paupers” rather than having their own homes.⁶⁵ Duncan argued that the United States was growing to resemble England as few could afford to own their own lands, leaving the majority of people in a position of servitude. However, Duncan conceded that some Cherokees had fenced large areas of land which they leased to whites. In order to preserve Cherokee land tenure, Duncan advocated the reduction of these larger holdings to preserve more land for other Cherokees.⁶⁶

Duncan also accused non-citizens and speculators of pushing the depiction of Indian Territory as tenuous and economically weak in order to push through allotment. According to Duncan, these outsiders “think the Cherokees are a set of fools and don’t know better.”⁶⁷ Duncan expressed frustration with speculators who boasted about how they could profit from lands appraised by the government far below their market value. According to Duncan, these speculators wanted to force the Cherokees to surrender their “indestructible patent” and enable outsiders to seize their “homes and country for a song.”⁶⁸ James Duncan quoted from older treaties between the Cherokee Nation and the United States to prove that the Cherokees already held title in fee simple to their lands in Indian Territory. Consequently, the United States did not have the legal authority to contest Cherokee ownership of the lands or require them to alter their form of land

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ James W. Duncan, “The ‘Unsettled Condition,’” *Indian Chieftain*, 18 April 1901, 2.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

tenure.⁶⁹ Duncan explained that the federal government could only reassert control over Cherokee lands when the Cherokee Nation ceased to exist. Duncan denied that the dissolution of the Cherokee government accomplished this as the Nation would survive “until the last individual Cherokee is dead.”⁷⁰

Luke G. McIntosh, a Creek, questioned why whites desiring land were unwilling to lease it from the Five Tribes. McIntosh argued that allotment would transform Indian Territory from a place where every Native family had a home to a land of homelessness. Furthermore, allotment would leave some American Indians with lands incapable of supporting agriculture or livestock. Rather than American Indians abandoning their system of land tenure, McIntosh suggested Oklahomans should hold land in common so that “all [would] have good homes and farms.”⁷¹ McIntosh conceded allotment would eventually come to Indian Territory but explained, “That is no reason I should favor it.”⁷² McIntosh thereby eschewed a view of Euro-American society as a beneficial linear progression as he argued embracing the division of tribal lands would bring hardship rather than prosperity.

Similarly R. M. Stephens, a Creek citizen, conceded the federal government had the power to seize the lands of the Five Tribes and divide them against their wishes. The possibility of a unilateral settlement by the government did not drive Stephens to call for

⁶⁹ James W. Duncan, “Our Patent,” *Indian Chieftain*, 18 April 1901, 2.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ L. G. McIntosh, “Allotment,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 21 September 1893, 8.

⁷² *Ibid.*

negotiations with the Dawes commission. Instead, Stephens concluded “if the United States will violate [its agreements] and force upon us a change, there was no need in negotiating with them.”⁷³ As such, Stephens saw little reason for the Five Tribes to negotiate for a deal they found unacceptable as the end result would be the same. Stephens thereby saw negotiations as fruitless. Stephen reported that an unidentified western tribe of Indians approached the Creek National Council in order to purchase land from the Creeks. This tribe had already experienced allotment and desired to escape its hardships by acquiring a new home.⁷⁴

Though the *Muskogee Phoenix* accepted the harsh report of the Dawes Commission published in 1895, the Creek official Albert Pike McKellop wrote a letter challenging many of its assertions and demanding proof of its charges.⁷⁵ Though McKellop rejected the plan to dismantle the Five Tribes, his greatest concern was “the statement of alleged shortcomings, grievances, injustice, and other wrongs claimed to exist” within Indian Territory.⁷⁶ McKellop contested the Dawes commission’s portrayal of education, traditional Indians, and the system of land tenure in Indian Territory. McKellop contended the Creeks spent more per capita on education than any state in the Union.⁷⁷ McKellop also countered claims justifying federal control over the Creek

⁷³ R. M. Stephens, “In Opposition to Allotment,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 5 April 1894, 1.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ A. P. McKellop, “Hon. A. P. M’Kellop,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 22 February 1894, 1.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

Nation, noting, “We have from time immemorial existed as distinct and separate political communities, capable of entering into treaty relations with the United States.”⁷⁸

McKellop thereby asserted the sovereignty of the Creek Nation and rejected the authority of the United States to abolish or alter tribal governments.

Auken Estort, a Cherokee, also wrote a letter to counteract the Dawes Commission report as he believed it was “unjust and false in many respects.”⁷⁹ He accused the Dawes Commission of using threats to coerce the Five Tribes into accepting new agreements.⁸⁰ He believed the Dawes commission falsified accounts of crime and chaos in its report in order to seek revenge against the Five Tribes for their refusal to submit to allotment and the dissolution of tribal governments.⁸¹ He blamed a border town named Caney, Kansas, for circulating these stories the Dawes commission accepted without question.⁸² Auken Estort then noted that only five percent of the convicted murderers from Indian Territory were Indians and accused the Dawes Commission of implying the percentage was fifty percent or higher.⁸³ In addition, though the Dawes Commission seemed deeply concerned about monopolistic practices within Indian

⁷⁸ Ibid. Walter A. Duncan read McKellop’s arguments and praised them in a letter appearing in a subsequent edition of the *Muskogee Phoenix*. Duncan praised McKellop for resisting allotment as Duncan predicted allotment would prove as devastating to the Five Tribes as Removal did earlier in the nineteenth century. W. A. Duncan, “Cherokees Not Alarmed,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 8 March 1894, 1.

⁷⁹ Auken Estort, “Dawes Commission Roasted,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 9 January 1896, 1.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid.

Territory, they seemed indifferent to the powerful corporate monopolies elsewhere in the United States. Auken Estort closed by noting the “full-blood” that the Dawes commission wished to protect did not want government interference in the affairs of the Five Tribes.⁸⁴

The Indian Citizen from Atoka, Choctaw Nation, also promoted allotment. Its Euro-American editor, Nora Smiser, attended Choctaw schools and worked to defend the interests of the Choctaw Nation.⁸⁵ Like many papers, the *Indian Citizen* attempted to promote the economic growth of its town by printing stories highlighting its potential and successes.⁸⁶ However, the *Citizen* focused on defending the the Atoka agreement between the federal government and the Choctaws and Chickasaws.⁸⁷ The *Citizen* cast this agreement as the best means of protecting the interests of the Choctaw people and defended the provisions of the agreement that prevented Choctaws from selling their lands immediately. Without this support, conservative Choctaws would be unable to cope

⁸⁴ Ibid. The *Muskogee Phoenix* rejected Auken Estort’s claims by asserting the Dawes commission was sincere in its charges against Indian Territory and him “not view[ing] the matter from the right standpoint.” “That Commission Report,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 9 January 1896, 4.

⁸⁵ Daniel Littlefield, Jr. and James Parins, *American Indian and Alaska Native Newspapers and Periodicals, 1826-1924* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984), 175.

⁸⁶ “About Atoka,” *Indian Citizen*, 19 July 1900, 4; “Allotment and Statehood,” *Indian Citizen*, 24 March 1904, 4; “Allotment of Indian Lands,” *Indian Citizen*, 4 December 1902, 1; “Atoka’s Advantages,” *Indian Citizen*, 22 May 1902, 4; “Atoka Commercial Club,” *Indian Citizen*, 29 August 1901, 4; “Atoka’s Future,” *Indian Citizen*, 26 September 1901, 4; “Atoka’s Future Brightens,” *Indian Citizen*, 6 November 1902, 1; “Atoka in 1903,” *Indian Citizen*, 1 January 1903, 4; “Atoka—Indian Territory,” *Indian Citizen*, 16 June 1904, 4; “Buy at Home,” *Indian Citizen*, 5 December 1901, 4; “Coming to Atoka,” *Indian Citizen*, 9 August 1900, 8; “Dallas in Atoka,” *Indian Citizen*, 23 May 1901, 4; “Greater Atoka,” *Indian Citizen*, 13 February 1902, 4; *Indian Citizen*, 25 January 1900, 4; *Indian Citizen*, 2 August 1900, 4; *Indian Citizen*, 11 October 1900, 4; *Indian Citizen*, 3 January 1901, 4; *Indian Citizen*, 14 August 1902, 4; *Indian Citizen*, 13 November 1902, 4; “Something about Atoka,” *Indian Citizen*, 1 May 1902, 4.

⁸⁷ *Indian Citizen*, 29 March 1900, 4.

with the flood of whites trying to swindle them.⁸⁸ The *Citizen* noted, “The footprints of civilization in America may be traced in the blood of the aborigines,” indicating that past experience left little doubt about what would happen to conservative Choctaws bereft of protection.⁸⁹ The *Citizen* pointed to conventions held by whites calling for the removal of restrictions on Indian lands as proof of the necessity for the protections of the Atoka agreement.⁹⁰ The *Citizen* also dismissed criticism of the agreement by noting any faults stemmed from the federal government’s intransigence and refusal to meet its obligations.⁹¹ Unlike the *Phoenix* the *Citizen* did not object to the Atoka agreement’s stipulation individuals pay 62.5 percent of the value of their town lot in order to receive title to it.⁹²

Politically, the *Indian Chieftain* supported the Tuskahoma Party in the Choctaw Nation, the party most associated with acceptance of allotment and economic development.⁹³ In 1900, the *Indian Citizen* critiqued the Union Party for adopting support of allotment and accused the party of doing so as a political ploy to capture votes and reminded readers the Union Party had resisted the Atoka Agreement and efforts to

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ *Indian Citizen*, “Some Plain Facts,” 5 April 1900, 8.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ “Who Did It?,” *Indian Citizen*, 26 July 1900, 4.

⁹² *Indian Citizen*, “The Fee Simple Title again,” 26 April 1900, 4.

⁹³ “Actions Speak Louder than Words,” *Indian Citizen*, 19 July 1900, 4; “Choctaw Politics,” *Indian Citizen*, 19 July 1900, 5; “Press Comments,” *Indian Citizen*, 12 July 1900, 8; “Principals of the Tuskahoma Party,” *Indian Citizen*, 12 July 1900, 4.

negotiate with the federal government.⁹⁴ The *Indian Citizen* explained the Union party “has always fought progression and tribal dissolution for better conditions.”⁹⁵

The *Indian Citizen* tried to warn its readers by noting, “You are being advertised to the world as a people who cannot cope with the white man in business ability and shrewdness.”⁹⁶ Rather than permitting this to continue, the *Indian Citizen* urged its readers “to fool these white people who are coming here to buy your lands, your homes for a song” by only selling a portion of their land or leasing it instead.⁹⁷ The *Indian Citizen* attacked local papers for publishing pieces denigrating culturally conservative Indians. In one response, the *Citizen* charged the author of the offending piece with being “absolutely ignorant of the fullblood Indian.”⁹⁸ The *Citizen* asserted that these “full bloods” were less likely to commit crimes or lie than any other class of people. If any “full bloods” exhibited these negative characteristics, they must have learned them from whites.

The *Indian Citizen* was critical of non-citizens for their efforts to avoid paying taxes. In 1900, the *Indian Citizen* took care to note that President William McKinley signed off on the revised permit and tax laws. Though non-citizens protested these taxes, the *Indian Citizen* explained that non-citizens entered the lands of the Five Tribes under

⁹⁴ “A Bold Theft,” *Indian Citizen*, 31 May 1900, 8.

⁹⁵ “That Robbery,” *Indian Chieftain*, 7 June 1900, 4.

⁹⁶ “To the Real Indian,” *Indian Citizen*, 25 December 1902, 4.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁹⁸ “Grossly Slandorous,” *Indian Citizen*, 20 August 1903, 4.

the terms of a contract between the federal government and the Five Tribes. As these taxes existed before the arrival of the non-citizens, those who entered Indian Territory knew paying tribal taxes was a necessity to work or conduct business in Indian Territory. In addition, the *Indian Chieftain* noted many whites had squatted and made farms on the best lands” of the Five Tribes without their approval.⁹⁹ As such, these others have received the benefits of Indian lands without payment.

An individual writing under the name Shakbitina agreed with the *Indian Citizen* on the issue of tribal taxes. Shakbitina argued the efforts to halt the collection of tribal taxes represented an assault on the governments of the Five Tribes. As white residents entered Indian Territory of their own volition, they chose to accept the legal obligations of doing so.¹⁰⁰ Shakbitina labeled the demand of non-citizens to acquire political rights as absurd and stated that anyone who made such an argument must “be an anarchist or a lunatic.”¹⁰¹ Shakbitina also rejected the complain that non-citizens lacked sufficient protection as these individuals did not have to submit to tribal courts¹⁰²

During the late 1890s, the *Indian Journal* from Eufaula in the Creek Nation was under the editorship of a white named K. W. Whitmore. Though the *Indian Journal* published fewer editorials than other publications, it too analyzed the federal

⁹⁹ “Cannot Be Sustained,” *Indian Chieftain*, 22 March 1900, 4.

¹⁰⁰ Shakbitina, “The Whiteman’s Burden,” *Indian Citizen*, 1 March 1900, 8.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid.

government's efforts to promote the allotment of Indian Territory.¹⁰³ In 1898, the *Indian Journal* used the threat of the "Curtis monstrosity" to encourage the Creeks to accept the proposed agreement with the Dawes Commission, as the Curtis Bill lacked any redeeming features.¹⁰⁴ According to the *Indian Journal*, the Curtis Bill would enable a "hobo" to "root the citizen off his place provided the hobo has energy enough to look and find a chunk of coal near the citizen's home."¹⁰⁵ Consequently, the *Indian Journal* endorsed the Creek-Dawes agreement as a lesser evil than the Curtis Act.¹⁰⁶

The *Indian Journal* accused members of the Dawes Commission of incompetence and urged their replacement with "two or three practical men" who would have a "free hand" to complete their work quickly.¹⁰⁷ The *Indian Journal* argued the slow work of the Dawes commission delayed economic development. However, the paper defended the rights of white non-citizens and accused the members of the Dawes commission of being the only non-productive whites in the territory.¹⁰⁸ As such, the *Indian Journal* supported rapid statehood by combining Indian Territory with Oklahoma Territory in order to provide the inhabitants with votes, thereby enabling them to put pressure on the Dawes

¹⁰³ Daniel Littlefield, Jr. and James Parins, *American Indian and Alaska Native Newspapers and Periodicals, 1826-1924* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984), 193-194.

¹⁰⁴ *Indian Journal*, 26 August 1898, 4.

¹⁰⁵ "Die Dog, or Eat Hatchet," *Indian Journal*, 19 August 1898, 4.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁷ "O, Mr. Dawes," *Indian journal*, 4 January 1901, 4.

¹⁰⁸ "We Thought So," *Indian Journal*, 21 December 1900, 4.

Commission.¹⁰⁹ As members of the Dawes commission were officeholders, the *Indian Journal* argued it had the right to critique their inefficiency without worrying about proper decorum.¹¹⁰

The *Indian Journal* was noteworthy as it frequently carried the writings of Charles Gibson, a Creek writer and humorist. Gibson earliest known writings date from 1895, but it is possible he published prior to this year.¹¹¹ Charles Gibson also addressed allotment and the dissolution of tribal governments. However, his stance was more ambiguous than other writers. For example, he repeatedly criticized the restrictions placed on the lands of the Five Tribes as he believed this denied true equality to the American Indians as they could not sell their lands without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.¹¹² As such, Gibson argued American Indians were United States citizens “in name only.”¹¹³ As Gibson explained, “[The Creek Indian] has been shoved upon a little plot of dirt of one hundred and sixty acres and is told that he is too ignorant to do as

¹⁰⁹ “Fuel for the Fire,” *Indian Journal*, 14 December 1900, 4.

¹¹⁰ “Don’t Think It!,” *Indian Journal*, 18 January 1901, 3.

¹¹¹ An author, writing under the initials, C.G., argued that the system of holding land in common was untenable as the Five Tribes did not farm cooperatively; the author conceded that the system of land tenure was necessary earlier on as the Creeks did not possess the experience or the knowledge to protect their lands from avaricious whites. However, after decades of experience with farming, C.G. contended the members of the Five Tribes “advanced in intelligence.” If these initials referred to Charles Gibson, it would indicate Gibson changed his interpretation of allotment during the three-year gap between the publication of this letter and Gibson’s earliest known writings from 1895. C.G., “The Pasture Question,” *Muskogee Phoenix*, 4 August 1892, 4.

¹¹² Charles Gibson, “As to Statehood,” *Indian Journal*, 21 November 1902, 2; Charles Gibson, “Creek Deeds Again,” *Indian Journal*, 29 November 1901, 1, 8; Charles Gibson, “Gibson’s Rifle Shots,” *Indian Journal*, 27 July 1906, 10;

¹¹³ Charles Gibson, “A Three Cornered Fight,” *Indian Journal*, 19 December 1902, 2.

he wishes with it.”¹¹⁴ He mocked the Curtis Act, predicting an amendment to the bill would make it illegal “to pass a dollar that had not been registered at the nearest bank in the last preceding ninety days.”¹¹⁵ Gibson also critiqued the debates over the future of Indian Territory as everyone “seems to delegate himself to see what is best to be done with it.”¹¹⁶

Though Gibson believed members of the Five Tribes should receive title to their lands, he was not optimistic about the outcome as he believed too many Indians would not receive the true value of the land due to their inexperience with treating land as an exchangeable commodity.¹¹⁷ Gibson explained allotment helped to teach American Indians about Euro-American vices, particularly greed. Indians who desired to enrich themselves allied with the whites in order to garner Congressional support “to make it hard on the ignorant fullblood.” Gibson explained the passage of the Creek-Dawes agreement by noting the proposition won support “by some hook, crook, or scheme.”¹¹⁸ According to Gibson, “dead people are being held up in their graves by their kin folks and made to call for their pro rata share of land.”¹¹⁹ Only after the family members

¹¹⁴ Charles Gibson, “Ready to Make Their Wills,” *Indian Journal*, 1 May 1908, 6.

