

TSALAGI TSULEHISANVHI: UNCOVERING CHEROKEE LANGUAGE ARTICLES FROM
THE CHEROKEE PHOENIX NEWSPAPER, 1828 - 1834

A thesis presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of
Western Carolina University in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in History.

By

Constance Owl

Director: Dr. Andrew Denson
Associate Professor of History
Department of History

Committee Members: Dr. Brett Riggs, Anthropology
Dr. Elizabeth McRae, History
Dr. Sara Snyder Hopkins, Cherokee Studies

April 2020

©2020 by Constance Owl

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I first want to thank Tom Belt and Wiggins Blackfox for the support, patience, guidance they gave me throughout the duration of this project. I am indebted to both of you for the time and knowledge you both so willingly shared with me throughout the research process. I am incredibly grateful to you both for encouraging and inspiring me to learn, practice, and honor our language in all things I do. Without you, this thesis simply would not exist today.

To my director, Professor Andrew Denson, I am immensely appreciative of the advice and direction you gave to me throughout the development of the thesis. I am sincerely grateful for your enduring confidence in my project. It was a privilege to be your student, and I am so thankful to have had the opportunity to begin this research under your guidance. To my committee members— Professor Brett Riggs, Professor Sara Snyder, and Professor Elizabeth McRae— thank you for your assistance and support over the last year and for the constant encouragement you gave me during my time at WCU.

I also want to acknowledge and thank Hartwell Francis, Ben Jensen, Barnes Powell, Matthew Yellowtail, and Gracie Young, who each supported me and this project over the last year. I extend my sincere thanks to the WCU Cherokee Studies Program, the WCU Cherokee Language Program, and the WCU History Department for their support of this project.

Finally, to my family, thank you for supporting my academic endeavors and for always encouraging me to challenge myself and find excitement in learning.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	IV
INTRODUCTION.....	1
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	4
THESIS STRUCTURE	15
CHAPTER ONE: “ <i>THIS DAY IS OURS</i> ”: THE BIRTH OF THE CHEROKEE PRESS	19
INTRODUCING THE <i>CHEROKEE PHOENIX</i> TO THE PEOPLE	26
CHAPTER TWO: “ <i>THEY BELIEVE THE EARTH ENCIRCLES THEM</i> ”: GEORGIA AND THE GROWING THREAT OF REMOVAL.....	35
A HEADMAN’S OPINION ON AMERICAN LEADERS.....	39
NEWS FROM THE WEST.....	46
BOUDINOT’S REPORT.....	52
CHAPTER THREE: “ <i>DO NOT LET YOUR HEARTS WEAKEN</i> ”: THE CHEROKEES’ INTERNAL BATTLE AGAINST REMOVAL.....	57
REMEMBERING THE WORDS OF FORMER LEADERS.....	58
BOUDINOT’S RESPONSE TO THE <i>CHEROKEE NATION V. GEORGIA</i> DECISION	65
BOUDINOT’S RESPONSE TO THE <i>WORCESTER V. GEORGIA</i> MANDATE	69
CONCLUSION	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	80
APPENDIX 1: <i>CHEROKEE PHOENIX</i> , FEBRUARY 21, 1828 - TRANSLATION #1.....	86
APPENDIX 2: <i>CHEROKEE PHOENIX</i> , FEBRUARY 21, 1828 - TRANSLATION #2.....	93
APPENDIX 3: <i>CHEROKEE PHOENIX</i> , JULY 31, 1830 - TRANSLATION #1.....	98
APPENDIX 4: <i>CHEROKEE PHOENIX</i> , JULY 31, 1830 - TRANSLATION #2.....	104
APPENDIX 5: <i>CHEROKEE PHOENIX</i> , MAY 7, 1831 - TRANSLATION	111
APPENDIX 6: <i>CHEROKEE PHOENIX</i> , MARCH 24, 1832 - TRANSLATION.....	116

ABSTRACT

TSALAGI TSULEHISANVHI: UNCOVERING CHEROKEE LANGUAGE ARTICLES FROM THE CHEROKEE PHOENIX NEWSPAPER, 1828 - 1834

Constance Amity Owl, M.A.

Western Carolina University (May 2020)

Director: Dr. Andrew Denson

The *Cherokee Phoenix* is arguably the most significant product of Native American journalism. Published between 1828 and 1834, the newspaper was formed in direct response to the developing territorial disputes between the Cherokee Nation and the state of Georgia. An invaluable linguistic and historical resource, the *Phoenix* stands as one of the most historically significant linguistic documents created by the Cherokee people with approximately thirty percent of the source written in the Cherokee language. Cited in nearly every major work concerning the Cherokee during this period, scholars who have incorporated the *Phoenix* into their studies have most often utilized only the English portions of the newspaper due to the fact that the Cherokee language content within it remains inaccessible to many. Historians and other scholars familiar with the *Phoenix* have generally accepted the assumption that what was printed in Cherokee was merely a word-for-word representation of partnering articles published in English. Because of this approach, the English portions of the newspaper have over time come to define the character of the *Phoenix* as well as the community in which it served thus allowing scholars to neglect important questions about the *Cherokee Phoenix* and the role it played for traditional Cherokee people in the years preceding their forced removal. Through providing a

basic introduction to the *Phoenix*'s Cherokee content, this work reveals novel insights about both the meaning and motivation behind the use of Cherokee language within the newspaper as well as the document's significance within the broader story of the Cherokee Removal. In recognizing the role the newspaper played within the Cherokee Nation's defense of their government and territorial rights, this thesis interrogates closely how knowledge of the *Phoenix*'s Cherokee content challenges traditional assumptions about the newspaper, its relevance to all levels of Cherokee society, and its significance to the community during their removal struggle.

INTRODUCTION

The Cherokee language is in a moment of crisis. Of the three federally recognized Cherokee tribes with their combined population of nearly 400,000 members, only approximately 2,000 fluent Cherokee speakers remain.¹ As elder first-language speakers pass, Cherokees inch closer toward a reality wherein their language ceases to exist in the way it once did. More than merely a means of communication, the Cherokee language is understood commonly among Cherokees as a vessel of spirituality, culture, and history. Once lost, so too are countless stories of place, tradition, and irrecoverable amounts of ancient knowledge. In recognizing how such aspects of the Cherokee world are encoded within the language itself, as first-language Cherokee speaker Tom Belt and scholar Margaret Bender explain in their article “Speaking Difference to Power: The Importance of Linguistic Sovereignty,” the preservation of the Cherokee language must be understood as an equivalent to the preservation of “the integrity of Cherokee thought.”²

Facing the possible loss of the Cherokee language and all that it holds, scholars working within Cherokee communities have begun to devote more attention to the language within their studies of Cherokee culture and history— many turning to early language documents in the process. Speaking to such efforts, ethnomusicology scholar and Cherokee language instructor Sara Hopkins argued that revisiting such materials “requires looking beyond the equivalencies of translation to the incommensurate knowledge that fell between the lines of translation.”³ Hopkins suggests that when examined in this manner, such documents transform from mere language

¹ Scott McKie B.P., “Tri-Council Declares State of Emergency for Cherokee Language.” *The Cherokee One Feather*, June 27, 2019. <https://www.theonefeather.com/2019/06/tri-council-declares-state-of-emergency-for-choerokee-language/>

² Tom Belt and Margaret Bender, “Speaking Difference to Power: The Importance of Linguistic Sovereignty” in *Foundations of First Peoples’ Sovereignty: History, Education, and Culture*. (New York: Peter Lang, 2008.), 188.