¹¹⁵ Poor Lo, “The Old and the New,” *Indian Journal*, 23 March 1906, 3.

¹¹⁶ Charles Gibson, “The State of Bone,” *Indian Journal*, 16 December 1904, 5.

¹¹⁷ Charles Gibson, “Now and Then,” *Indian Journal*, 8 May 1903, 1. Based on the resources and climate and soil Gibson believed it should bring a good price. *Ibid.*

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁹ Charles Gibson, “Raising the Dead,” *Indian Journal*, 1 August 1902, 2.

transferred these lands to “land sharks wanting dead Indian lands” could the deceased return to the grave.¹²⁰

Gibson believed American Indians would have trouble assimilating into a capitalistic economy he believed Indians were not foolish enough to place work and the accumulation of wealth as the focus of their lives.¹²¹ Gibson advocating letting American Indians sell their land so that Euro-Americans could deal with the tax collector.¹²² A humorous piece described Gibson’s visit to Chicago. Gibson questioned whether after the Indians buried the hatchet, “the pale face has dug it up and is a success at savagery.”¹²³ Gibson mocked the business of the city by explaining it as “one of the necessary evils in the mad rush for gold, prosperity, and civilization.”¹²⁴

Edley L. Cookson, a Cherokee, recognized “the futility of opposition” to the demands of the United States government.¹²⁵ Cookson accused carpetbaggers from the states of demanding allotment to further their own interests. While these intruders may have lacked morality, Cookson noted the federal government has “never been known to turn a deaf ear to the frantic appeals of white men to enter upon and take possession of Indians lands.”¹²⁶ Though Cookson acknowledged the certainty of allotment, he believed

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Charles Gibson, “The Future of the Creek Nation,” *Indian Journal*, 20 February 1903, 6.

¹²² Charles Gibson, “The State of Bone,” *Indian Journal*, 16 December 1904, 5.

¹²³ Charles Gibson, “Our Visit to Chicago,” *Indian Journal*, 1 June 1906, 4.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ E. L. Cookson, “Real Indian Sentiment,” *Indian Journal*, 4 October 1901, 6.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

“neither the Cherokee people nor the United States government is prepared or able to make a fair, honest and equitable division of the public domain and tribal funds” at the present time.¹²⁷ He indicated the Cherokees would “obey its behests and submit to its dictation, but we shall not dance at our own funeral.”¹²⁸ Cookson revealed that compliance with the government’s demands did not indicate the Cherokees approved of the destruction of their government or allotment. Cookson continued by comparing allotment to the story of “The Spider and the Fly.” Cookson’s comparison cast the United States as a spider prepared to devour the Cherokee Nation after allotment, noting, “The door is open, the Cherokees are about to enter, but they will never come out of the parlor.”¹²⁹

The *Indian Sentinel* from Tahlequah also embraced allotment as inevitable. From 1895 or 1896 through May 1900, Jefferson Thompson Parks, a Cherokee born in 1862, edited the paper and allied the publication with the Downing Party, the political group in the Cherokee Nation most associated with promoting allotment.¹³⁰ The paper admitted that though some Cherokees might “cling tenaciously to the institutions, laws and customs of the country they love so well,” all should be working in the direction of a final settlement of Cherokee business.¹³¹ After the passage of the Curtis Act in 1898, the

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ E. L. Cookson, “Appointed Time,” *Indian Chieftain*, 12 September 1901, 2.

¹³⁰ Daniel Littlefield, Jr. and James Parins, *American Indian and Alaska Native Newspapers and Periodicals, 1826-1924* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984), 228-229.

¹³¹ *Indian Sentinel*, 22 July 1898, 2.

Sentinel argued the Cherokees had fallen behind the other members of the Five Tribes and urged the Cherokee government to negotiate a settlement to protect the property rights of the Cherokee people.¹³² The paper attacked members of the National Party and some members of the Downing Party for inhibiting negotiations with the federal government.¹³³ The *Sentinel* rejoiced after the Cherokee tribal council voted to negotiate with the Dawes commission in 1898.¹³⁴

During 1898 and January 1899, the *Indian Sentinel* worked to oppose the Curtis Act. The *Indian Sentinel* cast this legislation as a disaster for the Cherokee Nation and argued it would threaten economic development, damage property values and tax revenue, and undermined Cherokee property rights.¹³⁵ Rather than supporting the growth of the Cherokee Nation, the Curtis Act would harm property values. In particular, the *Indian Sentinel* argued the Curtis Act would threaten property rights by permitting Euro-Americans to acquire mineral leases on lands without the consent of the property owner.¹³⁶ In addition, the Curtis Act would deal “a deadly blow to the industrious, enterprising Cherokee Indians.”¹³⁷ The *Indian Sentinel* also cast the Curtis Act as theft as it would only provide each Cherokee with 80 acres of land.¹³⁸ Despite these dire

¹³² *Indian Sentinel*, 29 September 1898, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 13 October 1898, 2.

¹³³ *Indian Sentinel*, 20 October 1898, 2.

¹³⁴ *Indian Sentinel*, 8 December 1898, 2.

¹³⁵ *Indian Sentinel*, 1 September 1898, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 8 September 1898, 2.

¹³⁶ *Indian Sentinel*, 25 August 1898, 2.

¹³⁷ *Indian Sentinel*, 22 July 1898, 2.

¹³⁸ “The Culmination,” *Indian Sentinel*, 13 October 1898, 2.

warnings, the *Indian Sentinel* was optimistic as it predicted the United States would gladly make a new agreement if the Cherokees negotiated, thereby negating the worst ravages of the Curtis Act.¹³⁹ Unlike Euro-American proponents of allotment and the Curtis Act, the *Indian Sentinel* rejected characterizations of the Cherokees as “lazy, improvident wretches.”¹⁴⁰ Instead, the interference of the federal government would promote “stagnation of business, grown up fields, deserted shops and a hand-to-mouth existence.”¹⁴¹ Consequently, American Indians were capable of handling their own affairs without the interference of the federal government.

The *Indian Sentinel* avoided denigrating culturally conservative Cherokees by arguing “they have been following false prophets.”¹⁴² According to the *Sentinel*, these politicians deceived the Cherokee people in order to win votes by suggesting the federal government would permit the Cherokees to retain their government and reestablish their courts.¹⁴³ The *Sentinel* identified these political figures as corrupt “vampires” intent upon “suck[ing] the life blood” of the Cherokee people.¹⁴⁴ The *Indian Sentinel* conceded culturally conservative Cherokees did not want to abandon their preferred way of living, but called on “honest, better informed Cherokee speaking people” to teach these

¹³⁹ *Indian Sentinel*, 5 August 1898, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 1 September 1898, 2.

¹⁴⁰ “The Culmination,” *Indian Sentinel*, 13 October 1898, 2.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴² *Indian Sentinel*, 8 September 1898, 2.

¹⁴³ *Indian Sentinel*, 5 August 1898, 2.

¹⁴⁴ *Indian Sentinel*, 24 February 1900, 2.

individuals the truth about the future of the Cherokee Nation.¹⁴⁵ The paper continually predicted these “full bloods” would soon awaken to the necessity of allotment.¹⁴⁶

Though the *Indian Sentinel* accepted allotment, it resented federal intrusion into the lives of the Five Tribes.¹⁴⁷ The paper explained the Cherokees believed they had secure title to their land but discovered they were “not exclusively entitled to anything but the blundering egotism of an uneducated nobody, technically known as a congressman, and a Kansas congressman at that.”¹⁴⁸ The *Indian Sentinel* criticized Charles Curtis, the author of the Curtis Act, and acknowledged that many Congressmen and Senators had “antagonistic” views of Indian tribes, thereby explaining their support for the law.¹⁴⁹ The *Indian Sentinel* was critical of the federal government’s previous treatment of the Cherokee Nation. The paper identified Removal as a cruelty “that time can never heal.”¹⁵⁰ Though the United States promised to preserve the Cherokee Nation in its new home, “the American people in their eagerness for ‘expansion’ soon forgot their word of honor and magnanimity.”¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁵ *Indian Sentinel*, 15 September 1898, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 24 February 1900, 2.

¹⁴⁶ *Indian Sentinel*, 10 November 1898, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 13 April 1899, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 18 May 1899, 2.

¹⁴⁷ *Indian Sentinel*, 16 February 1899, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 15 July 1899, 2.

¹⁴⁸ *Indian Sentinel*, 22 September 1898, 2.

¹⁴⁹ *Indian Sentinel*, 25 August 1898, 2.

¹⁵⁰ *Indian Sentinel*, 9 March 1899, 2.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

In January 1899, the Cherokees voted on a proposal that would lead to the division of their lands. The *Sentinel* called on every eligible Cherokee to vote in the election and praised the agreement, as it provided each citizen with 120 acres rather than the 80 stipulated in the Curtis Act.¹⁵² The *Sentinel* praised the finished agreement and predicted it would “remain a monument to the purity, patriotism and statesmanship of the men who composed the commission.”¹⁵³ After the agreement passed with a two-thirds majority, the *Sentinel* discounted the power of the Keetoowah, culturally conservative Cherokees opposed to allotment. When some Cherokees traveled to Washington to protest the ratification of the agreement, the *Sentinel* identified these self-appointed representatives as “enemies of the Cherokee Nation.”¹⁵⁴

As Congress refused to ratify the agreement before the specified deadline, the agreement failed. The *Indian Sentinel* questioned the reasons for this rejection as the agreement passed with the support of two-thirds of the Cherokee voters.¹⁵⁵ The *Indian Sentinel* speculated Congress believed the agreement was too beneficial to the Cherokees’ interests, promoting it to praise the members of the Cherokee commission for their diligence.¹⁵⁶ These actions cast Congress as hypocrites as they spent years referring

¹⁵² J. H. Gibson, “Words of Wisdom,” *Indian Sentinel*, 26 January 1899, 3; *Indian Sentinel*, 12 January 1899, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 19 January 1899, 2.

¹⁵³ *Indian Sentinel*, 26 January 1899, 2.

¹⁵⁴ *Indian Sentinel*, 23 February 1899, 2

¹⁵⁵ *Indian Sentinel*, 2 March 1899, 2.

¹⁵⁶ *Indian Sentinel*, 23 February 1899, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 2 March 1899, 2.

to the Cherokees as “pull-backs” and “do-nothings.”¹⁵⁷ [more]The *Indian Sentinel* also suggested the rejection was a punishment for the Cherokees’ refusal to negotiate earlier.¹⁵⁸ Following the defeat of this agreement, the *Indian Sentinel* saw the future as “dark and gloomy” as it feared the Cherokees would have no choice but to accept the smaller allotments provided under the Curtis Act.¹⁵⁹ The paper criticized Cherokees who lobbied against the passage of the agreement by traveling to Washington D.C. The *Indian Sentinel* hoped these individuals “will be forced to see the destruction of their own people,” in exchange for their acceptance of “thirty pieces of silver” to betray the Cherokee Nation.¹⁶⁰ This reference to the biblical account of the betrayal of Christ was significant. The *Sentinel* equated those who lobbied against the ratification of the Dawes-Cherokee agreement with Judas Iscariot. In addition, this comparison identified the Cherokee Nation with Christ, thereby casting the Cherokee Nation as righteous and innocent.

The *Sentinel* responded to the failed agreement by advocating the resumption of negotiations and reaffirmed its support of progress.¹⁶¹ However, the *Sentinel* warned readers, “The day is past when we can expect concessions.”¹⁶² The *Sentinel* accepted the proposition that a second agreement would not be as beneficial to the Cherokees as the

¹⁵⁷ *Indian Sentinel*, 23 February 1899, 2

¹⁵⁸ *Indian Sentinel*, 9 March 1899, 2.

¹⁵⁹ *Indian Sentinel*, 2 March 1899, 2.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁶¹ *Indian Sentinel*, 30 March 1899, 2.

¹⁶² *Indian Sentinel*, 20 April 1899, 2.

one Congress rejected. Rather than continuing to critique Congress for its refusal to accept the agreement, the *Sentinel* blamed Cherokee “obstructionists” for their “present deplorable condition.”¹⁶³

Due to its support for allotment, the *Indian Sentinel* attacked DeWitt Clinton Duncan for his opposition to the treaty of January 1899 and denounced him as a “demagogue” while questioning his concern for “the POOR Indian.”¹⁶⁴ The *Indian Sentinel* labeled DeWitt Clinton Duncan as an obstructionist, thereby connecting Duncan with Senators Eugene Hale, George Hoar, and Arthur Gorman for their opposition to the Treaty of Paris ending the Spanish-American War and transferring the Philippines from Spain to the United States. The *Indian Sentinel* observed, “Too-qua-stee can now exchange condolences with these gentlemen and solace himself with the reflection that it is a poor year for obstructionists anyway.”¹⁶⁵ The *Sentinel* continued to belittle Duncan,¹⁶⁶ suggesting that he was only “playing attorney.”¹⁶⁷ This characterization of Duncan ignored his previous legal victories, most notably his role in the defeat of David Payne’s Boomer efforts in 1881.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ *Indian Sentinel*, 26 January 1899, 2.

¹⁶⁵ *Indian Sentinel*, 9 February 1899, 2. The *Sentinel* expressed little opinion about the creation of an American empire overseas. Consequently, this particular critique was not an endorsement of empire but an effort to denigrate Duncan by comparing him to men who were then prominent in the news for their opposition to the treaty. As further evidence of this, the *Sentinel* critiqued the *Indian Chieftain* from Vinita later that year as the paper published too many stories “admiring Dewey and telling of the glorious fertility of the soil of the Philippine islands” rather than covering the Cherokee election of 1899. *Indian Sentinel*, 2 September 1899, 2.

¹⁶⁶ *Indian Sentinel*, 16 September 1899, 2; “Keetoowahs Meet Again,” *Indian Sentinel*, 10 March 1900, 2.

¹⁶⁷ *Indian Sentinel*, 3 February 1900, 2.

The *Sentinel* also found fault with the *Indian Chieftain*. Though the paper endorsed allotment, the *Sentinel* found its commitment to the cause inadequate. According to the *Sentinel*, it was only after the Cherokee election of 1899 that the *Chieftain* began praising Thomas Buffington, the principal chief and the victorious candidate for the Downing Party. In contrast, the *Sentinel* boasted it was the only paper to support the Downing Party “with vigor and earnestness.”¹⁶⁸ The *Sentinel* suggested Buffington could have used the support during the campaign rather than after it, especially as the election results were close. In addition, the *Sentinel* objected to the frequency with which DeWitt Clinton Duncan’s writings appeared in the *Indian Chieftain*.¹⁶⁹ The *Sentinel* did not consider whether the *Chieftain* merely sought to give coverage to all sides of the debate. Instead, the *Sentinel* continued to print editorials mocking the *Chieftain*’s editor for his lack of “prowess” as a journalist.¹⁷⁰

Newspapers from across Indian Territory debated the issue of allotment and opened their pages to Native writers. Even when Native contributors supported allotment, they often articulated viewpoints that contrasted with those presented by Euro-American editors. These pro-allotment members of the Five Tribes promoted the ratification of agreements that would better defend the interests and attacked Congress for perceived efforts to deprive them of their lands. Yet, they remained focused on the necessity of limiting federal control of the process so that they could attempt to implement allotment

¹⁶⁸ *Indian Sentinel*, 26 August 1899, 2.

¹⁶⁹ *Indian Sentinel*, 12 August 1899, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 26 August 1899, 2; *Indian Sentinel*, 9 September 1899, 2.

¹⁷⁰ *Indian Sentinel*, 9 September 1899, 2.

on their own terms. Native critics of allotment frequently noted the economic inequalities within the United States that undermined Euro-American claims of monopolistic practices within Indian Territory. As such, both supporters and opponents of allotment framed their arguments in ways that depicted their arguments as beneficial to Native communities. This similarity raises questions about how other groups responded to the pressures of American empire at the turn of the twentieth century. By comparing different groups, the experiences of American Indians can be placed in a larger history of empire.

Chapter 6

Comparing Responses to Empire at Home and Abroad

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Native communities faced racial prejudice, attacks on their culture, and Euro-American efforts to limit their sovereignty. Federal Indian policies, such as allotment and the creation of boarding schools, identified American Indians as inferior due to their refusal to conform to Euro-American norms. American Indian writers and newspaper editors challenged these conclusions by casting themselves as civilized and depicting the United States as immoral. Native proponents of assimilative policies undermined the justifications of American empire by casting the adoption of Euro-American norms as a means of defending American Indians from the rapacity of land-hungry whites. To better understand the relationship between American Indians and the American empire, it is necessary to compare Native responses to empire with two other communities: African Americans and Mexican Americans.¹ Representatives from all three groups faced similar challenges in their efforts to counter negative racial depictions, discrimination, and exclusion from American society. A comparative approach will thereby highlight the ways in which all three groups sought to understand and adapt to the American empire.

¹ Matthew Frye Jacobson's *Special Sorrows* addressed similar issues through an examination of the strong attachments that Jewish, Irish, and Polish immigrants retained for their homelands, or at least their Old World culture. Jacobsen devoted a significant portion of *Special Sorrows* to examining how these immigrant groups reflected upon the Spanish-American War and the subsequent expansion of an American empire. Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Special Sorrows: The Diasporic Imagination of Irish, Polish, and Jewish Immigrants in the United States* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 144-216.