³ Sara Snyder Hopkins, ““Going Over” and Coming Back: Reclaiming the Cherokee Singing Book for Contemporary Eastern Cherokee Language Revitalization” *In Press*. (2019): 3.

resources to sources that reveal how Cherokee people conceptualized the world around them.

This process, she suggests, “demonstrates a way that scholars and community language activists can work with remaining fluent speakers to reclaim indigenous modes of thought through the language ‘preserved’ within archival texts.”⁴

The *Cherokee Phoenix*, the first bilingual newspaper published by a Native American tribe printed in the years preceding the forced removal of the Cherokee from their homeland, is a document that demands such attention. An invaluable linguistic and historical resource, the *Phoenix* stands as one of the most historically significant documents created by the Cherokee people, with approximately thirty percent of the source written in the Cherokee language. Cited in nearly every major monograph concerning the Cherokee during this period, scholars who have incorporated the *Phoenix* into their work have most often utilized only the English portions of the newspaper due to the fact that translations of the Cherokee language content within it have never been published.⁵ Historians and other scholars most familiar with the *Phoenix* have generally accepted the assumption that what was printed in Cherokee was merely word-for-word representations of partnering articles published in English. Because of this approach, the English portions of the newspaper have over time come to define the character of the *Phoenix*, as well as the community in which it served thus allowing scholars to neglect important historical questions about the newspaper and the role it played for traditional Cherokee people in the years preceding their forced removal. Was the *Phoenix* simply a way to represent the perspective of the tribe on a national scale, or was it also utilized for more direct community-centered political organizing and education? Did discourse within the *Phoenix* surrounding removal and land rights issues

⁴ Hopkins, ““Going Over” and Coming Back,” 3.

⁵ Although Eastern Band Cherokee language speaker Marie Junaluska translated parts of the *Cherokee Phoenix* in the 1990s, the translations conducted as part of her research were never published nor widely circulated within academic circles. Moreover, Junaluska’s translations remain challenging to locate within existing archives.

change when directed toward a Cherokee audience and in their own language? What types of conversations and dialogue were documented within the newspaper in Cherokee that were not in English? Furthermore, how might knowledge of such discussions alter popular assumptions about Cherokee society, and the role of the *Phoenix* within it, during the Removal era?

In an effort to address the questions above, and in an attempt to partake in the reexamination process outlined by Hopkins, this thesis examines select excerpts of Cherokee language content from within the *Cherokee Phoenix*. The marriage of linguistic exploration and historical inquiry is, therefore, the central objective of this work. Through providing a basic introduction to the *Phoenix*'s Cherokee content, this work reveals novel insights about both the meaning and motivation behind the use of Cherokee language within the newspaper as well as the document's significance within the broader story of the Cherokee Removal. In recognizing the role the newspaper played within the Cherokee Nation's defense of their government and territorial rights, this thesis interrogates closely how knowledge of the *Phoenix*'s Cherokee content challenges traditional assumptions about the newspaper, its relevance to all levels of Cherokee society, and its significance to the community during their Removal struggle.

At the center of this examination sits a reverence for the authentic Cherokee voice. The articles, commentaries, letters, and speeches originally published in the Cherokee language in the *Phoenix* included in this work bring to light the intimate perspectives and opinions of Cherokees as they were shared exclusively within the community during a time of considerable uncertainty. With their words now uncovered through the translation process of translation, this work provides those who study the *Phoenix* and the Cherokee removal struggle new and meaningful lines of analysis that center Cherokees and their language at the heart of the narrative. This thesis, therefore, demonstrates the importance of language within the study of the Cherokee past

and argues that linguistic analysis and examination should be considered a requisite to any future study of the *Cherokee Phoenix* and its role within the Cherokee Nation's fight against removal.

Review of the Literature

The *Cherokee Phoenix* remains one of the most recognizable and well-known documents to emerge from this era of Cherokee history, however, every scholarly account of the publication has failed to address with any depth the Cherokee content of the newspaper. While numerous linguists and Cherokee language speakers from both the Cherokee Nation and the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians have translated sections of the *Phoenix* (most notably Marie Junaluska), the only published work that has explored the *Phoenix*'s Cherokee content (to the author's knowledge) is a single obscure article published by Cherokee scholars Jack and Anna Kilpatrick in 1965.⁶ Published within the *Great Plains Journal* under the title "Letters from an Arkansas Cherokee Chief (1828 - 29)," the Kilpatricks translated a series of three letters published within the *Phoenix* in the Cherokee language.⁷ The Kilpatricks' article came four years after the first complete collection of the *Cherokee Phoenix* was compiled on microfilm at the University of Oklahoma— a development they argued allowed scholars to form a proper and informed opinion on the *Cherokee Phoenix*'s "true nature" for the first time.⁸

The Kilpatricks were the first to address the misrepresentation of the *Cherokee Phoenix* within scholarly works. Contrary to the widespread assumption that all material published in the newspaper was done so in a bilingual manner, the Kilpatricks revealed through their research

⁶ Jack Frederick Kilpatrick and Anna Gritts Kilpatrick, "Letters from an Arkansas Cherokee Chief: 1828-29." *Great Plains Journal* 5, no. 1 (1965): 26 - 34.

⁷ As part of the research and translation process for this thesis, a Cherokee translator was given the Kilpatrick article to review the translations they originally published beside the original *Phoenix* articles. While the translator reviewed and made minimal interpretive notations to the Kilpatrick translations, a majority of the original messaging and language remained the same. The letters will be included in the second chapter of this thesis.

⁸ Kilpatrick, "Letters," 26.

that instead, “a relatively small percentage of [the *Phoenix*’s] content was offered in both English and Cherokee” with the majority of content published in either an English-only or Cherokee-only format.⁹ Through their exploration into the Cherokee letters published in the newspaper, the Kilpatricks argued that “the chief value of the *Cherokee Phoenix* to both the historian and the ethnographer is that part of it still in Cherokee.”¹⁰ Despite their effort to correct assumptions about the nature of Cherokee language use within the *Phoenix*, the Kilpatricks’ argument surrounding the value of the newspaper’s Cherokee language content would not extend far into subsequent scholarship.

In a majority of studies published following their article, primarily those by scholars attempting to gain insight into more ‘ordinary’ Cherokee experiences and perspectives during the Removal era, the *Phoenix* was considered a practically useless document for attaining such information. In 1977, notable historian of Cherokee history, Theda Perdue, cautioned her peers on using the *Phoenix* as an ethnohistorical source, arguing that the *Phoenix* “reveals more about what philanthropic whites in the early 19th century expected of Indians than it does about how most Cherokees actually lived, what they believed, and how they viewed themselves.”¹¹ While Perdue argued that scholars must recognize the limits of the *Phoenix* as a representative ethnographical source, the most Cherokee-centric parts of the document, the Cherokee language editorials, remained overlooked.

Within a majority of the published literature that would follow, the *Cherokee Phoenix* was examined not for the whole of its content, but rather for its significance as one of the first pieces

⁹ Kilpatrick, “Letters,” 26.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹¹ Theda Perdue, “Rising from the Ashes: The Cherokee Phoenix as an Ethnohistorical Source” *Ethnohistory* 24, no. 3 (1977): 207.

of Native American journalism and literary advocacy.¹² Moreover, numerous monographs that have explored the *Phoenix* to date have done so with greater attention paid toward its Editor, Elias Boudinot, than the content held within its pages.¹³ While some early scholars focused on the newspaper's general support of the civilization agenda for Native groups broadly, more recent works have adopted more multi-dimensional interpretations of the newspaper that seek to reconcile the accommodationist nature of the source with the vast amount "protest rhetoric" within its pages.¹⁴ While some scholars have suggested that the Cherokee language content within the newspaper might reveal more about the document than what had traditionally been inferred by the literature, no studies of the *Phoenix* have directly investigated the document's Cherokee content.

Beyond the use of Cherokee language within the newspaper, one must also appropriately account for its use of Cherokee syllabary, an invention of similar prominence to that of the *Phoenix* and whose creation has ignited debate of its own within the literature. Developed in the early 1820s by a Cherokee man named Sequoyah, the syllabary is a unique system of writing developed exclusively for the Cherokee language which utilizes eighty-five symbols to represent each sound made in the language. Despite initial backlash to its introduction from many Cherokee people, literacy acquisition occurred rapidly after the introduction of the syllabary. Some estimates suggest that it took only months for the majority of Cherokee speakers to learn

¹² Works of this nature include Robert G. Martin, "Cherokee Phoenix: Pioneer of Indian Journalism" *The Chronicles of Oklahoma* 25 (1947), 102 - 118; Barbara Luebke, *Cherokee Editor: The life and times of Elias Boudinot, Father of American Indian Journalism* (Createspace Independent Publishing Platform, 2014); Joe Holland and James Pate, *Cherokee Newspapers, 1828 - 1906: Tribal Voice of a People in Transition* (Tahlequah: Cherokee Heritage Press, 2012).

¹³ See Theda Perdue, *Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983), and Luebke, *Cherokee Editor*, (2014).

¹⁴ Rose Guble, "Unlearning the Pictures in Our Heads: Teaching the Cherokee Phoenix, Boudinot, and Cherokee History" in *Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story: Teaching American Indian Rhetorics* (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2015), 100.

and begin using the system frequently.¹⁵ In 1826, Cherokee leader John Ridge remarked that a large majority of the Cherokee population were literate in the syllabary and using the system to “regularly communicate” with relatives, noting in comparison that only approximately one-third of the population had the ability “to read and write in the English language” in the same year.¹⁶ The syllabary allowed not only the creation of the *Cherokee Phoenix* but also the complete translation of the New Testament, which brought the gospel to new segments of Cherokee society. Because of these associated accomplishments, the introduction of the syllabary has, in many ways, become a symbol of Cherokee assimilation. Within the existing literature, such characterization of the syllabary has often overshadowed the contrasting view of the syllabary as an exclusively indigenous invention able to compete with more traditional and Western forms of communication. This point is perhaps best promulgated by scholars Cullen Holland and James Pete in their work *Cherokee Newspapers 1828 - 1906: Tribal Voice of a People in Transition*, wherein the authors state that the formation of the *Cherokee Phoenix* newspaper, and its use of the syllabary specifically, “represented a transition from the Indian to the white man’s way.”¹⁷

Recent scholars have attempted, however, to complicate such characterizations of the syllabary in their work. The impact of Sequoyah's mission to indigenize communication styles through his invention of the syllabary, as well as the ways in which it revolutionized Cherokee education and literacy, has become a popular topic among scholars of literature, linguistics, and anthropology. Peter Wogan, for example, argued in an article titled “Perceptions of European Literacy in Early Contact Situations” that past historians tended to exaggerate Native Americans’

¹⁵ Margaret Bender, *Signs of Cherokee Culture: Sequoyah's Syllabary in Eastern Cherokee Life* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 25.

¹⁶ John Ridge, *Letter to Albert Gallatin*, February 27, 1826. in *Cherokee Removal: A Brief History with Documents*, eds. Theda Perdue and Michael Green (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2005), 35 - 44.

¹⁷ Holland and Pate, *Cherokee Newspapers*, 13.

fascination with European writing, many playing into exoticized stereotypes concerning Native people's worldviews as based in notions of the mystic.¹⁸ This trend is perhaps most relevant to the popularized 'talking leaves' narrative that is often attributed by both scholars and popular historians to Sequoyah's perspective on the power of the written word. The story of the "miracle of talking leaves," as one scholar puts it, often suggests that Sequoyah noticed how white men were able to communicate using symbols written on pieces of paper and that he called these pieces of paper 'talking leaves' because they were seemingly speaking to the reader.¹⁹ While the concept of 'talking leaves' is prevalent in connection to these histories, no primary source can directly account for its legitimacy. Despite this, numerous monographs have cited it within their accounts of Sequoyah and the creation of the Cherokee syllabary.

Sequoyah's creation contributed to the image of a Cherokee society and community that superficially seemed akin to white communities, further encouraging the characterization of the 'civilized' Cherokee to take root within the American imagination. Scholar Margaret Bender takes a more nuanced approach to the syllabary during this era in her book *Signs of Cherokee Culture: Sequoyah's Syllabary in Eastern Cherokee Life*, stating that it stood "between the reinforcement of a hierarchy and its dismantling; between self-definition and external categorization; between independence and nationalism on the one hand and assimilation on the other."²⁰ The syllabary was not simply a way to bring the Cherokee language into the new century; it was a tool of Cherokee design capable of supporting tribal interests, whatever their form.

¹⁸ Peter Wogan, "Perceptions of European Literacy in Early Contact Situations" *Ethnohistory* 41, (1994): 407 - 429

¹⁹ Rennard Strickland, *Fire and the Spirits: Cherokee Law from Clan to Court*. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1975), 105.

²⁰ Bender, *Signs of Cherokee Culture*, 25.