During the closing decades of the nineteenth century, the African American press faced its own struggles to recast the portrayal of their community in Euro-American society. Though the African American population of the United States outnumbered American Indians, they faced more determined resistance to efforts to defend their legal rights. Within the South, many African American papers muted their criticism of discriminatory legislation for fear of sparking retaliatory hangings, burnings, or beatings from white southerners. Ida B. Wells, and other writers who urged African Americans to defend themselves, received numerous threats in an effort to silence their campaigns. Wells' continually campaigned against lynching in the South, but her writings echoed Native authors such as Ora Eddleman Reed and Zitkala-Ša through her understanding of the harm caused by negative portrayals of racial minorities.² By the turn of the twentieth century, southern states passed numerous discriminatory laws despite the efforts of African Americans to halt their passage. These setbacks dampened the optimism that African American newspapers exhibited in the wake of the Civil War. The apathetic response of many Euro-American newspapers outside of the South to the Supreme Court's decision in *Plessy vs. Ferguson* furthered this pessimism. This decision upheld the constitutionality of efforts to segregate African Americans in schools, public accommodations, and public conveyances such as trains and streetcars.³ Even within the African American press, some papers urged accommodation with demands for

² Armistead Pride and Clint Wilson II, *A History of the Black Press* (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1997), 94, 117-118; Rodger Streitmatter, *Voices of Revolution: The Dissident Press in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 80-85; Patrick Washburn, *The African American Newspaper: Voice of Freedom* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1997), 53, 67.

³ Washburn, 42-44.

segregation.⁴ These divisions within the African American press extended to the overseas expansion of the American empire.

African American papers adopted a range of editorial positions regarding the creation of an American empire. Both advocates and critics of the extension of American power overseas considered how the creation of an American empire threatened or bolstered their status within the United States. According to African-American proponents of expansion, the formation of an American empire would empower the federal government, enabling it to compel the abuse of African Americans in the South. For example, the *Elevator*, an African-American newspaper from San Francisco, theorized the lives of African Americans would improve if the United States opposed the South with the same determination it used to oppose Spanish atrocities in Cuba. The *Elevator* mirrored other African-American papers by endorsing overseas expansion and the Republican Party. African American proponents of empire suggested the newly-acquired territories in the Caribbean and the Pacific might provide opportunities unavailable to African Americans within the United States.⁵

Many of the letters written by soldiers serving in the Philippines or Cuba addressed these commercial and professional prospects available to African Americans. On the surface, these optimistic proclamations bolstered the justification for the

⁴ Ibid., 61.

⁵ Willard B. Gatewood, Jr., *Black Americans and the White Man's Burden* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975), 16-17, 19, 155-157; "Hawaii May Be Seized," *The Elevator*, 11 June 1898, 1; "Lyceum Naval Night," *The Elevator*, 11 June 1898, 2; Michele Mitchell, "The Black Man's Burden: African Americans, Imperialism, and Notions of Racial Manhood 1890-1910," *International Review of Social History* 44, no. 7 (1999): 77-100; "Still at It," *The Elevator*, 11 June 1898, 2; "Tariff for the Philippines," *The Elevator*, 11 June 1898, 1.

American empire but these arguments simultaneously identified the limited opportunities available to African Americans within the United States. These proponents of empire did not explain the discrepancy that existed between their depiction of the United States as a beacon of liberty and the necessity of African Americans to travel overseas to find opportunities free of the discrimination found in the country of their birth. In addition, writers who called upon African Americans to travel to Cuba or the Philippines explained that the native populations would prefer to work with blacks rather than whites. Yet, letter writers limited their recommendations to African Americans who chose to engage in commerce, serve as missionaries, or practice a profession. According to these letters, African American laborers desiring to move overseas would not find sufficiently high wages to justify leaving the United States.⁶

Not all African American editors and letter writers saw the extension of American power overseas as beneficial for they saw American control of the Philippines and other Pacific islands as a denial of the wishes of the inhabitants. These editors could not face the contradiction of seeking freedom for themselves while denying it to others. They argued that the Spanish-American War proved that the United States government had the power to intervene for the good of oppressed peoples. For President William McKinley to justify his actions in Cuba on humanitarian grounds while failing to intervene in the South was hypocritical at best. Yet, the Democrats offered a poor alternative to Republican policies, for the Democratic Party was home to such men as Senator

⁶ William B. Gatewood, Jr., *"Smoked Yankees" and the Struggle for Empire: Letters from Negro Soldiers, 1898-1902* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1987), 2-3, 255, 271, 296, 311.

Benjamin Tillman.⁷ If African Americans joined the Anti-Imperialist League, they received a reminder of prevailing racial attitudes when organizers placed them into segregated chapters. The debate over the “White Man’s Burden” angered many African American editors, including those who had previously written positive pieces on expansionism. Other editors muffled their criticism to avoid the notice of those who equated dissent with a lack of patriotism.⁸

Anti-imperialist writers within the African American community empathized with the aspirations of the Cubans and the Filipinos. These critics of American expansionism expressed their revulsion for the Spanish oppression of their colonial subjects but noted that Spain managed to avoid instituting any policies reminiscent of segregation within the United States.⁹ These writers feared that an American annexation of additional territory would condemn Spain’s former colonial subjects to life under a Jim Crow empire. As T. Clay Smith of the 24th Infantry noted, “color prejudice has kept close in the wake of the flag.”¹⁰ Despite the efforts of whites to extend the territorial scope of Jim Crow, African American soldiers contrasted their status within the United States to what they found in

⁷ Scot Ngozi-Brown, “African-American Soldiers and Filipinos: Racial Imperialism, Jim Crow and Social Relations,” *The Journal of Negro History* 82, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 43-44; Benjamin Tillman, “Causes of Southern Opposition to Imperialism,” in *American Anti-Imperialism, 1895-1901*, ed. Gerald E. Markowitz (New York: Garland Publishing, 1976): 176-183.

⁸ Willard B. Gatewood, Jr., “Alabama’s ‘Negro Soldier Experiment,’ 1898-1899” *The Journal of Negro History* 57, no. 4 (Oct. 1972): 333-351; Willard B. Gatewood, Jr., “Black Americans and the Quest for Empire, 1898-1903,” *The Journal of Southern History* 38, no. 4 (Nov. 1972): 545-566; Gatewood, *Black Americans and the White Man’s Burden*, 20, 109-111, 184-188, 232-233, 238-246; Scot Ngozi-Brown, “African-American Soldiers and Filipinos: Racial Imperialism, Jim Crow and Social Relations,” *The Journal of Negro History* 82, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 42-53.

⁹ Gatewood, “*Smoked Yankees*” and the *Struggle for Empire*, 3.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 316.

Cuba and the Philippines. Regular troops and volunteers noted service overseas was far preferable to being stationed in the South. Soldiers stationed in both the Philippines and Cuba indicated that the Spanish paid far less attention to racial identities than white Americans.¹¹ Other African American soldiers expressed admiration and sympathy for Cubans and Filipinos. One soldier, Patrick Mason, wrote that he “fe[lt] sorry for [the Filipinos] and all that have come under the control of the United States” due to the despicable actions of whites. Though Mason saw the Filipinos as “a patient, burden-bearing people,” they had to contend with soldiers who “don’t believe that anyone has the right to live but the white American.”¹² These sentiment paralleled DeWitt Clinton Duncan’s views of the extension of American power overseas as he viewed the proponents of “civilization” as murderers and thieves.

African American experiences with Jim Crow did not preclude soldiers from adopting ethnocentric interpretations of the colonial populations in Cuba or the Philippines. C. T. Walker described Cubans as “lazy” and accused them of spending their days plotting new ways to cheat Americans. Furthermore, he denied the capacity of Cubans to govern their nation.¹³ George W. Prioleau described the “indolence and laziness” of the Filipinos but remained convinced that these limitations could not halt American progress. Despite these judgments of Filipino and Cuban cultural characteristics African American soldiers refused to follow the practice of their white

¹¹ Ibid., 61, 79.

¹² Ibid., 257.

¹³ Ibid., 208.

comrades who referred to Filipinos as “niggers.”¹⁴ African American soldiers recounted their conversations with their white counterparts who described the Filipinos as “niggers” and bragged about the abuse of the native population. These white soldiers did not consider the possibility that African Americans—regardless of their opinion of Filipinos—would find the usage of the word objectionable.¹⁵ The usage of such racial epithets also occurred in the writings of some American Indian soldiers present in the Philippines.¹⁶ The integration of American Indians into units with white soldiers may have provided a sense of inclusion that permitted them to vilify Filipinos and African Americans as an “Other.” African American criticism of colonial populations largely remained confined to attacks upon native cultures while eschewing arguments that identified the innate racial inferiority of non-white populations.

Despite the presence of vociferous advocates and critics of American imperialism, the majority of African American soldiers took a more nuanced approach. They generally saw their participation in the war effort as a civic obligation to aid the United States but they hoped their service would improve their condition without permitting attacks upon their manhood. These feelings of patriotism did not alleviate the conflicting opinions that many African Americans felt about the consequences of the Spanish-American War. In particular, many African Americans realized that their efforts to enhance their status within the United States came at the expense of the independence movement of Filipinos;

¹⁴ Ibid., 253.

¹⁵ Ibid., 280, 308.

¹⁶ George Candy, “A Cherokee Boy in Luzon,” *Tahlequah Arrow*, 4 August 1900, 4.

these misgivings led to widespread opposition to the continued war in the Philippines by 1900.¹⁷

Soldiers devoted many of their letters to the discussion of the racism they encountered in the American South. Some took a charitable view and distinguished between the “better element” of Southern society and those who were supporters of segregationists like Benjamin Tillman. They believed their service would encourage the majority of whites to act upon their opposition to lynching.¹⁸ Other African American soldiers took a more pessimistic view of Southern whites and described the preponderance of “crackers.”¹⁹ One soldier, C. W. Cordin decried the reconciliation of the North and the South by explaining, “There are dirty, low, white brutes down here that the devil wouldn’t have.”²⁰ In using the word “brutes,” Cordin adopted a term used to denigrate African Americans by comparing them to animals or savages and applied it to Southern whites instead. These letters exhibit a similarity to American Indian writers such as Zitkala-Ša and Augustus Ivey, who denigrated whites for their mistreatment of American Indians.

African American soldiers departing for service in the Spanish-American War needed to pass through the South. Prior to their arrival, letter writers predicted that the

¹⁷ Gatewood, “*Smoked Yankees*” and *the Struggle for Empire*, 6, 245.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 75, 107.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 121, 172.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 159.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 159.

presence of African Americans in uniform would inhibit discrimination. Many soldiers soon realized that their uniforms did not protect them from discrimination or the hostility of white soldiers or civilians; even those that received better treatment acknowledged fears that Southern whites would retaliate against their African American neighbors once the soldiers left for Cuba. Though African American soldiers performed well in Cuba, the War Department did not recommend that black soldiers receive commissions as officers. Though some African American soldiers from the regular army received commissions as lieutenants in volunteer units, this did little to assuage veterans or civilians. African Americans faced similar challenges in encouraging states to muster black militia units into federal service. Even Republican governors from the Midwest and the Northeast resisted the employment of African American volunteers. The only African American volunteer unit to see service in Cuba was Company L of the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment.²²

Within the Philippines, African Americans maintained generally positive relations with the local population. The cooperation between African Americans and Filipinos distressed some white newspapers correspondents and officers who feared that these soldiers had greater sympathy for the independence movement than the objectives of the United States. Letters from African American soldiers indicate that white Americans attempted to spread their notions of race to Filipinos and the Spanish living in the Philippines in order to divide blacks from the local population. However, these attempts failed because African American soldiers indicated that the Filipinos realized that blacks

²² Ibid., 9-10, 79, 170, 172.

showed greater respect to the local population than whites. The first civil governor of the Philippines, William Howard Taft, took credit for encouraging the removal of African American soldiers from the Philippines ahead of schedule in order to prevent their further fraternization with the Filipinos.²³

The outpouring of letters and newspapers from African Americans indicate that these individuals understood the power of the printed word as they discussed the tendency of Southern papers to dwell upon the alleged transgressions of black soldiers while dismissing or excusing the behavior of white troops. Efforts by African American soldiers to demand better treatment resulted in charges of “Negro domination” from Southern papers.²⁴ Soldiers stated their determination to counter the arguments of newspapers editors who claimed that African Americans were incapable or unwilling to serve in combat.²⁵ In these efforts, African Americans echoed American Indian responses to the American empire by seeking control over the representation of their community to counter the deleterious opinions printed by Euro Americans hostile to their interests.

Spanish-language newspapers published within the United States also addressed imperialism by examining the United States and the policies it adopted overseas at the turn of the twentieth century. Though these upper-class editors were of Mexican descent, many identified themselves as Hispanic or Spanish American rather than Mexican.²⁶

²³ Ibid., 242-243, 252-253.

²⁴ Ibid., 90, 121.

²⁵ Ibid., 224.

²⁶ The papers themselves frequently used the terms *mexicano*, *hispanoamericano* or *hispano* to describe themselves prior to 1900. A. Gabriel Meléndez countered that while papers included the term

These editors wished to create a clear racial and economic distinction between themselves and more recent immigrants from Mexico.²⁷ At the turn of the twentieth century, the vast majority of these Spanish-language newspapers originated in California, Texas, Colorado, and the territories of Arizona and New Mexico. Illiterate members of the community had access to the newspapers as they would listen as others read the latest edition aloud even if they did not embrace the arguments of the paper's editors. However, the dearth of literate Spanish-speaking residents could limit the success of such publications for editors faced great difficulties in acquiring sufficient advertising revenue while receiving few subscriptions from impoverished members of the community.²⁸

Though not always reflective of their communities, Hispanic editors adopted the cause of American expansion.²⁹ Papers implored the United States to follow in the

hispanoamericano, the translation Spanish American ignored its connotation as a unifying term for *Mexicanos* on both sides of the border. Meléndez made a crucial point but he noted that the term Spanish-American became a preferred word only after the year 1900 due to the issue of New Mexican statehood. Thus, the newspapers examined for this chapter appeared during the time of this transformation. As many editorials and articles used the term *hispanoamericano* while making explicit references to Spanish ancestry, it is clear that the editors had accepted the new definition. In addition, papers would make clear distinctions between those of Spanish descent and those of Indian descent, undermining the conception of a transnational unity with working-class Mexicans. A. Garbiel Meléndez, *Spanish-Language Newspapers in New Mexico, 1834-1958* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2005), 59-60.

²⁷ Spanish-language newspapers that reflected the views of working-class Mexicans did not start appearing within the United States until the Mexican Revolution began in 1910.

²⁸ Félix Gutiérrez, "Spanish-Language Media in America: Background, Resources, History," *Journalism History* 4, no. 2 (Summer 1977): 34-41; Doris Meyer, "The Language Issue in New Mexico, 1880-1900: Mexican-American Resistance Against Cultural Erosion," *The Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe* 4, no.1 and 2 (Jan.-Aug 1977): 99-106; Annabelle M. Oczon, "Bilingual and Spanish-Language Newspapers in Territorial New Mexico," *New Mexico Historical Review* 54, no. 1 (January 1979): 45-52.

²⁹ Mexican miners from New Mexico openly voiced their support for Spain. In addition, critics could point to the relatively few New Mexicans of Mexican descent who volunteered to fight in the Spanish-American War. Nevertheless, the general support for territorial expansion in Spanish-language newspapers mirrored the pro-annexationist arguments found throughout the English press from the West. In a survey of how American newspapers treated the Philippine War of 1899 to 1902, Richard E. Welch Jr. found that five of six major papers in the Far West supported the endeavor, indicating enthusiasm for the

footsteps of Great Britain and continue to acquire lands across the globe in order to expand the nation's business opportunities. *El Independiente*, of Las Vegas, New Mexico, edited by Enrique Salazar, consistently printed the most vociferous articles in favor of territorial annexation.³⁰ The paper argued that Commodore George Dewey's victory over the Spanish squadron at Manila Bay showed that a new military power with an unlimited potential had appeared on the scene. Salazar saw the United States as the most powerful nation on Earth and predicted it would soon exercise control over the entire Western hemisphere. *El Independiente* called for the annexation of Puerto Rico,

annexation of the archipelago. Matt Meier and Feliciano Ribera, *Mexican Americans/American Mexicans: From Conquistadors to Chicanos*, rev. ed. (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), 96; Maurilio Vigil, *The Hispanics of New Mexico: Essays on History and Culture* (Bristol: Indiana: Wyndham Hall Press, 1985), 30; *La Voz del Pueblo*, 27 May 1899, 2; Richard E. Welch Jr., "'The Philippine Insurrection' and the American Press," *The Historian* 36, no. 1 (Nov. 1973): 37, 43.

³⁰ Enrique Salazar grew up in Santa Fe and learned the newspaper business from William Manderfield, a key figure in the founding of the New Mexico Printing Company. When Salazar founded *El Independiente* in 1894, he declared that his paper would take an independent stance. However, by 1898, *El Independiente* clearly supported Republican policies and candidates. This change partially derived from Salazar's perception that the Republican Party presented New Mexico with a better chance for statehood, prompting Salazar to abandon his earlier connections with the Democrats. William McKinley's appointment of Salazar as postmaster of Las Vegas certainly contributed to reinforcing preexisting political leanings. Despite this, arguing that Salazar's compromised position negates his statements upon issues of race and territorial annexation fails to account for Salazar's continued efforts on behalf of the territory's *nuevomexicanos*. Meléndez, 73-77; Doris Meyer, *Speaking for Themselves: Neomexicano Cultural Identity and the Spanish-Language Press, 1880-1920* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996), 216-217,

Cuba, and the Philippines, as well as the construction of the Nicaragua Canal.³¹

Furthermore, the paper saw the acquisition of Canada as a legitimate goal.³²

The support for territorial acquisitions often connected with the future of the United States and its perceived civilizing mission. After the official end of the Philippine War, *La Bandera Americana* from Albuquerque, New Mexico, continued to justify the retention of the islands.³³ An editorial from August 1902 maintained that the United States had the right to possess the Philippines, insisting that earlier examples of territorial expansion, specifically the acquisitions of Alaska and Louisiana, had taken place without the consent of those living in the purchased territory. Interestingly, the editorial did not cite the Mexican cession as a legitimate example of United States expansion. Nestor Montoya, the paper's editor, may have excluded this example for fear of alienating readers who were critical of the terms of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The omission of the Mexican Cession would also negate Montoya's need to confront the Euro-American depiction of Mexican Americans as bereft of civilization.