Ellen Cushman's notable work, *The Cherokee Syllabary: Writing the People's Perseverance*, developed such ideas further. Cushman's study, which challenged readers to reposition their perspective of the syllabary away from alphabetic confines, revealed how the tool "enabled the Cherokees to weave foreign ideas about governments and religions into the fabric of everyday language and life"—something readily seen in the pages of the *Phoenix*.²¹ According to Cushman, the adaptability and power of this new tool not only made possible the tribe's continued existence in times of political conflict, but it also quickly "became a vehicle for and symbol of tribal sovereignty."²² Works such as Cushman's and Bender's speak to how the syllabary, despite being co-opted for assimilative purposes, ultimately gave many Cherokees a way to discuss, debate, and distribute their thoughts and ideas in a way that was inherently their own.²³ While such studies provide new and essential ways to examine and understand the syllabary's significance in Cherokee society and culture during the Removal era, they too, unfortunately, fall short in examining critical language sources like that of the *Cherokee Phoenix*.

Although one finds little trouble today locating scholarly works that address the syllabary in great detail, literature dealing with the Cherokee language and its importance to historic literary productions is far rarer. One of the only studies of this kind is Mary and Howard Merediths' *Reflections on Cherokee Literary Expressions*, wherein the authors argue that the Cherokee language "is the single most important element of [Cherokee] literary expression since

²¹ Ellen Cushman, *The Cherokee Syllabary: Writing the People's Perseverance* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011), 10.

²² *Ibid.*, 16.

²³ New works that discuss the influential power of the syllabary include James W. Parins, *Literacy and Intellectual Life in the Cherokee Nation, 1820-1906* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2013); Gregory Smithers, *The Cherokee Diaspora: An Indigenous History of Migration, Resettlement, and Identity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015); Timothy Sandefur, "Sequoyah and the Vital Nature of the Written Word" *The Objective Standard* 13, no. 3 (2018), 53 - 69.

the creation of the Sequoyah syllabary.”²⁴ Central to the Merediths’ study is the assertion that with Cherokee language use also comes the implementation of the Cherokee worldview, as the two cannot be separated. When approaching Cherokee language literature, the authors argued that one must account for the deficiencies of the English language perspective to capture the intricacies held within the Cherokee language. This type of approach, they argued, tends to limit one’s understanding without the proper “perception of the living essence of the [Cherokee] literature itself.”²⁵

When specifically considering the *Cherokee Phoenix*’s bilingual content, the Merediths’ examination is particularly relevant and useful. In their study they note that when comparing Cherokee literature written in English to Cherokee literature written in the Cherokee language, that the two do not “speak the same vocabulary.”²⁶ If the long-held assumption that the *Phoenix*’s bilingual content consists solely of word-for-word translations is, in fact, valid, according to the Merediths’ analysis one would still find irreconcilable differences between the two versions in that the use of English language divorces one’s word from the unique worldview enacted through the use of Cherokee language.

In his celebrated book *Our Fire Survives the Storm: A Cherokee Literary History* (which examines English language Cherokee literature), Daniel Heath Justice pushes back on such arguments asserting that when it comes to the use of English in comparison to Cherokee that “*difference* isn’t necessarily synonymous with *deficiency*.”²⁷ Speaking to the manner in which he approached his own research, Justice states,

²⁴ Mary Ellen Meredith and Howard L. Meredith. *Reflections on Cherokee Literary Expression*. (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2003), 1.

²⁵ Meredith, *Reflections on Cherokee Literary Expression*, 18.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Daniel Heath Justice, *Our Fire Survives the Storm: A Cherokee Literary History*. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), 12.

Although the English language was often imposed on Native peoples, many Cherokees eagerly embraced it as another tool for decolonization and access to social, political, and economic resources. [The use of English language was] a primary means of meaningful expression for many Cherokees; rather than viewing this linguistic reality as a disability that inevitably separates us from any understanding of what it is to be Cherokee, this study presumes that there are different expressive ways of being Cherokee that doesn't require a rejection of one or the other.²⁸

While careful not to suggest that attention to the Cherokee language is not a vital and necessary pursuit for those interested in examining Cherokee worldviews within literary expressions, Justice argues that at the same time that scholars cannot dismiss the same kind of expressions that took form in English. Contrary to the Merediths' suggestion, he argues that "Cherokee literature in English is deeply rooted in indigenouslyness."²⁹ Justice's work contends that English language-based Cherokee Literature represents "more than just a concession to the linguistic violence of an oppressive invader culture," but instead "like the Cherokee language itself, is a powerful reflection of self-determination and agency by people who are deeply invested in the historical, genealogical, geographic, and cosmological significance of all that it is to be Cherokee."³⁰ Although neither Justice nor the Merediths connect their examinations to the *Phoenix* directly, the arguments made in both works concerning the factor of language use and expression remain extremely valuable when considering the nature of the bilingual content within the *Phoenix*.

Methodology

There are many ways in which the story of the *Cherokee Phoenix* can be told. For some, Boudinot becomes its central character. For others, the story of the newspaper simply acts as a prelude to the forced removals that would follow its final publication. While both indeed

²⁸ Justice, *Our Fire Survives the Storm*, 12.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 13.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

constitute a significant part of the *Phoenix*'s narrative, for this thesis, language takes center stage. The bulk of the research for this project, therefore, consisted of completing translations of Cherokee language content from the publication. Approaching this kind of research from the unique position of both a member of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians and a current second language Cherokee learner, I was uniquely fortunate in the resources available to me to support my interest in translating parts of the *Phoenix*. As a language learner who is far from fluent in the language, I knew that by engaging in translation-based research, I would be dependent on fluent speakers to complete the bulk of my research. Moreover, considering the sheer amount of time translation work typically requires, I was acutely aware at the inception of this project that the work would be grounded in community-based collaboration. I was fortunate that I came into this project with strong relationships and connections to both first-language Cherokee speakers, as well as various academics and linguists who were already engaging with language work within the community. Without the support and participation of such individuals, this research simply would not have been possible.

With the above considerations in mind, all involved in the production of this thesis felt attempting to translate every piece of Cherokee language in the *Phoenix* would simply not be possible in the time frame in which the research process had to be completed. Therefore, due to time constraints, limited resources, and the community-based nature of this research, only a select portion of the Cherokee content from the *Phoenix* was translated. In partnership with Cherokee speakers and the advisors for this project, I elected to identify significant moments wherein the newspaper's Editor, Elias Boudinot, and other community leaders were using the newspaper to directly respond to particular political and social issues concerning the tribe's conflict with the state of Georgia and the issue of removal. Though small in number, these few

translations provide significant insights into the publication that inspire new questions about the newspaper, the language utilized within it, and how both relate to broader questions about Cherokee society during the era and the political climate in which Cherokees lived.