³¹ "Destino Manifiesto," *El Independiente*, 18 May 1898, 1; "La Guerra," *El Independiente*, 2 June 1898, 4; Though the United States ultimately constructed the isthmian canal in Panama, earlier plans called for the placement of the canal in Nicaragua. Lawrence Clayton, "The Nicaragua Canal in the Nineteenth Century: Prelude to American Empire in the Caribbean," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 19, no. 2 (Nov. 1987): 323-352; Paul J. Scheips, "United States Commercial Pressures for a Nicaragua Canal in the 1890's," *The Americas* 20, no. 4 (April 1964): 333-358.

³² "Destino Manifiesto," *El Independiente*, 18 May 1898, 1. Further interest in the United States and its efforts appears in articles providing information on the ships that made up the American Navy, as well as in articles that described the celebrations of Dewey's victory. "El Dia De Dewey," *El Independiente*, 9 June 1898, 4; "La Marina Norteamericana," *Las Dos Americas*, 6 June 1898, 1.

³³ The editor of *La Bandera Americana* was Nestor Montoya. In 1888, he helped Enrique Salazar found *La Voz del Pueblo* in Santa Fe. Two years later, Montoya sold his interest in the paper but continued to work as the paper's editor until Salazar moved the paper to Las Vegas. Montoya started publishing *La Bandera Americana* in 1901. Politically, Montoya belonged to the Republican Party and served as a delegate at New Mexico's constitutional convention in 1910. Meyer, 215.

In 1902, *El Independiente* hoped that the World's Fair of 1904 in St. Louis would impress the public with the great strides that the American Indians had taken under the tutelage of the United States. The opinion mirrored earlier sentiments that described a new generation of American Indian. According to *El Independiente*, these individuals received an education that prepared them to assume the rights of citizens and abandon the supposedly "semi-barbaric" lifestyles of their ancestors. *El Independiente* ran a Spanish-language advertisement for Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show that promised visitors the chance to see American Indians engaged in their favorite activities, creating a perception of Indian cultures as exotic.³⁴ Such depictions of American Indians did not strike the editors of Spanish-language newspapers as contradictory or problematic. These editors made it clear that in contrast to more recent immigrants from Mexico, they did not possess Indian blood in any significant quantity. Thus, Spanish-American editors could analyze the "progress" of indigenous people from the United States and Mexico without raising any questions about their own status.

Spanish-language editors expanded their analysis beyond the American Indian to include the Filipinos and the Cubans. *La Voz del Valle*, a paper from Antonito, Colorado, wrote that the Filipinos, like the Japanese, enjoyed copying the developments of the

³⁴ "La Cuestión Filipina," *La Bandera Americana*, 8 August 1902, 2; *El Independiente*, 28 July 1898, 2; *El Independiente*, 2 October 1902, 2; "Exposicion Indigena en San Louis," *El Independiente*, 4 December 1902, 2. The portrayal of Indian life would rely upon public expectations regarding how Indians should live and behave. In addition, the advertisement also promised visitors the opportunity to view mounted warriors of all races prepared for battle. Furthermore, the advertisement contained several references to combat, thereby helping to promote a particular view of masculinity and the American West. *El Independiente*, 2 October 1902, 2.

“civilized” world.³⁵ As evidence, the paper cited the discovery of forged American and Spanish money in the archipelago. *La Voz del Valle* printed an editorial on the subjects of civilization and savagery and focused on the Spanish Empire in Mexico. The piece described the conquistadors as “los aventureros heróicos” who conquered Mexico and advanced civilization. The piece reflected the desires of my Hispanic editors to identify themselves with the Spanish. In terms of American empire, references to the conquistadors enabled editors to label their ancestors as the forerunners of America’s efforts to spread civilization. Such sentiments would ideally defend against persistent rhetoric that cast Hispanics as uncivilized and inferior to white Americans. At least for wealthy Hispanics, their association with their Spanish ancestors solidified their position as colonizers rather than the colonized.³⁶

Editorials drew a clear distinction between Spain’s colonial subjects and the descendents of the Spanish settlers. In 1900, *El Independiente* discussed the opposition

³⁵ The editor of *La Voz del Valle* for the years under consideration was J. D. Frazey. While the name does not provide clear evidence of clear Hispanic ownership, the paper referred to Hispanic Americans as “nuestra raza,” or our race. An editorial entitled “Los Hispanos Americanos” defended Hispanics on the grounds that unlike many immigrants arriving from Europe, they did not bring the cancer of socialism to attack the foundations of civilization. It is unlikely that such editorials represented direct translations from English-language editorials, indicating that even if the paper had Anglo ownership, there was likely Hispanic influence upon content. “Los Hispano Americanos,” *La Voz del Valle*, 20 September 1900, 4.

³⁶ “Civilizados y Salvajes,” *La Voz del Valle*, 27 December 1900, 4; *La Voz del Valle*, 26 July 1900, 4; “Nuestros Aliados Cubanos,” *El Independiente*, 28 July 1898, 4; *Vigil*, 70. The editors of the Spanish-language press largely consisted of individuals whose parents had remained within the Mexican Cession after the Mexican-American War. Despite their efforts to differentiate themselves from more recent arrivals from Mexico, Americans consistently refused to draw a distinction. This suggests a failure of Hispanics to convince Euro-Americans to identify them as white. Harold Alford, *The Proud Peoples: The Heritage and Culture of Spanish-Speaking Peoples in the United States* (New York: David McKay Company, 1972), 135; Albert Camarillo, *Chicanos in California: A History of Mexican Americans in California* (Sparks, Nevada: Materials for Today’s Learning, 1990), 35; David Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness*, rev. ed. (New York: Verso, 1999); David Roediger, *Working toward Whiteness: How America’s Immigrants Became White* (New York: Basic Books, 2005); *Vigil*, 79.

that anti-imperialists expressed towards the incorporation of Puerto Rico and the Philippines into the United States, blaming it on the racial and religious bigotry of those opposed to McKinley's policies. Yet, this did not represent a defense of Spain's colonial subjects, for the editorial specifically sought to exclude the "millones de tágalos y negros" that live in Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines from its discussion. Instead, the editorial concerned itself with the future of the two million inhabitants descended from Spanish settlers, referring to them as brothers. The editorial criticized political figures who warned that absorbing these Spanish descendants represented a threat to the institutions of the United States. The editor, Enrique Salazar explained that the United States already possessed millions of citizens who were either foreign born or the children of immigrants. Salazar then predicted that once the United States accepted the former Spanish colonies, the members of the Spanish race in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines would prosper under the world's most benevolent and liberal government.³⁷

With regard to Cuba and Puerto Rico, expansionist editors focused upon more physical, positive manifestations of American morality. Editorials mentioned the construction of sanitation, infrastructure, and schools, while noting the declining rate of yellow fever.³⁸ When debating Cuba's future, papers generally favored the American retention of the island, arguing that the Cubans themselves would benefit. However, the papers insisted that annexation required the consent of the Cuban people, thereby

³⁷ "Nuestros Primos de Ultramar," *El Independiente*, 15 February 1900, 1.

³⁸ "La Educacion en Puerto Rico," *El Independiente*, 12 September 1901, 3; *El Independiente*, 5 January 1899, 2; *El Independiente*, 19 October 1899, 2; *El Independiente*, 21 February 1901, 2; "La Ocupación Americana y Cuba," *El Independiente*, 21 August 1902, 4; "Venticinco mil Leprosos," *El Independiente*, 9 May 1901, 2.

contrasting with the assertion that the United States could administer the Philippines without consulting the Filipinos. Editors believed that, in time, the Cubans would see the benefit of living under American jurisdiction and would willingly clamor for the annexation of their island. When the anticipated outpouring of joy failed to occur, *El Independiente* wrote about the ingratitude of the Cuban people. The paper alleged that Cubans had forgotten all that the Americans had given them as well as the millions of dollars that the American government spent to destroy Spanish power on the island.³⁹

The support for territorial expansion frequently coincided with fervent loyalty to the Republican Party.⁴⁰ Consequently, papers from election years such as 1898, 1900, and 1902 endorsed Republican candidates. One editorial lauded McKinley while arguing that the Republican Party had always supported liberty and popular government. To mark the occasion of McKinley's second inauguration, *El Independiente* presented an editorial arguing that no American president had fared so well in the face of difficult problems, with the possible exception of Abraham Lincoln.⁴¹ At least in New Mexico, part of this

³⁹ "La Anexacion de Cuba," *El Independiente*, 7 August 1902, 1; *El Indito*, 4 April 1901, 2; "La Ingratitud de los Cubanos," *El Independiente*, 18 April 1901, 4; *El Tiempo*, 1 September 1898, 2; *El Tiempo*, 15 July 1899, 4. *El Tiempo*'s editor and publisher was Marcial Valdez. Secondary sources reveal little about him other than his membership in La Prensa Asociada Hispano-Americana which held its first meetings in 1891. The proprietors of *El Indito* were Gabriel Armijo and a partner with the last name Varela. Porter Stratton, *The Territorial Press of New Mexico, 1834-1912* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1969), 272; Meléndez, 64.

⁴⁰ The following is just a sampling of the many pro-Republican pieces carried in the Spanish-language press. "Bryan y McKinley," *El Tiempo*, 20 October 1900, 2; "Un Partido Harmonizado," *El Independiente*, 23 August 1900, 1; "Razones para Abandonar el Partido Demócrata," *La Bandera Americana*, 8 August 1902, 2; "El Tiempo de Obrar," *El Independiente*, 2 August 1900, 1; "Victoria a Segurada," *El Tiempo*, 3 November 1900, 2; "Victoria Republicana," *La Voz del Valle*, 8 November 1900, 4. Until the 1930s and the New Deal, Hispanics remained largely supportive of the Republican Party. Vigil, 28.

⁴¹ "¡Salud al Jefe!," *El Independiente*, 14 March 1901, 1.

Republican enthusiasm might stem from McKinley's appointment of Miguel Otero, the only Hispanic governor of the territory.⁴² To New Mexicans, McKinley's actions differentiated the Republicans from the Democrats and their association with discriminatory legislation. Editors learned about the treatment of blacks in the South and connected this with their own experiences. One editorial challenged William Jennings Bryan, the Democratic presidential candidate of 1900, for discussing conditions in the Philippines while ignoring the supporters of "la opresión y la tiranía," within the party responsible for the Civil War. According to the editorial, the Democrats were the only true imperialists within the United States.⁴³

Such criticisms marked a wider attack on the Democratic Party and its more critical stance on the American acquisition of new territories. *La Bandera Americana* scoffed at the term imperialism and compared Democratic policies to a tortoise that was always inside its shell. *El Independiente* charged the Democratic opposition to the Philippine War with wanting to see Filipinos live under a despotic ruler. The newspaper labeled the Democratic Party as "virtualmente enemigo de la nación," identifying Democrats as enemies of the United States who desired the continuation of the Philippine War for political gain.⁴⁴ A poem from September of 1900 praised McKinley, comparing

⁴² Though Otero was the only non-Euro-American governor of the territory, New Mexico frequently sent Hispanic representatives to Congress as territorial delegate. *Vigil*, 26-27.

⁴³ "Imperialismo," *El Independiente*, 9 August 1900, 3; "Imperialismo," *La Voz del Valle*, 23 August 1900, 4; Meyer, *Speaking for Themselves*, 107. Another example of the editorial's rhetoric appears in the line "la tendencia dominadora en la democracia ha sido destruir la república y sustitir una oligarquía imperialística," which accused the Democrats of seeking to destroy the republic and replace it with an imperialistic oligarchy. *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ "La Expansión de Nuestro Gobierno," *La Bandera Americana*, 24 July 1903, 2; *El Independiente*, 26 October 1899, 2; *El Independiente*, 23 November 1899, 2; *El Independiente*, 25 January

him to Abraham Lincoln and labeling his rule as one of great virtue. Under McKinley, the United States rose from a miserable and prostrate condition to create a bright future for itself. The poem also proclaimed that McKinley's bright start would continue to shine brilliantly in peace and in war. The piece attacked the Democrats, referring to them as "inhabil y ciega," meaning unskilled and blind. The poem also promised that the Democratic Party would bring ruin, poverty, and dishonor to the United States.⁴⁵

The acceptance of United States expansion and the Republican Party did not indicate that Hispanics abandoned a distinct identity. *El Independiente* celebrated McKinley's 1900 victory by depicting the president as a rooster who had just killed his opponent in a cock fight. The defeated rooster, representing Bryan, lay dead upon the ground, symbolizing his electoral loss and connecting the contest with local cultural practices.⁴⁶ An editorial from *La Bandera Americana* spoke about great leaders whose lives served to inspire the young. The list included Abraham Lincoln, William McKinley, Ulysses S. Grant, and also Benito Juárez and Porfirio Díaz of Mexico. The same paper explained that Díaz had safeguarded peace and facilitated Mexico's economic progress

1900, 2; *El Independiente*, 13 September 1900, 2; "Partidarios de Aguinaldo," *El Independiente*, 18 January 1900, 4.

⁴⁵ "McKinley," *El Independiente*, 6 September 1900, 2. Throughout the Southwestern United States, Spanish-language papers frequently carried poetry. One of the most prominent types of poems focused on political issues. This footnote only lists a few poems to indicate that multiple publications engaged in the promotion of poetry. "Aromas," *El Nuevo Mundo*, 27 July 1899, 1; Jose de Velilla, "Cubana," *Las Dos Americas*, 21 March 1898, 2; "A la Guerra," *La Voz del Pueblo*, 7 May 1898, 4; Andres A. Mata, "Los Ebrios," *Las Noticias*, 20 January 1900, 3; Meléndez, 133-135; Doris Meyer, "Anonymous Poetry in Spanish-Language New Mexico Newspapers (1880-1900)," *The Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe* 2, no. 3 (Sept.-Dec. 1975): 259-275; "Refranes Locos," *El Indito*, 24 November 1900, 3; "A Rosa," *El Monitor*, 30 June 1899, 3.

⁴⁶ "¡Que Viva McKinley!," *El Independiente*, 8 November 1900, 1. When local Republican candidates emerged victorious in 1902, *El Independiente* ran the same image. "La Victoria es Nuestra," *El Independiente*, 13 November 1902, 2.

without referring to the leader's dictatorial practices.⁴⁷ The paper also failed to mention the economic hardships that Díaz's policies created. Another editorial labeled Díaz as a progressive, forward-thinking man for his support of the Panama Canal. Hispanic editors viewed the Panama Canal positively, not just for the benefits it would bring to the United States but for the economic development it would encourage in Mexico.⁴⁸

The laudatory descriptions of Porfirio Díaz betrayed the upper-class sympathies found in the Spanish-language press. Though Díaz's programs facilitated economic development, the standard of living for Mexico's poor fell as the price of corn rose. Porfirian Mexico gave little attention to the needs of the impoverished, particularly its Indian residents who found themselves in a system of debt peonage. The Mexican government considered expending money to promote the social welfare of disadvantaged citizens unscientific and contrary to efficient economic development. Furthermore, the

⁴⁷ *La Bandera Americana*, 18 December 1903, 2; "Porfirio Díaz," *La Bandera Americana*, 21 February 1902, 3. The paper did not explain how both men could be great leaders if Díaz had rebelled against Juárez. Furthermore, railroad construction, which Díaz advocated, facilitated the movement of additional Mexican workers to the United States. The issue paralleled the discussion of the American Indians in the United States, for Díaz wanted to Europeanize Mexico's Indian population. His policies thereby drove many of these individuals off of their land, prompting some to journey to the United States. Manuel Ceballos-Ramírez and Oscar J. Martínez, "Conflict and Accommodation on the U.S.-Mexican Border, 1848-1911," in *Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings: The Roots of Conflict in U.S.-Mexican Relations*, eds. Jaime Rodríguez and Kathryn Vincent (Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1997), 149; Mario T. García, *Desert Immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 37-44; David C. Gutiérrez, *Walls and Mirrors: Mexican Americans, Mexican Immigrants, and the Politics of Ethnicity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 39-44; Ruth Stanton Lamb, *Mexican Americans: Sons of the Southwest* (Claremont: Ocelot Press, 1970), 105; Meier and Ribera, 78-79, 104-105.