To aid in the translation process, I compiled high-quality scans of every issue of the *Cherokee Phoenix* to fill in missing or illegible issues published through the Digital Library of Georgia's online collection of the *Phoenix*.³¹ Both Georgia's digital repository and the scanned images gave the research and translation process high mobility, meaning that speakers and myself could meet in virtually any setting to complete a translation. While the published issues were more often than not extremely legible, I found early on in the research stage that many speakers preferred editable phonetic versions of the articles when translating. Because of this, the translation process typically occurred as follows. Once a Cherokee language article was selected for full translation, an image of the article would then be processed by a Tesseract optical character recognition (OCR) software. The OCR program would identify and pull the syllabary characters from the scanned image to create an editable text document. The syllabic text from this document would then be put into a transliteration program that would generate the syllabic text into Latin phonetics. The phonetic translation produced from this program often had numerous errors; therefore, manual editing of the phonetic version was more often than not required. Following these steps, the Cherokee language speakers would be provided with all three versions of the selected article to begin translation (the original scan, the OCR syllabic text, and the phonetic rendering). From this point, the first-language speakers and I would begin the

³¹ *Cherokee Phoenix*. Georgia Historic Newspapers. Digital Library of Georgia. <https://gahistoricnewspapers.galileo.usg.edu/lccn/sn83020866/>.

translation process with the speakers collaborating to translate the Cherokee language word for word with myself documenting in English their translation in a separate document.

After a complete translated version was produced, the speakers and I would do a second-round translation, often rearranging words to format sentences that followed a more traditional English gloss. Given how the Cherokee language is structured, most English speakers would find some sentences extremely difficult to understand if the content were to be translated word-for-word from Cherokee into English. One major factor that contributes to such translation difficulty between the two languages is that within the Cherokee language, many words represent entire concepts that require far more extensive explanation when translated to fit into an English gloss. Therefore, some sections of the translations made required significant editing for flow and general comprehension when presented in English. Such alterations were made at the discretion of the author and the speakers involved in the translation process.

A key and vital aspect of the translation process was the participation of first-language speakers of both modern dialects of the Cherokee language— the Overhill and Middle dialects. The majority of the language printed in the *Phoenix* was done so in what many today would recognize as the Overhill dialect of the Cherokee language, most often associated with the dialect of Cherokee language spoken in the Cherokee Nation and United Keetoowah Band in Oklahoma. In an effort to create and ensure accurate translations from the *Phoenix*, speakers from both dialect groups participated and were consulted in every step of the translation process. Wiggins Blackfox, a first language Cherokee speaker from the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians and current Cherokee language consultant at Western Carolina University, and Tom Belt, a first language speaker from the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma and current Cherokee language instructor at Stanford University, both participated as language consultants for this project. Both

Blackfox and Belt felt it was necessary to have speakers of both dialects present during the translations as the Cherokee content in the *Phoenix* often contains words that have, over time, fallen out of widespread use within Cherokee speaking communities or whose pronunciations have changed slightly since the newspaper's first publication 191 years ago. Considering the polysynthetic nature of the Cherokee language, meaning that complete sentences or thoughts are often represented in a single word or morpheme comprised of various sound elements, the slightest change in pronunciation or dialect was a critical factor that had to be accounted for throughout the translation process.

Thesis Structure

The translations of the Cherokee language articles from the *Phoenix* represent not only the central focus of this thesis but also the most significant contribution of this research. Centered around the uncovered content revealed through the Cherokee translations, this thesis consists of three thematic chapters separated by historically significant moments in the story of the *Cherokee Phoenix* and the Cherokee removal. Each chapter draws specific attention to how Cherokee leaders understood and made use of the *Cherokee Phoenix* in unique moments within the Cherokee's battle against removal, each respective chapter featuring choice translations that act as centerpieces for such analysis. Due to his role in the creation of the *Phoenix*, as well as his influence over the publication as it developed, Elias Boudinot becomes an increasingly prominent figure as the study progresses through each chapter. Although a clear product of the interests of the Cherokee government, the *Cherokee Phoenix* was equally a product of Boudinot and must be examined as such.

The first chapter, titled "*This Day is Ours*": *The Birth of the Cherokee Press*," addresses how Boudinot, in his role as Editor and early advocate for the *Cherokee Phoenix*, communicated

and outlined the purpose and overall mission of the newspaper to both white and Cherokee readers in both English and Cherokee within the first published edition of the *Phoenix* printed on February 21st, 1828. Through the examination of two editorials presented bi-lingually within the first edition of the newspaper, I argue that the content and messaging of the Cherokee version when compared to the partnered English version showcases a dramatically different editorial mission for the *Phoenix*. Boudinot intentionally alters and shapes the editorial originally printed in English to speak to the concerns, interests, and cultural perspectives of the Cherokee national government and community when presented in the Cherokee language. Beyond disproving the common conception that most, if not all, Cherokee in the *Phoenix* was mirrored translations of that which appeared in English, these early examples reveal the extent to which Boudinot as Editor utilized the Cherokee language to create a true paper for the people that allowed Cherokees to engage in a dialogue between themselves outside of the gaze of white Americans through the employment of their traditional language.

The second chapter, titled “*They Believe the Earth Encircles Them*”: *Georgia and the Growing Threat of Removal*,” highlights the various ways the broader Cherokee community made use of the *Cherokee Phoenix* in moments of political, social, and cultural turmoil and transformation. The first editorial examined provides as an example of how some Cherokee leaders used the *Phoenix* to disseminate information throughout the Nation. The nature of the language utilized within the specific editorial is extraordinary. In the speech delivered by a traditional headman to the Governor and legislators of Georgia, the headman enacted an extremely elevated and formal version of Cherokee language most often used exclusively in moments and spaces of profound importance and significance within traditional Cherokee cultural environments. The Arkansas letters first translated by the Kilpatrick’s, reviewed by Belt

and Blackfox for this thesis, are examined in this chapter as well. These letters reveal how the newspaper was also used as a medium for communication by Cherokees following the tribe's first geographical separation in the late 1820s when a small group of Cherokees voluntarily emigrated west. The chapter ends with an examination of a third article from the *Phoenix*, published in 1830, wherein Boudinot communicates words of caution to the Cherokee community as federal troops entered the Nation's northern territory known to be home to significant gold deposits. The article indicates that the Cherokee portions of the *Phoenix* were not only used to share relevant news affecting the community but were also spaces within the newspaper that leaders utilized to communicate their personal concerns and words of advice to their people.

The third chapter, titled "*Do Not Let Your Hearts Weaken*": *The Cherokees' Internal Battle Against Removal*," documents how Boudinot discussed the state of the Nation and the issue of removal to the Cherokee populace in the wake of the Indian Removal Act and the subsequent Cherokee Supreme Court cases. Following the decisions of the *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* and *Worcester v. Georgia* cases in 1831 and 1832, the question of removal for Cherokee leaders was no longer an issue of *if* removal would occur, but rather, when and how it would take place for the Cherokee people. As the translated articles included in this chapter suggest, a major issue for Cherokee leaders involved in the defense of Cherokee sovereignty both during and after such battles would be the issue of Cherokee unity. In the first article examined, published directly following the passage of the Indian Removal Act, Boudinot leans on the words of former President George Washington as a means to remind the community of the long-standing relationship between the U.S. government and their people. In the second article discussed, published after the *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* decision, Boudinot urges his people not to

become discouraged by the decision. He argues that the outcome of the case would ultimately prove to benefit the Nation only if the people remained committed and adamant about their territorial claims. In the final translated article examined in the chapter, published after the Supreme Court's *Worcester v. Georgia* mandate was sent to Georgia's leaders, Boudinot shares a message of caution to his Cherokee readers. The articles included in this chapter showcase Boudinot's initial responses and immediate meditations over such questions and concerns as he shared them directly with his fellow Cherokee people.

CHAPTER ONE: “THIS DAY IS OURS”: THE BIRTH OF THE CHEROKEE PRESS

In order to fully appreciate the *Cherokee Phoenix*, one must first understand the context in which it was born. At the turn of the nineteenth century, the Cherokee people found themselves in a unique position within their southern homeland. Still recovering from the events of the Revolutionary War that fueled tensions both within Cherokee society and between the tribe and the new United States, leaders of the tribe entered into a new era of governance wherein the fate of the tribe’s autonomy and sovereignty was in near-constant question. Due to their support of the British forces during the war, the Cherokees subsequently became the targets of increased hostility from some American leaders that viewed the tribe as a defeated people and their territory under the dominion of the United States by right of conquest.¹ As scholar Tim Allen Garrison writes, “the attitude of conquest assumed by many Americans only exacerbated the animosities between Indians and settlers, and the postrevolutionary period was marked by continuous conflict on the young nation’s western edges.”² After continuously failing to prevent their citizens from illegally seizing and settling Native lands west of the Appalachian mountains, just as the British did before them, U.S. officials elected to meet with the Cherokee and several other southeastern tribes in an effort to negotiate the terms of their new diplomatic relationship. The Treaty of Hopewell, signed in November of 1785 by Cherokee leaders, established a formal peaceful relationship between the tribe and the United States. Although the treaty defined clear tribal territorial lines and recognized Cherokee power to punish and expel intruders who

¹ Tim Allen Garrison, *The Legal Ideology of Removal: The Southern Judiciary and the Sovereignty of Native Americans*. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2002; 2010), 15.

² Ibid.

attempted to settle on Cherokee lands, settlers from neighboring states such as North Carolina and Georgia pushed into Cherokee territory without pause.

Increasingly concerned about the need to reaffirm their territorial control, Cherokee leaders met again with U.S. officials just five years later in July of 1791 to sign what would become known as the Treaty of Holston. Along with the designation of new territorial lines and a mutual agreement that no U.S. citizens were to settle Cherokee lands nor hunt on them, a unique provision added to the treaty stated that the United States agreed to aid in the promotion and conversion of the Cherokee to an agriculturally based society. The provision became one of the first significant developments in what would later develop into the United States' 'civilization' policy toward Native Nations during the early nineteenth century. This agenda would prove to define the relationship between Native peoples and the U.S. government for decades to follow.³

As a result of such developments, Cherokee culture faced continuous sanctions from U.S. leaders and missionaries alike in the years following the signing of the treaty. Government officials and Christian missionaries entered Cherokee territory and together promoted what would have been at the time drastic changes to traditional forms of subsistence, spirituality, and familial structures. Despite the heavy pressure to assimilate the tribe during this era, many Cherokee families made only minor changes to their social, cultural, economic practices— the extent of their conversion most often limited to the adoption of tools, products, and agricultural goods to support their family homesteads. Concurrently, a select portion of Cherokee families (many of whom intermarried with whites) transformed their lifestyles dramatically. Such individuals often pursued some level of higher education, became devout followers of Christianity, and actively sought to become active participants in the Southern economy by

³ Theda Perdue and Michael Green, *The Cherokee Removal: A Brief History with Documents*. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2005), 11 - 12.

establishing large farms— a practice made possible and profitable often through the adoption of slavery.

The assimilation ‘progress’ made by these unique Cherokee families, however, had different outcomes than white advocates perhaps initially expected. As historian Clinton Ray Carroll explains, “instead of producing individuals completely assimilated to Euro-American ways, this process produced fiercely patriotic Cherokee nationalists.”⁴ Such Cherokee nationalists like Elias Boudinot and John Ross, both armed with the tools of English language, heightened social mobility through education, and a shared complex understanding of the American political and legal system, became prominent and essential actors in the tribes’ first steps toward active legal and political resistance against American intrusion and maltreatment. It remains important to stress, however, that the proximity to whiteness such Cherokee men and others like them held that afforded them certain privileges often out of reach to their ‘full-blooded’ Cherokee relatives did not make them any less Cherokee at the core of their being. Their ‘whiteness,’ as well as their assimilated lifestyles, did not immediately relegate them to a place of ignorance when it came to traditional Cherokee values and morals, nor did it erase their connection to their indigeneity. As historian Andrew Denson writes, such individuals “seem never to have thought of themselves as anything but Cherokee. White ‘blood’ did not wash away Cherokee identity, nor did formal education inevitably erode it.”⁵ Along with scholars like Theda Perdue, Denson argues that in order to advance and complicate the traditional narrative associated with the experiences and worldviews of such individuals, terms like “mixed-bloods” must be rejected by historians in favor of more appropriate and applicable terms such as

⁴ Clinton Roy Carrol. *Re-Imagining Community: Political Ecology and Indigenous State Formation in the Cherokee Nation*. (University of California, Berkeley, 2011), 33.

⁵ Andrew Denson, *Demanding the Cherokee Nation: Indian Autonomy and American Culture, 1830 - 1900*. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004), 19.

“bicultural” that better represent the lived experiences and worldviews of men like Ross and Boudinot.

As issues of territorial intrusion continued to persist and the concern over the tribe’s strength against the dominance of the United States government and its states in the region continued to grow, these bicultural Cherokees became central actors in the Cherokee’s historic struggle for tribal sovereignty, many often acting as intermediaries between traditional Cherokee leadership and United States government figures. As the threat of removal became increasingly real for many Cherokees living near the borderlands of Georgia and Tennessee, many bicultural Cherokee leaders, in particular, understood that the fate of the tribe depended on the recognition and support of its legitimate claim to its traditional homelands and political autonomy. Their concerns turned toward community organizing, and in July of 1827, delegates from multiple Cherokee districts met in the newly formed capital town of New Echota to create what would be the first formal Constitution of the Cherokee Nation. Following the appointment of John Ross as the Nation’s first Principal Chief, the formalization of the Cherokee government and law ignited the growth of Cherokee nationalism that would define the social and political spheres of the Nation throughout the next decade.