⁴⁸ "Canal de Panama," *La Bandera Americana*, 2 May 1902, 1; Matt Meier and Feliciano Ribera, *Mexican Americans/American Mexicans: From Conquistadors to Chicanos*, rev. ed. (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), 105; "México y la Cuestión de Panama," *La Bandera Americana*, 11 December 1903, 2; "Negocia Concluido," *La Bandera Americana*, 4 December 1903, 2; "Panama," *La Bandera Americana*, 4 December 1903, 2; "El Tratado del Canal," *El Independiente*, 26 January 1901, 2; *El Independiente*, 2 May 1901, 2.

positivists planning economic development in the country accepted racial thinking that considered particular groups, such as Mexico's Indians, as inferior. Consequently, Mexico's elite sought to inculcate the Indian population with European values and norms to improve Mexico's economic development. The need for miners and agricultural workers in the American West combined with Díaz's authoritarian rule to encourage greater immigration. Furthermore, railroad construction, which Díaz advocated, facilitated the movement of additional Mexican workers into the United States. This created tensions between newly-arrived Mexicans and Mexican Americans who resented how Anglos equated them with laborers. If editors such as Salazar and Montoya felt a kinship with Mexican laborers south of the border, their papers would not have effused such enthusiasm for Díaz's disruptive economic policies.⁴⁹

Apart from the difference in class, Hispanics chose to separate themselves from Mexican immigrants in terms of blood. Particularly in New Mexico, Hispanics traced their ancestry back to the Spanish settlers, thereby indicating that the native residents were white. Hispanics tried to cast themselves as pure representatives of the Spanish race, often calling themselves Spanish, thereby nullifying any Indian heritage. The newly-arrived immigrants, however, had a higher level of Indian blood, indicating their inferiority to those Mexican Americans who emphasized their Spanish heritage they

⁴⁹ Lawrence Cardoso, *Mexican Emigration to the United States, 1897-1931: Socio Economic Patterns* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1980); 5, 13, 17; Ceballos-Ramírez and Martínez, 138; Gutiérrez, 44; Richard Nostrand, *The Hispano Homeland* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992), 161-162, 164; Meier and Ribera, 83, 86; Robert Rosenbaum, *Mexicano Resistance in the Southwest* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1981), 148; George Sánchez, *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 19, 29. During the 1920s, immigration restrictions, particularly the National Origins Act of 1924 would only increase the need for agricultural labor. *Ibid.*, 19.

might possess. The emphasis on blood indicated that these Hispanic editors accepted Anglo thoughts about the necessity of white ancestry for inclusion within the United States.⁵⁰

Hispanic editors framed their support of American territorial expansion as a means of aiding both the United States and Mexico. Albuquerque's *La Bandera Americana* discussed the possibility of exporting Mexican horses to the Philippines for use by American soldiers. Similarly, *El Paso del Norte* from El Paso, Texas, ran an article listing the prices that Mexicans earned for their products in Cuba, while *La Voz del Valle* described the sugar industry in Cuba and speculated about what lessons it might hold for Mexico.⁵¹ These sentiments tied Mexico's economic development to that of the United States, thereby rendering the Democrats' opposition to further territorial acquisitions as a threat to the prosperity of both nations. As with the heroic portrayal of Díaz, this description of Mexico's economic prosperity has a focus upon the wealthy, or at least individuals solidly within the middle class. The possibility of exporting sugar or horses across the Pacific would derive little tangible benefit to laboring Mexicans.⁵²

⁵⁰ Nostrand, 164; John Nieto-Phillips, *The Language of Blood: The Making of Spanish-American Identity in New Mexico, 1880s-1930s* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004), 2. Nieto-Phillips argued that *Nuevomexicanos* started to place greater emphasis upon their Spanish heritage during the 1910s, though this chapter makes the earlier roots of this shift visible within members of the elite. *Ibid.*, 2-3, 8-9, 53-55.

⁵¹ "Caballos Mejicanos para Filipinas," *La Bandera Americana*, 24 June 1904, 2; "La Industria Azucarera en Cuba y Mexico," *La Voz del Valle*, 7 June 1900, 1; "Precios del ganado mexicano en la isla de Cuba," *El Paso del Norte*, 19 March 1904, 1.

⁵² The Anglo press of territorial New Mexico also published positive editorials concerning Díaz, praising the leader for his economic policies that helped to spread liberty and opportunity across North America. "Destiny of Mexico," *Dona Ana County Republican*, 12 August 1899, 2; "Old Mexico," *Las Vegas Daily Optic*, 31 January 1902, 2.

The Spanish-language press explored the relationship between Hispanics, the United States, and Mexico. *Las Noticias*, a paper from El Paso, Texas, called on Hispanics to protect the country in which they lived, referring to the United States. The same editorial also urged Hispanics to defend the name and the honor of their ancestors while guarding against those whose actions might cast aspersions on the entire community.⁵³ *El Independiente* did not take such a casual stance to criticism of the Hispanic community. It lamented that the territory's Anglo population had criticized Hispanics for their sparse participation in a force of 340 cavalry created for the Spanish-American War in 1898. The low turnout led other New Mexicans to label Hispanics as either disloyal or as cowards who refused to fight. *El Independiente* countered "es una acusación frívola y ridícula que ninguna persona de juicio y sentido común pueda admitir ni por un momenta."⁵⁴ Consequently, the paper charged that anyone who made such a charge, even for a moment, lacked a sense of justice. Furthermore, *El Independiente* cited the dearth of spots within the volunteer unit. The publication promised that if President McKinley called for additional volunteers, Hispanics would willingly step forward to serve.⁵⁵ Interestingly, during the subsequent pushes for statehood, advocates pointed to the high proportion of New Mexican volunteers in the Spanish-American War in relation to the territory's population. These valorizations neglected to mention that few of these

⁵³ "Patriotismo," *Las Noticias*, 21 October 1899, 1.

⁵⁴ "Los Voluntarios de Nuevo México," *El Independiente*, 12 May 1898, 1.

⁵⁵ The 340 volunteers would later form a portion of Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders. Charles Montgomery, *The Spanish Redemption: Heritage, Power, and Loss on New Mexico's Upper Rio Grande* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 77-78; "Los Voluntarios de Nuevo México," *El Independiente*, 12 May 1898, 1.

volunteers had a Hispanic background. Yet, the accounts of eager New Mexican volunteers created the impression that Hispanics joined with their Anglo neighbors in fighting Spain, thereby undermining the critics of statehood who attacked the non-Anglo population.⁵⁶

Language provided another avenue for the Spanish-language press to assert an independent identity within the United States. Hispanic editors resisted calls to assimilate and abandon their native tongue, mutual aid societies, and customs. The Spanish-language press acknowledged the need to learn English for dealing with government and conducting business in the United States. Papers dismissed the notion of abandoning Spanish due to its cultural value to the community, even if Euro-American papers praised individuals and groups for their desire to learn English.⁵⁷ However, the prospect of territorial expansion and increased American involvement in Latin America added a new facet to the debate. In an editorial, *La Bandera Americana* discussed the necessity of employing both English and Spanish and continued to assert the community's need to learn the dominant language of the United States. Rather than emphasizing the cultural value of Spanish, the piece focused on the language as a means of extending business with Mexico and the rest of Latin America.⁵⁸ Retaining knowledge of Spanish did not

⁵⁶ Nieto-Phillips, 89, 91.

⁵⁷ "The English Language," *Las Vegas Optic*, 19 January 1901, 2; Vigil, 28.

⁵⁸ "Ingles y Español," *La Bandera Americana*, 30 May 1902, 3. The Spanish-language press was not alone in recognizing such opportunities. The *New York Times* carried a wire story that articulated the need for Spanish-speaking Americans to take part in the administration of Spain's former colonies. The article did not mention Hispanic Americans and most likely only included Anglo-Americans. The *Los Angeles Times* had a similar theme, urging Americans to learn Spanish as "the Latin Races are slow at learning a foreign language, preferring to carry on business in their native tongue." "Spanish-Speaking

just provide a means of preserving one's culture but it held the promise of allowing some Hispanic Americans to find a role within expanded inter-American relations. Using their bilingual talents, wealthy Hispanics could conduct business in the United States, Mexico, and Latin America. Thus, while Spanish-language newspapers discussed the possibilities that America's empire would hold for Hispanics, the benefits only applied to Hispanics of a specific class background.

Hispanics editors did not voice complete support for the Republican Party but Democratic papers often fell into the minority. *El Democrata*, published in Phoenix, Arizona, proclaimed that it was "the only Democratic Spanish Daily Paper published in Arizona" during the election of 1900.⁵⁹ With regards to the Spanish-American War, *El Democrata* acknowledged the suffering of the Cuban people and hoped that the United States would grant the island its independence. The paper called for Hispanics to avoid commenting on the war as it might insult the patriotic feelings of the larger community.⁶⁰ A much stronger opinion appears within *El Nuevo Mundo*, a paper from Albuquerque. An

Americans," *New York Times*, 21 October 1898, 4; "Trade with Spanish-American Countries," *Los Angeles Times*, 29 September 1898, 8; Vigil, 28.

⁵⁹ Though the paper itself is in Spanish, the quote appeared in English on the paper's front page. *El Democrata*, 1 October 1900, 1. The proprietor of the paper was Pedro G. de la Lama.

⁶⁰ "Telegramas de La Guerra entre Espana y los Estados Unidos," *El Democrata*, 23 April 1898, 3; *El Democrata*, 23 April 1898, 3. The importance of this warning lies in the hysteria that gripped portions of the Southwest, where Euro-Americans feared that Mexican Americans would join with forces in Mexico and attack the United States in support of Spain. Rodolfo Acuña, *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*, 4th ed. (New York: Longman, 2000), 77; Arnoldo De León, *The Tejano Community, 1836-1900* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982), 22; Meier and Ribera, 86, 96.

editorial from the summer of 1899 identified Emilio Aguinaldo as the liberator of his people and an honest man.⁶¹

Yet, denunciations of American expansion did not necessarily equate with condemnations of empire. In 1904, two years after the formal cessation of the Philippine War, *El Paso del Norte* ran a story about the Philippines that described horrific conditions within the archipelago. The same edition claimed the \$20 million that the United States paid for the Philippines had only purchased fifty years of war. The article argued that the United States spent subsequent millions without achieving anything of substance. *El Paso del Norte* did not call for the United States to grant independence to the Filipinos. The paper hoped that the Russo-Japanese War would end within the near future and that Japan would desire to administer the islands. Thus, the paper merely wanted to pass the archipelago into the hands of another imperial power, thereby perpetuating assumptions about the inability of the Filipinos to govern themselves. The article provided no insight into how the Japanese would correct the injustices of American rule but still advocated transferring control of the islands as the only possible solution. The proposal indicated an acceptance of assumptions regarding race and the propriety of empire.⁶²

The Spanish-language press was not alone in seeking to portray itself as Spanish-American. For example, within New Mexico, the English-language press realized that

⁶¹ “Aguinaldo,” *El Nuevo Mundo*, 3 August 1899, 1; *La Voz del Pueblo*, 29 April 1899, 2; *La Voz del Pueblo*, 2 June 1900, 2; *La Voz del Pueblo*, 16 June 1900, 2.

⁶² “Miserable Situacion de Filipinos,” *El Paso del Norte*, 28 August 1904, 4; *El Paso del Norte*, 28 August 1904, 4.

condemning Spanish-speaking citizens endangered local interests. Attacks upon the territory's native population dated back to its acquisition with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. In debating the outcome of the Mexican-American War, John C. Calhoun stated that Americans "never dreamt of incorporating into our Union any but the Caucasian race—the free white race."⁶³ Calhoun then attacked the Spanish for allowing themselves to grant equality to non-whites, while condemning Mexico for its large Indian population. Lastly, Calhoun raised the specter of white Americans living under the rule of Indians "ignorant and unfit for liberty."⁶⁴ After the turn of the twentieth century, Republican Senator Albert Beveridge represented one of the chief opponents of New Mexico's statehood. When Beveridge traveled to New Mexico to conduct hearings on the territory's desire for statehood, he refused to announce his arrival and rejected participation in local celebrations. In fact, his main purpose in going to New Mexico was locating evidence that would justify the denial of statehood; he accomplished this by locating witnesses who agreed with his views.⁶⁵

Citizens of the territory recognized that Congress and opponents of New Mexico's statehood would use the territory's Spanish-speaking population to delay statehood. An article from the *New York Times* exemplified such attacks on Hispanic New Mexicans. The title referred to New Mexico as the "Most Un-American Part of the

⁶³ John C. Calhoun, "The Government of a White Race," in *Foreigners in their Native Land: Historical roots of the Mexican Americans*, ed. David Weber (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1973), 135.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 137.

⁶⁵ Montgomery, "74-75; Vigil, 31-32. Beveridge continued to attack New Mexican statehood, repeating many of his arguments in 1910. *Ibid.*, 32.

United States.” The piece labeled Hispanics as “ignorant and indifferent” to American institutions while discussing outrages committed against the white population, the unsanitary nature of Mexicans, as well as citing examples of gross incompetence among politicians.⁶⁶ The reference to Mexicans as unsanitary paralleled public health discourse that depicted racial “others” as a medical threat to whites.⁶⁷ In another article from the summer of 1898, the *New York Times* urged the nation to learn from its failures in New Mexico to facilitate the proper assimilation of Puerto Rico. An acceptable form of assimilation involved forcing the inhabitants to abandon the usage of the Spanish language. The paper charged Hispanic New Mexicans with giving complete support to Spain during the war and explained that “the trouble with these disaffected, semi-traitorous citizens is that they have been allowed to attend schools in which only the Spanish-language was spoken.”⁶⁸

These attacks explain why Euro-American editors from New Mexico sought to cast the territory’s Spanish-speakers as Spanish rather than Mexican.⁶⁹ The *Las Vegas Optic* portrayed relations between Hispanics and Anglos as largely peaceful. The *Optic*

⁶⁶ “Most Un-American part of the United States,” *New York Times*, 20 August 1905, SM3.

⁶⁷ Warwick Anderson, *Colonial Pathologies: American Tropical Medicine, Race, and Hygiene in the Philippines* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006); Natalia Molina, *Fit to be Citizens?: Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879-1939* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); Nayan Shah, *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco’s Chinatown* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Alexandra Minna Stern, *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).

⁶⁸ “Topics of the Times,” *New York Times*, 24 August 1898, 6.

⁶⁹ William Deverell described the efforts of Anglo residents of Los Angeles to confront the city’s Mexican past. William Deverell, *Whitewashed Adobe: The Rise of Los Angeles and the Remaking of Its Mexican Past* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).

then explained that any “incapacity” for self-government on the part of Mexicans would vanish with the expansion of the school system. Hispanics sought a greater claim to acceptance within the United States while Anglo New Mexicans desired statehood. The creation of Spanish-Americans helped to advance both of these goals. Yet, even these expressions of support from Anglo-Americans exhibited a desire to change the demographics of the territory. In articles and editorials, the English-language press encouraged other Anglo-Americans to come to New Mexico due to the many opportunities it offered. The arrival of such settlers would alter the population, reducing the proportion of Mexican Americans.⁷⁰

English-language press gave little attention to newspapers in Spanish. When the Spanish-language press received criticism, the complaints seldom centered upon the language or culture of the paper in question. For example, the *Las Vegas Optic* occasionally addressed *El Independiente* but its attacks centered upon the pro-Republican stance of the Spanish-language paper. In 1901, the *Optic* reminded readers about the cartoon depicting William Jennings Bryan about to slaughter the territory’s wool industry and noted that decline in prices following McKinley’s reelection. In discussing corruption

⁷⁰ *Dona Ana County Republican*, 9 December 1897, 2; *Dona Ana County Republican*, 20 May 1899, 4; *Dona Ana County Republican*, 17 June 1899, 4; *Las Cruces Progress*, 27 September 1902, 4; “The Fittest Shall Survive,” *Las Cruces Progress*, 14 June 1902, 4; “Loyalty of New Mexicans,” *Las Vegas Optic*, 15 June 1901, 2; “Our Admission,” *Las Vegas Daily Optic*, 8 October 1901, 2; “The Republican Platform,” *Dona Ana County Republican*, 20 October 1900, 4; “Southwestern Colonization,” *Las Cruces Progress*, 8 November 1902, 4; “Statehood for New Mexico,” *Las Vegas Optic*, 5 March 1901, 2; “Truth about the ‘Race Issue,’” *Las Vegas Optic*, 8 December 1900, 2; “Wanted—Men,” *Las Cruces Progress*, 8 November 1902, 4. Charles Montgomery examined how both Anglos and Hispanics helped to fashion a Spanish-American identity for the native inhabitants of New Mexico, writing that “both elite Hispanos and Anglos found it worthwhile to live with the imagined legacy of colonial Spain. In spite of very evident differences of race, language, religion, and politics, they were eager to transcend their ‘Mexican’ burdens by embracing a redemptive past.” Montgomery, 17.

within the Republican Party, the *Optic* wrote that “even ‘El Independiente’ had awakened to the fact that some underhanded measures have been resorted to” by the territory’s officials. The critique of Salazar’s paper makes no reference to the race of its editor.⁷¹

Though California had few Spanish-language newspapers at the turn of the twentieth century compared to New Mexico, one particular incident is worthy of note. *Las Dos Republicas*, a paper from Los Angeles, attracted an inordinate degree of attention, unmatched by other Spanish-language newspapers. The paper asserted that Hispanics who supported the United States during its confrontation with Spain held a minority opinion. *Las Dos Republicas* mocked Hispanic community leaders who voiced their patriotic feelings for the United States as fools who made noise and behaved in a ridiculous fashion. These sentiments angered a portion of the city’s Hispanic community and drew the attention of the *Los Angeles Times* to the paper’s editor, A. J. Flores. Though the *Times* joked about Flores, it paid little attention to what the editor said in his paper. Instead, the *Times* ran several stories discussing the negative response from the Hispanic community of Los Angeles. At a mass meeting, Hispanic citizens distanced themselves from Flores, claiming that the paper’s editor did not speak for their community and that Flores was a foreigner who had insulted their honor and patriotism. Frank Dominguez wrote a letter to the *Times* to explain their views. In this message, Dominguez affirmed the patriotism of Hispanics while claiming that members of his community would gladly step forward to serve the United States during a war with Spain.

⁷¹ “Kicking Out of the Traces,” *Las Vegas Optic*, 16 November 1900, 2; *Las Vegas Optic*, 3 June 1901, 2.

Dominguez proclaimed that Spanish Americans “recognize no flag but the glorious Stars and Stripes.” Within a few days of the public gathering challenging A.J. Flores, a man named Joe Romero, a member of the Spanish-American Republican League of Southern California, confronted the editor of *Las Dos Republicas*, starting a fight that ended in Romero’s arrest.⁷²

Frank Dominguez merits closer attention as a key figure in the relationship between Hispanic Americans and United States expansion overseas. Dominguez was a member of the Young Business Men’s Republican Club and the Spanish-American Republican League during 1898. Within the Spanish-American Republican League, Dominguez served as the organizer in Southern California. In a burst of public enthusiasm that took place earlier in 1898, Frank Dominguez sat on an enrollment committee for the National Volunteer Reserve. Though the possibility of a Spanish attack upon the West Coast was extremely remote, some civic leaders considered the creation of a volunteer defense force imperative.⁷³ At a meeting for the National Volunteer Reserve, Dominguez stated that “while his ancestors were Spanish he preferred America and

⁷² “All Along the Line,” *Los Angeles Times*, 9 March 1898, 7; “Cuba Libre,” *Los Angeles Times*, 17 March 1898, 16; “The First Battle,” *Los Angeles Times*, 3 April 1898, A11; “Flores Repudiated,” *Los Angeles Times*, 31 March 1898, 9; “Gross Misrepresentation,” *Los Angeles Times*, 1 April 1898, 6; *Los Angeles Times*, 2 April 1898, 6; “‘El Monitor’ Mistaken,” *Los Angeles Times*, 21 May 1902, A3; “Patriotismo o Política,” *Las Dos Republicas*, 19 March 1898, 2; “Spanish-American Sentiment,” *Los Angeles Times*, 30 March 1898, 6. The anger against Flores dissipated later that same year as A. J. Flores took part in the eighty-eighth anniversary of Mexico’s independence without drawing any particular comment from the *Times*. The paper noted his presence but made no remarks about the earlier controversy. “Mexican Independence,” *Los Angeles Times*, 16 September 1898, 7.