Utilizing the format of the U.S. Constitution to clearly outline and demonstrate the claims and rights of the Nation, Cherokee leaders communicated to the U.S. government and its citizens their dedication to curtailing the ever-increasing intrusion of whites on Cherokee lands. Following the formation of the constitution, the Nation’s National Council established a code of laws that created provisions that sought to limit the involvement of whites within the Nation and put additional measures into place that specifically attempted to strengthen Cherokee control of land. One statute, for example, made the unauthorized selling of land to the United States

government punishable by death. Additional laws stipulated that land could only be transferred between citizens of the Nation, making all transfers to “citizens of the adjoining states” illegal.⁶

Despite such legislative developments, Cherokee leaders remained in constant fear and uncertainty when it came to the question of removal. In an 1826 letter to a United States government official, Albert Gallatin, ‘bicultural’ Cherokee leader John Ridge wrote,

It is true we Govern ourselves, but yet we live in fear. We are urged by these strangers to make room for their settlements & go farther west. Our National existence is suspended on the faith and honor of the U. States, alone. Their convenience may cut this asunder, & with a little faint struggle we may cease to be.⁷

Along with concerns about their relationship with their American neighbors, Cherokee Nation leaders also dealt with anxieties about their own community. The political developments initiated by such leaders were not enthusiastically welcomed in all concerns of the Cherokee world. The adoption of the more Euro-American centralized government structure represented a considerable move away from the traditional autonomous town and clan-based Cherokee organization and governing model. As U.S. government officials and missionaries alike encouraged drastic changes to traditional Cherokee ways of life, many ‘traditionalists’ within the tribe reacted adversely to their own people instituting changes to their traditional model of governance. White Path, a traditional Cherokee leader who fought alongside Dragging Canoe during the American Revolution, championed a “counterrevolution” against the National Council’s efforts to form a constitution for the Nation after fears circulated amongst traditional leaders that their powers would be limited and authority undermined by such legislation.⁸ As leaders of the Cherokee Nation began to reconcile the tensions building within their community,

⁶ *Letter to Albert Gallatin*, February 27, 1826.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ William McLoughlin, *Cherokee Renaissance in the New Republic*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1896), 390.

the need for a unifying voice to foster a sense of solidarity among the people became increasingly apparent. Moreover, as disputes with neighboring states over land and resources continued to develop, Cherokee leaders promptly recognized the pressing need for public representation for the Nation that could efficiently share the perspective of the tribe on a national scale. The *Cherokee Phoenix* would be their answer.

The power of the press was not lost on Cherokee leaders. Having spent significant time in Washington D.C. and other major cities as part of delegation parties, a vast majority of Cherokee headmen and political actors were acutely aware of the effectiveness of the press to represent the views and concerns of one's community, as well as its usefulness as a medium in garnering public support and sympathy for one's cause. By the mid-1820s, such leaders were not ignorant of the cogency of the press in providing "a means of seeking and shaping the public's favor for a cause."⁹ When the National Council convened in 1825, one of the most pressing matters on their agenda was the proposal to form the inaugural Cherokee Nation weekly news publication. As their relationship with the state Georgia became increasingly tumultuous, Cherokee leaders felt it imperative that their perspectives and viewpoints considering land disputes, Cherokee government autonomy, as well as the prospect of removal, were represented on a national scale. Following the allocation of \$1,500 of tribal funds (nearly one-fifth of the council's yearly income) to buy the necessary equipment and to build an appropriate space to host the publication, the Cherokee National Council selected the young Elias Boudinot (who was at the time serving at the council's clerk) to solicit funds for the support of the newspaper throughout major cities across the United States. In these cities, Boudinot distinguished himself as a passionate advocate for Cherokee interests and proved to be a remarkable asset to the National

⁹ Holland and Pete, *Cherokee Newspapers*, 19.

Council's strategy to gather monetary support from sympathetic Christian philanthropists for the intended newspaper.

Born into what many considered to be a 'progressive' Cherokee family in the northwest corner of the Cherokee territory in present-day north Georgia, 'Galagina' or 'the Buck' (Elias Boudinot's true name), was among the first generation of Cherokee youth to be formally educated. Along with his younger brother, 'Degataga' (Stand Watie), and cousin 'Ganvdatlegino' (John Ridge), Galagina attended the local Moravian missionary school where his natural abilities were immediately recognized. Galagina's and Ganvdatlegino's aptitude and expressed ambition at the mission school landed both a spot, on the recommendation of the Moravians, at the American Board's boarding school located in Cornwall, Connecticut in 1818. There the boys adopted their English names, Elias Boudinot and John Ridge, fell in love and married two white Cornwall women to much public dissent, and completed their formal education, becoming two of the most-highly educated Cherokee men of their time. Many missionaries and philanthropists celebrated the accomplishments of both young men as successful examples of the civilization agenda. As scholar Gregory Smithers explains, both Boudinot and Ridge represented the exact "type of pupils that missionaries envisioned would lead the Indian race into a 'civilized' future. They were bright, possessed mixed racial ancestry (although [they] insisted they were 'full-blood' Cherokees), and descended from 'leading men of the Nation.'"¹⁰ Both Boudinot and Ridge, however, were equally products (as well as active members) of the Cherokee culture. As speakers of the language and born participants of the traditional clan-system, both men carried knowledge of deep cultural significance and each possessed meaningful familial and social connections within the community. The pair's

¹⁰ Smithers, *The Cherokee Diaspora*, 65.

education, both cultural and western, and their family's standing within the Cherokee community easily positioned the young men to become leading voices for the Cherokee people, a role both would enthusiastically take on in the following decades.

Following his return to Cherokee territory in 1826, Boudinot was named the first official Editor of the new Cherokee newspaper. A year later, in 1827, Boudinot released a prospectus for the anticipated newspaper to be circulated throughout the country to inform the public of the central goals of what would soon be known as the *Cherokee Phoenix*. Boudinot outlined four fundamental principles for which the *Phoenix* would aspire to print relevant content in both Cherokee and English. First, the documentation of government and legal documents of the Nation; second, “account[s] of the manners and customs of the Cherokees, and their progress in Education, Religion, and the arts of civilized life”; third, timely news and information; and fourth, various articles “calculated to promote Literature, Civilization, and Religion among the Cherokees.”¹¹ Following a minor dispute over compensation and numerous delays in procuring the proper equipment and supplies to physically produce the publication, three years after the National Council's initial declaration, the first issue of the *Cherokee Phoenix* left the press house on February 21st, 1828.