⁷³ “An Enthusiastic Gathering,” *Los Angeles Times*, 3 August 1898, 7; “The Ratification Meeting at Hazards Pavilion,” *Los Angeles Times*, 24 September 1898, 11; “Spanish-American Republicans,” *Los Angeles Times*, 29 June 1898, 14; “Volunteer Reserve,” *Los Angeles Times*, 5 April 1898, 7.

American principles for himself.”⁷⁴ Dominguez continued his speech, describing a war in the city’s Spanish American community and labeling Flores as “a Spanish editor who has dared to voice un-American sentiments.”⁷⁵ This attack upon Flores was critical for the emphasis that it placed upon the identification of a Mexican citizen as Spanish. Even though Dominguez detested Flores’s behavior, he refused to refer to his opponent as Mexican.

Dominguez echoed those who cast the annexation of Pacific territories as a fantastic opportunity for California to expand its commerce. In 1900, his loyalty to the Republican Party earned him a position as an assistant secretary for the Philippine Commission led by William Howard Taft. However, Dominguez did not keep his post for long before he resigned to pursue a private practice in Manila. His bilingual talents earned him many wealthy Filipino clients who hired him to recover property seized by revolutionary forces in the archipelago. Dominguez referred to wealthy Filipinos as “the better class” and asserted that they “[were] learning swiftly and always manifest an interest in the ingenious methods that Americans are introducing.” During his stay in the Philippines, Dominguez remained committed to the Republican Party and praised the efforts of the Americans in the archipelago while attacking those who criticized United States policy. Dominguez also praised Jake Smith, an army officer with an infamous

⁷⁴ “Volunteer Reserve,” *Los Angeles Times*, 3 April 1898, B1.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* Dominguez’s usage of the term “Spanish American” matches research that indicated that Mexican Americans living in California continued using the term into the twentieth century. In addition, many of these Mexican Americans considered the word “Mexican” an insult. That connotation explains Dominguez’s insistence on his self-portrayal as Spanish, but it still raises questions about his reference to Flores as Spanish. Nostrand, 17.

reputation due to his order to turn the island of Samar into a “howling wilderness.”⁷⁶

Indeed, in Dominguez’s mind, Smith deserved credit as he “cleared the scoundrels out of that island.” In addition, Dominguez referred to the infamous water cure as “a harmless punishment.” This supposedly benign method of extracting information from prisoners involved forcefully filling an individual’s stomach with water. American soldiers or their Filipino allies would then strike the prisoner in the stomach, forcing the water back out through the mouth. Dominguez scoffed at the claims of American atrocities in the Philippines, lambasting the Filipinos as “half-savage murderers.”⁷⁷

Unfortunately for Frank Dominguez, his career within America’s empire came to a premature end. The Supreme Court of the Philippines disbarred Dominguez and his partner, Augustus Montagne, for a period of one year in 1904. Dominguez and Montagne had allegedly engaged in “fraudulent practices,” that brought them a considerable sum of money “too quickly.”⁷⁸ This setback created financial difficulties for Frank Dominguez, prompting him to travel to Panama, where he hoped to help a Japanese company acquire a contract to send “an army of little brown men” to aid in the construction of the Panama

⁷⁶ “Angelinos are Doing Well in Manila,” *Los Angeles Times*, 8 December 1901, B8; “American Progress in the Philippines,” *Los Angeles Times*, 10 June 1902, 3; “First Gun of Campaign,” *Los Angeles Times*, 18 June 1902, A1; “Manila Smokes,” *Los Angeles Times*, 3 January 1901, 9. “Wins Fame at Manila Bar,” *Los Angeles Times*, 7 March 1901, 11. The United States campaign on the island of Samar has colored much of the history of the Philippine War. The struggle for the island was far bloodier than many of the earlier campaigns. Brian Linn, a key scholar on the Philippine War, pointed out that the violence that took place on Samar colored many histories in that scholars extrapolated conditions on Samar to the entire archipelago. Instead, Linn argued for a nuanced approach that acknowledges the heterogeneous conditions that existed in the Philippines. Brian Linn, *The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 26-27.

⁷⁷ “Slanders Refuted,” *Los Angeles Times*, 8 June 1902, 1.

⁷⁸ “Are Disbarred for a Year,” *Los Angeles Times*, 12 June 1904, A1.

Canal.⁷⁹ The plan did not meet with much apparent success as the *Los Angeles Times* never mentioned Dominguez in connection to the Panama Canal again. In subsequent years, Dominguez continued to appear in the *Los Angeles Times*, but these later articles did not mention a heroic return to Manila. Instead, Frank Dominguez remained in the Southern California area where he served as a defense attorney and remained involved in local affairs.⁸⁰ Nevertheless, Dominguez serves as a prominent example of a wealthy Hispanic who sought to use his bilingual skills to succeed within the American empire.

African Americans and Hispanic Americans faced similar challenges to American Indians when they analyzed the American empire. Nevertheless, Hispanic Americans and African Americans differed from American Indians in one crucial area. Proponents of territorial expansion located the potential for African Americans and Mexican Americans to prosper within the American empire. African American businessmen, professionals, and missionaries could find new opportunities overseas away from the restrictive atmosphere of segregation while Hispanic Americans could utilize their bilingual skills to serve as intermediaries between the United States and its colonial subjects. Though American Indian writers occasionally adopted critical views of Cubans and Filipinos, they did not identify newly-acquired American territories as locations suited to members of their tribes and nations to engage in business. These writers may have recognized

⁷⁹ "Enlisting for Panama," *Los Angeles Times*, 20 July 1904, 7.

⁸⁰ "Calm Before the Storm," *Los Angeles Times*, 7 August 1902, A1; "Counterfeiter Once, He's One NO Longer," *Los Angeles Times*, 17 August 1911, III; "Dia de Fiesta en el Rancho," *Los Angeles Times*, 23 September 1906, V20; "Driver Vs. Officer," *Los Angeles Times*, 15 June 1911, II6; "Orders for Joy Riders," *Los Angeles Times*, 29 April 1912, III; "Whew! Things Will be Done," *Los Angeles Times*, 17 September 1906, 14.

parallels between their own relationship with the federal government and the conditions experienced by colonial populations across the sea.

Within the American Empire, the writings of Native Hawaiians most closely resembled American Indian critiques of governmental domination. Previous scholarship largely ignored Native Hawaiian's resistance to the erosion of their sovereignty as few studies examined Hawaiian-language newspapers. In addition, these previous histories drew upon English-language newspapers that deliberately understated Native Hawaiian resistance to annexation and the creation of a Hawaiian Republic. This omission permitted the creation of histories that cast the founding of the Hawaiian Republic in 1893 as a step towards the establishment of "good government" in the islands rather than the destruction of a sovereign nation for economic gain. Noenoe Silva's *Aloha Betrayed* analyzed these Hawaiian language sources and demonstrated how these newspapers constituted a form of cultural resistance.⁸¹

During the 1860s, a nationalist press appeared in Hawaii and attracted the largest body of readers through the end of the nineteenth century, indicating a significant base of support. The use of the Hawaiian language permitted the newspapers to evade the surveillance of the missionaries and planters who came to the islands. In this way, the Hawaiian-language press, like the *Cherokee Advocate* and other American Indian publications, could communicate with members of their respective communities while limiting the capacity of Euro-American observers to monitor these writings. Even when

⁸¹ Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004).

Europeans and their Hawaiian-born children learned Hawaiian, they had difficulty deciphering these newspapers as the editors of these publications employed metaphors and references to Hawaiian oral traditions and stories. Consequently, these Hawaiian-language texts remained opaque to those unfamiliar with the allusions made by the authors. In addition to Hawaiian-language newspapers, Native Hawaiians held mass meetings to protest the founding of the Republic of Hawaii in 1893 and launched two petition drives to collect signatures protesting the annexation of Hawaii to the United States. These two petitions held over 38,000 signatures; even though some individuals may have signed both petitions, the total Native Hawaiian population at the end of the nineteenth century numbered 40,000.⁸²

Native Hawaiians also rejected characterizations of their culture as backward by identifying themselves as “civilized.” However, this assertion did not rest upon the adoption of Euro-American cultural norms; instead, Native Hawaiians pointed to the expansion of literacy as well as their participation in business as signs of their adoption of “civilization” while retaining their culture. These writers rejected the Euro-American demand to abandon their customs in order to receive the right to govern themselves.⁸³

The Hawaiian Queen, Liliuokalani, also participated in the defense of Hawaiian culture and sovereignty. During the debate over Hawaiian annexation, Liliuokalani visited the United States to protest the policy and publish *Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen*. The book included a portrait of Liliuokalani, enabling the Hawaiian ruler to

⁸² Ibid., 66-67, 137, 150-151.

⁸³ Ibid., 73, 115.

counteract the racist caricatures of her appearing within American newspapers and magazines. These images drew upon stereotypical depictions of African Americans to cast Liliuokalani as a savage and discredit her claim as the legal ruler of Hawaii. Liliuokalani countered these images through her portrait that depicted her wearing expensive clothing, thereby identifying her with the upper class and signifying her claim to authority. In addition, she appeared at social functions in east coast cities in order to demonstrate to the public that she did was not the savage described by Hawaii's white planters.⁸⁴

The experiences of American Indians and Native Hawaiians exhibited many commonalities. Both groups experienced pressure from whites to abandon their cultures in order to achieve civilization. The Hawaiian-language newspapers as well as the work of American Indian authors critical of American empire indicate that these populations did not consider their adoption of literacy as a rejection of their customs or traditions. Instead, they used newspapers to promote a more positive image of their communities within American society. For both Native Hawaiians and American Indians, these actions served to defend their sovereignty as they expressed their right and intention to govern their own communities. The existence of these printed denunciations of imperialism also indicates that American Indians and Native Hawaiians were very capable of understanding and articulating their responses to American policies. Though these critiques may not have altered federal policies or returned the Hawaiian government to

⁸⁴ Ibid., 178-179.

the hands of Native Hawaiians, Euro-American efforts to silence or mitigate these voices indicates their success in threatening the legitimacy of American justifications for empire.

Conclusion

American Indians encountered the American empire at home and abroad. Native writers plainly understood the implications of rhetoric that cast overseas populations as uncivilized as American Indians witnessed how similar charges justified the violation of Native sovereignty. Familiarity with their own tribal histories as well as the experiences of other American Indian tribes and nations enabled Native writers to critique Euro-American society for its own lack of civilization. Other Native writers accepted the value of civilization but sought to challenge the denigration of Native peoples by casting American Indians as the equals of whites.

These utilizations of empire reveal that American Indians were aware of the world beyond their communities. Though Native writers remained focused upon their own communities, their knowledge of the American empire helped to formulate their responses to the challenges their tribes and nations faced. This conclusion is important as it permits scholars to expand their analysis of American imperialism beyond its present limitations. Previous scholars ably demonstrated how racial discourses used to denigrate African Americans and American Indians found parallels in islands throughout the Pacific and the Caribbean. This does not negate the new forms of colonial discourse that emerged at the turn of the twentieth century to help Euro-American analyze their newly-acquired overseas territories, but it is important to avoid identifying the aftermath of the Spanish-American War as an aberration in United States history. The expansion of the United States across the North American continent may have resulted in increased economic opportunities for Euro-Americans but it also promoted governmental attacks on

Native sovereignty. As such, American Indians recognized traces of their own experiences with the federal government when they learned about the extension of American power overseas.

Examining American Indian conceptions and utilizations of American empire helps to center Native communities in studies of United States imperialism. Examining the racial or legislative parallels that connected American Indians, Filipinos, African Americans, Hawaiians, and others without considering their responses to these policies perpetuates the designation of these groups as passive objects of Euro-American action. It is necessary to examine the deleterious impact of many federal policies, but future scholarship must continue to emphasize Native voices from the turn of the twentieth century. The study of these sources poses certain challenges as many Native authors seemingly embraced the discourse of civilization and progress. However, a careful study of these documents often reveals that American Indian writers often used these terms in significantly different ways than Euro-Americans. In addition, Native justifications for adopting elements of Euro-American society often contained nuances that stressed the necessity, not the value, of adopting Euro-American norms in order to protect American Indian communities.

Future research should continue to explore the writings of American Indians and their experiences with the United States empire. Stories from newspapers in Indian Territory and elsewhere indicated that a number of American Indian soldiers fought in Cuba and the Philippines. Though this work identified several of them, further work can

uncover their names and determine whether they left diaries or other documents behind discussing their experiences.

In addition, the work of Noenoe K. Silva on Hawaiian-language newspapers raises important questions about American Indian newspapers. A number of newspapers edited by or targeted at American Indians contained columns—if not entire pages or editions—in Native languages. An examination of these papers would reveal whether editors presented different arguments to non-English speaking American Indians. In addition, Silva ably demonstrated the capability of Native Hawaiians to speak to their people free of Euro-American supervision by filling their stories with references to Hawaiian stories. Even when Euro-Americans could read Hawaiian, they were unable to decipher these stories as they lacked the appropriate cultural knowledge to understand the references and what they meant to Native Hawaiians. It is certainly possible that Native newspapers adopted similar strategies in order to communicate with their non-English speaking audience.

The study of American Indian responses to empire remains important as it highlights the resourcefulness and insight of Native peoples. Though Hawaii and the Philippines were thousands of miles away from Indian reservations or Indian Territory, Native writers identified parallels with their own experiences. This permitted them to appropriate the American empire for their own use by referencing it to justify their critiques of the United States and Euro-American society. Euro-American society did not baffle or confound Native people. They fully comprehended the significance of the rhetoric of empire and understood how it justified attacks on Native communities. As

such, even though relatively few American Indians actively participated in the creation of an American empire, Native communities were active historical agents in redefining or challenging the concept of empire for their own needs.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

A. K. Smiley Library (Redlands, CA)

Lake Mohonk Conferences on the Indian

American Indian Resource Center (Huntington Park, CA)

Chilocco Farmer and Stock Grower (Chilocco, OK)

Iapi Oaye (Santee, NE)

Indian School Journal (Chilocco, OK)

Indian Sentinel (Washington, D.C.)

Native American (Phoenix, AZ)

Word Carrier (Santee, NE)

Bacone College library (Muskogee, OK)

The Baconian (Muskogee, OK)

East Los Angeles Public Library

La Bandera Americana (Albuquerque, Territory of New Mexico)

El Democrata (Phoenix, Territory of Arizona)

Dona Ana County Republican [Later *Las Cruces Progress*] (Las Cruces, Territory of New Mexico)

Las Dos Americas (El Paso, Texas)

Las Dos Republicas (Los Angeles, California)

El Independiente (Las Vegas, Territory of New Mexico)

El Indito (Albuquerque, Territory of New Mexico)

Las Cruces Progress (Las Cruces, Territory of New Mexico)

El Monitor (El Paso, Texas)

Las Noticias (El Paso, Texas)

El Nuevo Mundo (Albuquerque, Territory of New Mexico)

El Paso del Norte (El Paso, Texas)

El Tiempo (Las Cruces, Territory of New Mexico)

Las Vegas Optic (Las Vegas, Territory of New Mexico)

La Voz del Pueblo (Las Vegas, Territory of New Mexico)

La Voz del Valle (Antonito, Colorado)

Gilcrease (Tulsa, OK)

Prominent Indians' Views of the Political Parties of *the Day*. *Showing the Abuses the Indian has received at the Hands of the Republican Party*. [Oklahoma]: Oklahoma Democratic Committee, 1906.

Northeastern State University (Tahlequah, OK)

Cherokee Gospel Tidings (Going Snake, Indian Territory)

Oklahoma Historical Society (Oklahoma City, OK)

Adair Weekly Ledger (Adair, Indian Territory and Oklahoma)

Atoka Choctaw Champion (Atoka, Indian Territory)

Cherokee County Democrat (Tahlequah, Indian Territory and Oklahoma)

Durant Times (Durant, Indian Territory)

Indian Chieftain (Vinita, Indian Territory)

Indian Citizen (Atoka, Indian Territory)

Indian Home and Farm (Muskogee, Oklahoma)

Indian Journal (Eufaula, Indian Territory)

Indian Outlook (Wichita, KS)

Indian Sentinel (Tahlequah, Indian Territory)

Muskogee Evening Times (Muskogee, Indian Territory)

Muskogee Phoenix (Muskogee, Indian Territory)

New Era (Stillwell, Indian Territory)

Sallisaw Gazette (Sallisaw, Indian Territory)

Sallisaw Star (Sallisaw, Indian Territory)

Spanish-American War Collection

Sturm's Oklahoma Magazine (Tulsa, Oklahoma)

Sturm's Statehood Magazine (Tulsa, Indian Territory)

Tahlequah Arrow (Tahlequah, Indian Territory)

Twin Territories: The Indian Magazine (Muskogee, Indian Territory; Fort Gibson, Indian Territory; Oklahoma City, OK)

Riverside Public Library

Sherman Bulletin (Riverside, CA)

University of Central Oklahoma (Edmond, OK)

Western Christian Advocate (Ardmore and Ada, Indian Territory)

University of Tulsa

Alex Posey Papers

DeWitt Lipe - Cherokee Strip papers

Indians of North America Historical Manuscripts and Documents

Papers of the Robertson and Worcester Families

Other Periodicals

Cherokee Advocate (Tahlequah, Indian Territory)

The Elevator (San Francisco, CA)

Indian Guide (Wyoming)

Indian Leader (Lawrence, KS)

Los Angeles Times

New York Times

Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma

Creek Nation Papers

D.C. McCurtain Collection

Dennis Wolfe Bushyhead Collection

Edwards Everett Dale Collection

Frank Boudinot Collection

Isparhecher Collection

Madeline Czarina Colbert Conlan Collection

Richard L. Martin Collection

Robert M. Harris Collection

Virgil Berry Collection

Walter Stanley Campbell Collection

W. C. Rogers Collection

Published Primary Sources

- Anti-Imperialist League. *Soldiers' Letters: Being Material for the History of a War of Criminal Aggression*. Boston: Anti-Imperialist League, 1899.
- Gatewood, Willard B., Jr. "*Smoked Yankees*" and the Struggle for Empire: *Letters from Negro Soldiers, 1898-1902*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971.
- Tillman, Benjamin. "Causes of Southern Opposition to Imperialism." In *American Anti Imperialism, 1895-1901*, ed. Gerald E. Markowitz, 176-183. New York: Garland Publishing, 1976.
- Zitkala-Ša, *American Indian Stories*. Washington D.C.: Hayworth Publishing, 1923. Reprint, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985.

Secondary Sources

- Acuña, Rodolfo. *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*. 4th ed. New York: Longman, 2000.
- Adams, David. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995.
- Alford, Harold. *The Proud Peoples: The Heritage and Culture of Spanish-Speaking Peoples in the United States*. New York: David McKay Company, 1972.
- Anderson, Warwick. *Colonial Pathologies: American Tropical Medicine, Race, and Hygiene in the Philippines*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.
- _____. "Disease, Race, and Empire." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 70, no. 1 (1996): 62-67.
- _____. "Excremental Colonialism: Public Health and the Poetics of Pollution." *Critical Inquiry* 21, no. 3 (Spring 1995): 640-669.
- _____. "Immunities of Empire: Race, Disease, and the New Tropical Medicine, 1900-1920." *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 70, no. 1 (1996): 94-118.
- Auxier, George W. "Middle Western Newspapers and the Spanish-American War, 1895-1898." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 26, no. 4 (March 1940): 523-534.
- Bain, David Haward. *Sitting in Darkness: Americans in the Philippines*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

- Barsh, Russel. "Progressive-Era Bureacrats and the Unity of Twentieth-Century Indian Policy." *American Indian Quarterly* 15, no. 1 (Winter 1991): 1-17.
- Baldasty, Gerald J. E. *W. Scripps and the Business of Newspapers*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Bays, Brad. *Townsite Settlement and Dispossession in the Cherokee Nation, 1866-1907*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1998.
- Beisner, Robert. *Twelve Against Empire: The Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1968.
- Bickers, Robert and R.G. Tiedemann, eds. *The Boxers, China, and the World*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2007.
- Blackhawk, Ned. *Violence over the Land: Indians and Empires in the Early American West*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Bloom, Khaled. "An American Tragedy of the Commons: Land and Labor in the Cherokee Nation, 1870-1900." *Agricultural History* 76, no. 3 (Summer 2002): 497-523.
- Bobbé, Dorothe. *De Witt Clinton*. New York: Minton, Balch, and Company, 1933.
- Boles, David. "Editorial Opinion in Oklahoma and Indian Territories on the Cuban Insurrection. 1895-1898." *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 47, no. 3 (1969): 258-267.
- Bolt, Christine. *American Indian Policy and American Reform: Case Studies of the Campaign to Assimilate the American Indians*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1987.
- Brechin, Gray. *Imperial San Francisco: Urban Power, Earthly Ruin*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Brody, David. *Visualizing American Empire: Orientalism and Imperialism in the Philippines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Briggs, Laura. *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Britten, Thomas. *American Indians in World War I: At Home and at War*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999.
- Burton, Jeffrey. *Indian Territory and the United States, 1866-1906*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995.

- Camarillo, Albert. *Chicanos in California: A History of Mexican Americans in California*. Sparks, Nevada: Materials for Today's Learning, 1990.
- Campbell, W. Joseph. *Yellow Journalism: Punctuating the Myths, Defining the Legacies*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2001.
- Cardoso, Lawrence. *Mexican Emigration to the United States, 1897-1931: Socio Economic Patterns*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1980.
- Carlson, Leonard. *Indians, Bureaucrats, and Land: The Dawes Act and the Decline of Indian Farming*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1981.
- Carter, Kent. *The Dawes Commission and the Allotment of the Five Civilized Tribes, 1893-1914*. Orem, UT: Ancestry.com, 1999.
- Chang, David. *The Color of the Land: Race, Nation, and the Politics of Landownership in Oklahoma, 1832-1929*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.
- Chapin, Helen. *Shaping History: The Role of Newspapers in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996.
- Cheyfitz, Eric. *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan*. Expanded ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.
- Child, Brenda. *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900-1949*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Clark, Blue. *Indian Tribes of Oklahoma: A Guide*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009.
- Clayton, Lawrence. "The Nicaragua Canal in the Nineteenth Century: Prelude to American Empire in the Caribbean." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 19, no. 2 (Nov. 1987): 323-352.
- Cloud, Barbara. *The Business of Newspapers on the Western Frontier*. Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1992.
- Coats, Stephen D. "Gathering at the Golden Gate: The U.S. Army and San Francisco, 1898." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1998.

- Cobb, Amanda. *Listening to Our Grandmothers' Stories: The Bloomfield Academy for Chickasaw Females, 1852-1949*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000; reprint, White Pine Press, 1992.
- Coffman, Edward. *The Regulars: The American Army, 1898-1941*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2004.
- Coleman, Michael. *American Indian Children at School, 1850-1930*. Jackson, University Press of Mississippi, 1993.
- _____. "Problematic Panacea: Presbyterian Missionaries and the Allotment of Indian Lands in the Late Nineteenth Century." *Pacific Historical Review* 54, no. 2 (May 1985): 143-159.
- Condra, G. E. "Opening of the Indian Territory." *Bulletin of the American Geographic Society* 39, no. 6 (1907): 323-324.
- Confer, Clarissa. *The Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007.
- Conley, Robert. *The Cherokee Nation: A History*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005.
- Cooke, Michelle. "Benjamin H. Colbert: Legacy of a Chickasaw Rough Rider." *Journal of Chickasaw History and Culture* 11, no. 3 (Fall 2008): 32-46.
- Cooper, Frederick and Ann Laura Stoler. *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Cornog, Evan. *The Birth of Empire: DeWitt Clinton and the American Experience, 1769-1828*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Coward, John. *The Newspaper Indian: Native American Identity in the Press, 1820-90*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Debo, Angie. *The Rise and Fall of the Choctaw Republic*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1934.
- _____. *The Road to Disappearance: A History of the Creek Indians*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1941.
- _____. *And Still the Waters Run Deep: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940.

- Deere, Carmen Diana. "Here Comes the Yankees! The Rise and Decline of the United States Colonies in Cuba, 1898-1930." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 78, no. 4 (Nov. 1998): 729-765.
- De León, Arnoldo. *The Tejano Community, 1836-1900*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982.
- Deloria, Philip J. *Indians in Unexpected Places*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004.
- Denson, Andrew. *Demanding the Cherokee Nation: Indian Autonomy and American Culture, 1830-1900*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004.
- Deverell, William. *Whitewashed Adobe: The Rise of Los Angeles and the Remaking of Its Mexican Past*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Dillingham, William. *Rudyard Kipling: Hell and Heroism*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.
- Diokno, Maria Serena. "'Benevolent Assimilation' and Filipino Responses." In *Mixed Blessing: The Impact of the American Colonial Experience on Politics and Society in the Philippines*, ed. Hazel M. McFerson, 75-88. London: Greenwood Press, 2002.
- Dobson, John. *America's Ascent: The United States Becomes a Great Power, 1880-1914*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1978.
- _____. *Reticent Expansion: The Foreign Policy of William McKinley*. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Duquesne University Press, 1988.
- Doolen, Andy. *Fugitive Empire: Locating Early American Imperialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Douglas, George. *The Golden Age of the Newspaper*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999.
- Drinnon, Richard. *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire Building*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980.
- Dudden, Arthur Power. *The American Pacific: From the Old China Trade to the Present*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Dunlay, Thomas. *Wolves for the Blue Soldiers: Indian Scouts and Auxiliaries with the United States Army, 1860-90*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982.

- Dyer, Thomas. *Theodore Roosevelt and the Idea of Race*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980.
- Edmunds, R. David. "Native Americans, New Voices: American Indian History, 1895-1995." *American Historical Review* 100, no. 3 (June 1995): 717-740.
- Ellis, Clyde. *To Change Them Forever: Indian Education at the Rainy Mountain Boarding School, 1893-1920*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996.
- Evans, Kathrine Mae. "'For the Generations to Follow': Traditional Cherokee History of the Twentieth Century." M.A. thesis, Arizona State University, 1990.
- Fear-Segal, Jacqueline. *White Man's Club: Schools, Race, and the Struggle of Indian Acculturation*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007.
- Ferrer, Ada. "Rustic Men, Civilized Nation: Race, Culture, and Contention on the Eve of Cuban Independence." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 78, no. 4 (Nov. 1998): 663-686.
- Field, James A., Jr. "American Imperialism: The Worst Chapter in Almost Any Book." *The American Historical Review* 83, no. 3 (June 1978): 644-668.
- Fisher, Alice. "The Transportation of Tradition: A Study of Zitkala Sa and Mourning Dove, Two Transitional American Indian Writers," Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1979. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1984.
- Foley, Neil. *The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Foreman, Carolyn. *Oklahoma Imprints, 1835-1907: A History of Printing in Oklahoma before Statehood*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1936.
- Foreman, Grant. *The Five Civilized Tribes*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1934.
- Foster, Morris. *Being Comanche: A Social History of an American Indian Community*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1991.
- Fowler, Loretta. *Tribal Sovereignty and the Historical Imagination: Cheyenne-Arapaho Politics*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002.
- García, Mario T. *Desert Immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.

- Garret, Kathleen. "Dartmouth Alumni in the Indian Territory." *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 32, no. 2 (1954): 123-141.
- Gatewood, Willard B., Jr. "Alabama's 'Negro Soldier Experiment,' 1898-1899." *The Journal of Negro History* 57, no. 4 (Oct. 1972): 333-351.
- _____. "Black Americans and the Quest for Empire, 1898-1903." *The Journal of Southern History* 38, no. 4 (Nov. 1972): 545-566.
- _____. *Black Americans and the White Man's Burden, 1898-1903*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975.
- Goble, Danney. *Progressive Oklahoma: The Making of a New Kind of State*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980.
- Go, Julian. *American Empire and the Politics of Meaning: Elite Political Cultures in the Philippines and Puerto Rico during U.S. Colonialism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.
- Go, Julian and Anne L. Foster, eds. *The American Colonial State in the Philippines: Global Perspectives*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.
- Goff, Victoria. "Spanish-Language Newspapers in California." In *Outsiders in 19th Century Press History: Multicultural Perspectives*, eds. Frankie Hutton and Barbara Reed, 71-92. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1995.
- Golay, Frank. *Face of Empire: United States-Philippine Relations, 1898-1946*. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1998.
- Gonzalez-Cruz, Michael. "The U.S. Invasion of Puerto Rico: Occupation and Resistance to the Colonial State, 1898 to the Present." *Latin America Perspectives* 25, no. 5 (Sep. 1998): 7-26.
- Greenberg, Amy. *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Grinde, Donald, Jr. and Quintard Taylor. "Red vs. Black: Conflict and Accommodation in the Post Civil War Indian Territory, 1865-1907." *American Indian Quarterly* 8, no. 3 (Summer 1984): 211-229.
- Gutiérrez, David C. *Walls and Mirrors: Mexican Americans, Mexican Immigrants, and the Politics of Ethnicity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

- Gutiérrez, Félix "Spanish-Language Media in America: Background, Resources, History," *Journalism History* 4, no. 2 (Summer 1977): 34-41.
- Hagan, William. *Indian Police and Judges: Experiments in Acculturation and Control*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.
- Hagan, William. *Theodore Roosevelt and Six Friends of the Indian*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997.
- Hannigan, Robert E. *The New World Power: America's Foreign Policy, 1898-1917*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.
- Hannon, Charles. "Zitkala-Sä and the Commercial Magazine Apparatus." In *"The Only Efficient Instrument": American Women Writers and the Periodical, 1837-1916*, eds. Aleta Feinsod Cane and Susan Alves, 179-201. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2001.
- Harris, Sharon, ed. *Blue Pencils and Hidden Agendas: Women Editing Periodicals, 1830-1910*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2004.
- Harris, Stephen. *Harlem's Hell Fighters: The African-American 369th Infantry in World War I*. Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books, 2003.
- Hatfield, Shelley Bowen *Chasing Shadows: Indians along the United States-Mexico Border, 1876-1911*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998.
- Healy, David. *US Expansionism: The Imperialist Urge in the 1890s*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.
- Heffer, Jean. *The United States and the Pacific: History of a Frontier*. Trans. W. Donald Wilson. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002.
- Herner, Charles. *The Arizona Rough Riders*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1970.
- Hertzberg, Hazel. *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1971.
- Hietala, Thomas. *Manifest Design: American Exceptionalism and Empire*. Rev ed. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Hines, Richard K. "'First to Respond to their Country's Call' The First Montana Infantry and the Spanish-American War and Philippine Insurrection." *Montana* 52, no. 3 (Autumn 2002): 45-57.

- Hoganson, Kristin L. *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Hoig, Stanley. *The Cherokees and Their Chiefs: In the Wake of Empire*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1998.
- Hoig, Stan. *The Oklahoma Land Rush of 1889*. Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Historical Society, 1989.
- Holland, Cullen Joe. "The Cherokee Indian Newspapers, 1828-1906: The Tribal Voice of a People in Transition." Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1956.
- Holm, Tom. *The Great Confusion in Indian Affairs: Native Americans and Whites in the Progressive Era*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005.
- Holm, Tom. "Indian Lobbyists: Cherokee Opposition to the Allotment of Tribal Lands." *American Indian Quarterly* 5, no. 2 (May 1979): 115-134.
- Holt, Elizabeth Mary. *Colonizing Filipinas: Nineteenth-Century Representations of the Philippines in Western Historiography*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2002.
- Horsman, Reginald. *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo Saxonism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Hoxie, Frederick. "Exploring a Cultural Borderland: Native American Journeys of Discovery in the Early Twentieth Century." *The Journal of American History* 79, no. 3 (December 1992): 969-995.
- _____. *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984.
- _____. *Parading through History: The Making of the Crow Nation in America, 1805-1935*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Hutton, Frankie and Barbara Straus Reed, eds. *Outsiders in 19th-Century Press History: Multicultural Perspectives*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1995.
- Iverson, Peter. *We Are Still Here: American Indians in the Twentieth Century*. Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, 1998.

- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*.
- _____. *Special Sorrows: The Diasporic Imagination of Irish, Polish, and Jewish Immigrants in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Jones, Preston. *Empire's Edge: American Society in Nome, Alaska, 1898-1934*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 2007.
- Kaplan, Amy and Donald E. Pease, eds. *Cultures of United States Imperialism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.
- Karnow, Stanley. *In our Image: America's Empire in the Philippines*. New York: Random House, 1989.
- Katanski, Amelia. *Learning to Write "Indian": The Boarding-School Experience and American Indian Literature*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005.
- Kessler, Richard J. *Rebellion and Repression in the Philippines*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Kilcup, Karen. *Native American Women's Writing, 1800-1924: An Anthology*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- Kosmider, Alexia. "Strike a Euroamerican Pose: Ora Eddleman Reed's 'Types of Indian Girls.'" *American Transcendental Quarterly* (June 1998):
- _____. "'What the Curious Want to Know': Cherokee Writer, Ora Eddleman Reed Writes Back to the Empire." *Literature and Psychology* 41, no. 4 (1995): 51-72.
- Kramer, Paul. *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States and the Philippines*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- LaFeber, Walter. "The 'Lion in the Path': The U.S. Emergence as a World Power." *Political Science Quarterly* 101, no. 5 (1986): 705-718.
- _____. *The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963.
- Lamar, Howard and Leonard Thompson. *The Frontier in History: North America and Southern Africa Compared*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Lamb, Ruth Stanton. *Mexican Americans: Sons of the Southwest*. Claremont: Ocelot Press, 1970.

- Lasch, Christopher. "The Anti-Imperialists, the Philippines, and the Inequality of Man." *The Journal of Southern History* 24, no. 3 (Aug. 1958): 319-331.
- Lebergott, Stanley. "The Returns to U.S. Imperialism, 1890-1929." *The Journal of Economic History* 40, no. 2 (June 1980): 229-252.
- Linn, Brian McAllister. *Guardians of Empire: The U.S. Army and the Pacific, 1902-1940*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- _____. "The Long Twilight of the Frontier Army." *The Western Historical Review* 27, no. 2 (Summer 1996): 141-167.
- _____. *The Philippine War, 1899-1902*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000.
- _____. *The U.S. Army and Counterinsurgency in the Philippine War, 1899-1902*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989.
- Littlefield, David, Jr. *Alex Posey: Creek Poet, Journalist, and Humorist*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Cherokee Freedmen: From Emancipation to American Citizenship*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978.
- _____. *The Chickasaw Freedmen: A People without a Country*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1980.
- _____. *Seminole Burning: A Story of Racial Violence*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1996.
- _____. "Utopian Dreams of the Cherokee Fullboods: 1890-1934." *Journal of the West* 10 (1971): 404-427.
- Littlefield, Daniel, Jr. and Carol Petty Hunter, eds. *The Fus Fixico Letters: A Creek Humorist in Early Oklahoma*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002.
- Littlefield, Daniel, Jr. and James Parins. *American Indian and Alaska Native Newspapers and Periodicals, 1826-1924*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984.
- _____. *A Biobibliography of Native American Writers, 1772-1924*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1981.
- _____. *A Biobibliography of Native American Writers, 1772-1924: A Supplement*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1985.

- _____. *Native American Writing in the Southeast: An Anthology, 1875-1935*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1995.
- Lomawaima, K. Tsianina. *They Called it Prairie Light: The Story of Chilocco Indian School*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994.
- Lomawaima, K. Tsianina and Teresa McCarty. *To Remain an Indian: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education*. New York: Teacher's College, 2006.
- Love, Eric T. *Race over Empire: Race & U.S. Imperialism, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Lowry, Donal, ed. *The South African War Reappraised*. New York: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- McBeth, Sally. *Ethnic Identity and eth Boarding School Experience of West-Central Oklahoma American Indians*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1983.
- McCartney, Paul. *Power and Progress: American National Identity, the War of 1898, and the Rise of American Imperialism*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006.
- McDonnel, Janet. *The Dispossession of the American Indian, 1887-1934*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- McFerson, Hazel. *The Racial Dimension of American Overseas Colonial Policy*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1997.
- Malone, Patrick. *The Skulking Way of War: Technology and Tactics among the New England Indians*. New York: Madison Books, 1991.
- May, Ernest. *American Imperialism: A Speculative Essay*. New York: Atheneum, 1968.
- _____. *Imperial Democracy: The Emergence of America as a Great Power*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961.
- May, Glen Anthony. *Battle for Batangas: A Philippine Province at War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- _____. "Why the United States Won the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902." *Pacific Historical Review* 52, no. 4 (Nov. 1983): 353-377.

- Meier, Matt and Feliciano Ribera. *Mexican Americans/American Mexicans: From Conquistadors to Chicanos*. Rev. ed. New York: Hill and Wang, 1993.
- Meixsel, Richard B. "Camp Stotsenburg and The Army Experience in the Philippines: A Brief History." *Bulletin of the American Historical Collection* 22, no. 3 (1994): 5-36.
- Meléndez, A. Garbiel. *Spanish-Language Newspapers in New Mexico, 1834-1958*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2005.
- _____. *So All is Not Lost: The Poetics of Print in Nuevo Mexicano Communities, 1834-1958*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.
- Merriam, Allen. "Racism in the Expansionist Controversy of 1898-1900." *Phylon* 39, no. 4 (1978): 369-380.
- Meyer, Doris. "Anonymous Poetry in Spanish-Language New Mexico Newspapers (1880-1900)." *The Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe* 2, no. 3 (Sept.-Dec. 1975): 259-275.
- _____. "The Language Issue in New Mexico, 1880-1900: Mexican-American Resistance Against Cultural Erosion." *The Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe* 4, no.1 and 2 (Jan.-Aug 1977): 99-106.
- _____. *Speaking for Themselves: Newmexicano Cultural Identity and the Spanish Language Press, 1880-1920*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996.
- Meyer, John, ed. *American Indians and U.S. Politics: A Companion Reader*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002.
- Mihesuah, Devon. *Cultivating the Rosebuds: The Education of Women at the Cherokee Female Seminary*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Miller, Stuart Creighton. *"Benevolent Assimilation": The American Conquest of the Philippines, 1899-1903*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Miner, H. Craig. "The Cherokee Oil and Gas Co., 1889-1902: Indian Sovereignty and Economic Change." *Business History Review* 46, no. 1 (Spring 1972): 46-66.
- _____. *The Corporation and the Indian: Tribal Sovereignty and Industrial Civilization in Indian Territory, 1865-1907*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1976.

- Mitchell, Michele. "The Black Man's Burden: African Americans, Imperialism, and Notions of Racial Manhood 1890-1910." *International Review of Social History* 44, no. 7 (1999): 77-100.
- Mojares, Resil B. *The War Against the Americans: Resistance and Collaboration in Cebu, 1899-1906*. Quezon City: Aleno de Manila University Press, 1999.
- Molina, Natalia. *Fit to Be Citizens?: Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879-1939*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Montgomery, Charles. *The Spanish Redemption: Heritage, Power, and Loss on New Mexico's Upper Rio Grande*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Mooney, James. *Historical Sketch of the Cherokee*. New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction, 2005.
- Morgan, H. Wayne. *America's Road to Empire: The War with Spain and Overseas Expansion*. New York: Wiley, 1965.
- _____. *William McKinley and His America*. Rev. ed. Kent: Kent State University Press, 2003.
- Morrison, Daryl. "Twin Territories: The Indian Magazine and Its Editor, Ora Eddleman Reed." *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 60 (1982): 136-166.
- Moses, A Dirk, ed. *Empire, Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2008.
- Mott, Frank Luther. "Newspapers in Presidential Campaigns," *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 8, no. 3 (Autumn 1944): 348-367.
- Munro, Dana. *Intervention and Dollar Diplomacy in the Caribbean, 1900-1921*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- Musicant, Ivan. *Empire by Default: The Spanish-American War and the Dawn of the American Century*. New York: Henry Holt, 1998.
- Naylor, Celia. *African Cherokees in Indian Territory: From Chattel to Citizens*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Neale, R.G. *Great Britain and the United States Expansion: 1898-1900*. Michigan State University Press, 1966.

- Newsom, D. E. *Kicking Bird and the Birth of Oklahoma: A Biography of Milton W. Reynolds*. Perkins, Oklahoma: Evans Publishers, 1983.
- Ngai, Mae. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Ngozi-Brown, Scot. "African-American Soldiers and Filipinos: Racial Imperialism, Jim Crow and Social Relations." *The Journal of Negro History* 82, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 42-53.
- Nieto-Phillips, John M. *The Language of Blood: The Making of Spanish-American Identity in New Mexico, 1880s-1930s*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004.
- Nostrand, Richard. *The Hispano Homeland*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992.
- Oczon, Annabelle M. "Bilingual and Spanish-Language Newspapers in Territorial New Mexico." *New Mexico Historical Review* 54, no. 1 (January 1979): 45-52.
- Oklahoma Historical Society*.
<http://digital.library.okstate.edu/encyclopedia/entries/R/RE019.html> (accessed March 4, 2011).
- Omissi, David and Andrew Thompson, eds. *The Impact of the South African War*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Otis, D. S. *The Dawes Act and the Allotment of Indian Lands*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1973.
- Paterson, Thomas G., ed. *American Imperialism & Anti-Imperialism: Problem Studies in American History*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1973.
- _____. "United States Intervention in Cuba, 1898: Interpretations of the Spanish American-Cuban-Filipino War." *The History Teacher* 29, no. 3 (May 1996): 341-361.
- Paterson, Thomas G. and Stephen G Rabe, eds. *Imperial Surge: The United States Abroad, The 1890s-Early 1900s*. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1992.
- Peceney, Mark. "A Constructivist Interpretation of the Liberal Peace: The Ambiguous Case of the Spanish-American War." *Journal of Peace Research* 34, no. 4 (Nov. 1997): 415-430.

- _____. "Forcing Them to Be Free." *Political Research Quarterly* 52, no. 3 (Sep. 1999): 549-582.
- Perdue, Theda, ed. *Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996.
- Pérez, Louis, Jr., *On Becoming Cuban: Identity, Nationality, and Culture*. New York: Ecco Press, 1999. Rev. and ed. by Alcione M. Amos and Thomas Senter Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Peyer, Bernd C., ed. *American Indian Nonfiction: An Anthology of Writings, 1760s 1930s*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007.
- Pomeroy, William J. *American Neo-colonialism: Its Emergence in the Philippines and Asia*. New York: International Publishers, 1970.
- Porter, Kenneth. *The Black Seminoles: History of a Freedom-Seeking People*. Revised and edited by Alcione Amos and Thomas Senter. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1996.
- Pride, Armistead and Clint Wilson II, *A History of the Black Press*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1997.
- Prucha, Francis Paul. *The Churches and the Indian Schools, 1888-1912*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.
- Reed, Ora Eddleman. "Pioneer Publisher, First Daily Newspaper in Indian Territory," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 23 (Spring 1945): 36-39.
- Renda, Mary A. *Taking Haiti: Military Occupation and the Culture of U.S. Imperialism, 1915-1940*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Ricketts, Harry. *Rudyard Kipling: A Life*. New York: Carroll and Graf Publishers, 2000.
- Riney, Scott. *The Rapid City Indian School, 1898-1933*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.
- Ring, Natalie. "Inventing the Tropical South: Race, Region, and the Colonial Model." *Mississippi Quarterly* 56, no. 4. (2003): 619-631.
- Rister, Carl Coke. *Land Hunger: David Payne and the Oklahoma Boomers*. New York: Arno Press, 1975.

- Rodríguez, Dylan. *Suspended Apocalypse: White Supremacy, Genocide, and the Filipino Condition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.
- Rodríguez, Jaime and Kathryn Vincent, eds. *Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings: The Roots of Conflict in U.S.-Mexican Relations*. Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1997.
- Roediger, David. *The Wages of Whiteness*. Rev. ed. New York: Verso, 1999.
- _____. *Working toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White*. New York: Basic Books, 2005.
- Rosenbaum, Robert Johnson. *Mexicano Versus Americano: A Study of Hispanic American Resistance to Anglo-American Control in New Mexico Territory, 1870-1900*. Ph.D. diss., University of Texas, Austin 1972.
- Rosenberg, Emily. *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1982.
- Roth, Russel. *Muddy Glory: America's "Indian Wars" in the Philippines, 1899-1935*. W. Hanover, Mass.: Christopher Publishing House, 1981.
- Round, Phillip. *Removable Type: Histories of the Book in Indian Country, 1663-1880*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.
- Rydell, Robert W. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- _____. "The Trans-Mississippi and International Exposition: 'To Work Out the Problem of Universal Civilization.'" *American Quarterly* 33, no. 5 (Winter 1981): 587-607.
- Rystad, Göran. *Ambiguous Imperialism: American Foreign Policy and Domestic Politics at the Turn of the Century*. Lund: Esselte Studium, 1975.
- Salamanca, Bonifacio S. *The Filipino Reaction to American Rule, 1901-1913*. Detroit, Mich.: Exclusive Distributors, Cellar Book Shop, 1984.
- Salman, Michael. *The Embarrassment of Slavery: Controversies over Bondage and Nationalism in the American Colonial Philippines*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Sánchez, George. *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

- San Buenaventura, Steffi. "The Colors of Manifest Destiny: Filipinos and the American Other(s)." *Amerasia Journal* 24, no. 3 (1998): 1-26.
- Saunt, Claudio. *Black, White, and Indian: Race and the Unmasking of an American Family*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Saxton, Alexander. *The Rise and Fall of the White Republic*. London: Verso, 2003.
- Scales, James and Danney Goble. *Oklahoma Politics: A History*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980.
- Scheips, Paul J. "United States Commercial Pressures for a Nicaragua Canal in the 1890's." *The Americas* 20, no. 4 (April 1964): 333-358.
- Schirmer, Daniel B. *Republic or Empire: American Resistance to the Philippine War*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1972.
- Schoonover, Thomas. *Uncle Same's War of 1898 and the Origins of Globalization*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2003.
- Schott, Joseph L. *The Ordeal of Samar*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965.
- Senier, Siobhan. *Voices of American Indian Assimilation and Resistance*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2001.
- Sexton, William Thaddeus. *Soldiers in the Sun: An Adventure in Imperialism*. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1971.
- Shah, Nayan. *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco's Chinatown*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Shaw, Robert Wheaton. "'No Imperial Designs Lurk in the American Mind': The Evolution of Racist Discourse Concerning the Philippines, 1898-1904." MA thesis, University of Nevada, 1999.
- Silbey, Dave. *War of Frontier and Empire: The Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2007.
- Silva, Noenoe K. *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.
- Slotkin, Richard. "Nostalgia and Progress: Theodore Roosevelt's Myth of the Frontier." *American Quarterly* 33, no. 5 (Winter 1981): 608-637.

- Slotkin, Richard. *Lost Battalions: The Great War and the Crisis of American Nationality*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2005.
- Slotkin, Richard. *The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialization, 1800-1890*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998.
- Smith, Andrea. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005.
- Smith, Willard H. "William Jennings Bryan and Racism." *The Journal of Negro History* 54, no. 2 (April 1969): 127-149.
- Smythe, Ted Curtis. *The Gilded Age Press, 1865-1900*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003.
- Sparrow, Bartholomew. *The Insular Cases and the Emergence of American Empire*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006.
- Spence, Mark. *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Starr, Emmet. *Encyclopedia of Oklahoma*. Claremore, Oklahoma: Emmet Starr, 1912. Reprint, Lawton, Oklahoma: Histree, 1980.
- Stephanson, Anders. *Manifest Destiny: American Expansion and the Empire of Right*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1995.
- Stern, Alexandra Minna. *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Stoler, Ann. *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Storey, Moorfield. *The Conquest of the Philippines by the United States, 1898-1925*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926.
- Stratton, Porter. *The Territorial Press of New Mexico, 1834-1912*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1969.
- Streitmatter, Rodger. *Voices of Revolution: The Dissident Press in America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Sturm, Circe. *Blood Politics: Race, Culture, and Identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

- Svingen, Orlan. *The Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, 1877-1900*. Niwot, CO: University Press of Colorado, 1993.
- Takaki, Ronald. *Iron Cages: Race and Culture in 19th-Century America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Tan, Samuel K. *The Filipino-American War, 1899-1913*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 2002.
- Tate, Michael. *The Frontier Army in the Settlement of the West*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.
- Thomas, Robert K. "The Origin and Development of the Redbird Smith Movement." M.A. thesis, University of Arizona, 1953.
- Thornton, Russel. *The Cherokees: A Population History*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990.
- Tiongson, Antonio, Jr., Edgardo Gutierrez and Ricardo Gutierrez. *Positively No Filipinos Allowed: Building Communities and Discourse*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006.
- Torruella, Juan. *Global Intrigues: The Era of the Spanish-American War and the Rise of the United States to World Power*. San Juan: Universidad de Puerto Rico, 2007.
- Trafzer, Clifford, Jean Keller, and Lorence Sisquoc. *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007.
- Trask, David F. *The War with Spain in 1898*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.
- Traxel, David. *1898: The Birth of the American Century*. New York: Vintage Books, 1998.
- Troutman, John W. *Indian Blues: American Indians and the Politics of Music, 1879-1934*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009.
- Tyrrell, Ian. *Transnational Nation: United States History in Global Perspective Since 1789*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Underhill, Lonnie and Daniel Littlefield, Jr., eds. *Hamlin Garland's Observations on the American Indian, 1895-1905*. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 1976.

- Unrau, William. *Mixed Bloods and Tribal Dissolution: Charles Curtis and the Quest for Indian Identity*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1989.
- Vaughn, Christopher A. "The 'Discovery' of the Philippines by the U.S. Press, 1898-1902." *The Historian* 57, no. 2 (Winter 1995): 303-314.
- Vigil, Maurilio. *The Hispanics of New Mexico: Essays on History and Culture*. Bristol, Indiana: Wyndham Hall Press, 1985.
- Ward, Carol. *Native Americans in the School System: Family, Community, and Academic Achievement*. New York: Altamira Press, 2005.
- Warde, Mary Jane. *George Washington Grayson and the Creek Nation, 1843-1920*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.
- Wardell, Morris. *A Political History of the Cherokee Nation*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1938.
- Washburn, Patrick. *The African American Newspaper: Voice of Freedom*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1997.
- Weber, David, ed. *Foreigners in their Native Land: Historical Roots of the Mexican Americans*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1973.
- Weeks, Philip. *Farewell my Nation: American Indian and the United States, 1820-1890*. Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, 1990.
- Weiner, Mark. *Americans without Law: The Racial Boundaries of Citizenship*. New York: New York University Press, 2006.
- Welch, Deborah. "Gertrude Simmons Bonnin (Zitkala-Ša): Dakota." In *The New Warriors: Native American Leaders since 1900*, ed. David Edmunds, 35-53. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.
- Welch, Richard E. "American Atrocities in The Philippines: The Indictment and the Response." *Pacific Historical Review* 43 (1974): 233-253.
- _____. "Opponents and Colleagues: George Frisbie Hoar and Henry Cabot Lodge, 1898-1904." *New England Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (Jun. 1966): 182-209.
- _____. "'The Philippine Insurrection' and the American Press." *The Historian* 36 (1973): 34-51.

- _____. *Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine American War, 1899-1902*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979.
- Wessel, Thomas. "Agriculture, Indians, and American History." *Agricultural History* 50, no. 1 (January 1976): 9-20.
- Wexler, Laura. *Tender Violence: Domestic Visions in the Age of US Imperialism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Whitt, Laurie Anne. "Cultural Imperialism and the Marketing of Native America," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 19, no. 3 (1995): 1-31.
- Wickett, Murray. *Contested Territory: Whites, Native Americans, and African Americans in Oklahoma, 1865-1907*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000.
- Wilkerson, Marcus M. *Public Opinion and the Spanish-American War: A Study in War Propaganda*. New York: Russel & Russel, 1932.
- Williams, Walter L. "United States Indian Policy and the Debate over Philippine Annexation: Implications for the Origins of American Imperialism." *Journal of American History* 66, no. 4 (Mar. 1980): 810-831.
- Williams, William Appleman. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. Rev. ed. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1962.
- Wilson, Angela. *Remember This!: Dakota Decolonization and the Eli Taylor Narratives*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.
- Wilson, Keith, ed. *The International Impact of the Boer War*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Witcher, Esther. "Territorial Magazines." *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 29 (Winter 1951-1952): 484-497.
- Wooster, Robert. *The Military and United States Indian Policy, 1865-1903*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Zellar, Gary. *African Creeks: Estelveste and the Creek Nation*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007.
- Zimmerman, Warren. *First Great Triumph: How Five Americans Made Their Country a World Power*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002.