Introducing the *Cherokee Phoenix* to the People

Of the four goals outlined by Boudinot in his prospectus for the *Phoenix*, the first was the most ardently fulfilled throughout the tenure of the newspaper. The laws and government documents of the Nation, some dating as far back as 1808, filled the front pages of *Phoenix* for months— the Constitution of the Cherokee Nation being the first of such documents printed. Published in both Cherokee and English, Boudinot (who early on fulfilled both the role of Editor

¹¹ *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 28, 1828.

and primary translator for the *Phoenix*) employed a theoretically exact translation approach for such documents. Following the parallel English and Cherokee versions of the Cherokee Constitution printed in the first edition of the *Phoenix*, one reads a nearly mirrored conversation both in language as well as in visual representation. Considering the legal nature of the information presented to the reader, which leaves no natural space for personal nor individual interpretation or opinion, it is unsurprising that the Editor utilized this method of language translation for this particular content in the newspaper. A Cherokee language concept called *gowohiltanv'i*, meaning 'going over,' is attributed to this particular type of translation work. The concept outlines the philosophy that with documents of this nature, the translator is expected to remain as precisely to the original material as possible.¹² Examples of Cherokee language texts that have employed this type of translation include the Cherokee version of the Bible (translated by missionary Samuel Worcester with the support of Boudinot) and other various Cherokee language hymn and music books. Although the 'going over' approach is associated with literal translation work, it remains important to note that it is nearly impossible to produce word-for-word translations between the Cherokee and English languages. While one can obtain a certain level of exactness when interpreting basic information between the two languages, as scholar Sara Hopkins notes, "words and phrases from the source language [can often] fail to form perfect equivalences to words in the target language."¹³

When reviewing the sheer number of documents published in this manner within the *Phoenix*, and in recognizing the time and energy the translation process required (something Boudinot himself often noted in his own writings), one must question why those who produced the *Phoenix* were so committed to ensuring the bilingual representation of such content in the

¹² Hopkins, "'Going Over' and Coming Back," 5.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 5 - 6.

newspaper. In *Fire and the Spirits: Cherokee Law from Clan to Court*, historian Rennard

Strickland writes that,

the legal system of the Cherokees as set forth in the printed laws had great value to the tribe. Whenever the civilization of the Cherokees was at issue, the written law was paraded forth as final and indisputable evidence of Cherokee accomplishments. [...] The widespread distribution of these laws was part of the deliberate campaign to influence attitude toward Cherokee achievement.¹⁴

Having such laws so predominantly represented in the pages of the *Phoenix* showcased to white readers, especially, the considerable transformation that Cherokee governing had undergone, effectively demonstrating the extent to which Cherokee leaders were committed to protecting their Nation. Having such laws presented in the Cherokee language also provided a vital legal education to many Cherokees who, prior to the implementation of the syllabary and the print of the newspaper, would have only known said laws as they were distributed and shared orally by headmen in their respective communities. For both white and Cherokee readers, the *Phoenix* was, in many ways, a “periodical treatise on Cherokee law.”¹⁵ For the latter, a legal education that would become increasingly vital as the tribes’ relationship with Georgia and the United States became progressively contentious as they moved into the decade of the 1830s.

Similar to the cultural concept of *gawohitlanv’i* that is associated with the process of literal translation often employed with the legal and government documents published in the *Phoenix*, the concept of *ahnelatanv’i*, loosely defined as ‘interpretation,’ is typically associated with a written product that “privileges the translator’s perspective on the information being conveyed.”¹⁶ Articles that are products of interpretative translation within the early editions of *Cherokee Phoenix* present perhaps the most interesting insights into the meaning and motivation

¹⁴ Strickland, *Fire and the Spirits*, 118.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 111.

¹⁶ Hopkins, ““Going Over” and Coming Back,” 4.

guiding language use within the newspaper. The following pair of articles are prime examples of *ahnelatanv'i* at work within the pages of the *Phoenix*. In the English version titled “TO THE PUBLIC,” Boudinot addresses the readership of the *Cherokee Phoenix* directly for the first time, detailing the publication’s overall mission and goals. He states,

Let the public but consider our motives, and the design of this paper, which is, the benefit of the Cherokees, and we are sure, those who wish well to the Indian race, will keep out of view all the failings and deficiencies of the Editor, and give a prompt support to the first paper ever published in the Indian country, [...] it is certainly a laudable undertaking, which the Christian, the Patriot, and the Philanthropist will not be ashamed to aid. [...] Those therefore, who are engaged for the good of the Indians of every tribe, and who pray that salvation, peace, and the comforts of civilized life may be extended to every Indian fire side on this continent, will consider us as co-workers together in their benevolent labors. To them we make our appeal for patronage, and pledge ourselves to encourage and assist them, in whatever appears to be for the benefit of the Aborigines.¹⁷

This section best captures the essence of Boudinot’s first article. When read thoroughly, the article paints the *Phoenix* as a white-serving, pro-assimilationist production that was also, undoubtedly, a product of Cherokee nationalism. Framed by Boudinot as a tool of assistance to white interests (particularly regarding missionization), the first address positions the newspaper as a critical element in the continued efforts to fully assimilate and ‘civilize’ the Cherokee and therefore prop up their national project in the eyes of American society. With a majority of his opening address dedicated to celebrating the good that he believed the civilization agenda had done for Cherokee society, Boudinot also repeatedly pointed to the need for outside monetary support to ensure the survival of the publication so that this particular agenda of ‘progress’ may continue to flourish in Cherokee country. Despite the *Phoenix*’s clear Cherokee nationalistic political agenda, only a small fraction of his first address concerns the political issues facing the tribe— Boudinot commenting only once that the views of the tribes’ majority in this respect had

¹⁷ *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828.

been “misrepresented.”¹⁸ It is clear that the central purpose of this passage is to gain support, both financially and in public sentiment, from the *Phoenix*’s white readers.

The partnering Cherokee version of this opening message, however, indicates an entirely separate editorial mission. Here Boudinot speaks directly to his fellow Cherokees, communicating the significance and purpose of the creation of the newspaper as intended and imagined by both traditional and governmental Cherokee leaders. Boudinot begins the statement in the Cherokee language, translated as follows,

For a long time Native Americans have thought about how they want something good to happen for them, and the reputable people of our region, for good to happen to us. If they could print a paper of our place and that would be in our own language— this is what the leaders and national intellectuals have thought and the councils of our eight districts. This newspaper comes forth carrying the name above, I have been sent by our council to print. Now we begin this my friends and my Cherokee.¹⁹

Immediately with this introduction, a new conversation emerges from the pages of the *Phoenix*, one that takes place privately between Cherokee people through the use of their language. It is important to note that Boudinot makes a point to establish the newspaper as a direct product of both those leading the new national Cherokee government as well as the traditional district leaders. Moreover, Boudinot deliberately makes a point to introduce the newspaper as something community-based and led. In his opening statement, Boudinot offers the paper as a solution and answer to the community’s hope that ‘good’ things would come to them. With the statement ‘now we begin this,’ Boudinot positions the *Phoenix* as a device for the community to shape and use for their collective benefit. He continues,

Carried here can be heard all the things that are said, the news that is needed. [...] God willing this people’s government story will be heard by an increasing crowd. And their beliefs and perspectives will be recorded as they happen. [...] The Cherokee Phoenix will be heard. You’ll hear about things just like white people do. It will be a great help to us vis-a-

¹⁸ *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828.

¹⁹ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828. No. 1 (Appendix 1)

vis those who are unaware of the state that we are in and why they discriminate against us and the land that they are always asking us for.²⁰

In recognizing the effectiveness of the press within American society and its ability to streamline the dispersal of information, Boudinot argued that the same format would be a beneficial tactic for the Cherokee community to employ as political issues over land, sovereignty, and culture continued to threaten the existence of the Nation. In this context, the purpose guiding the formation of the *Cherokee Phoenix* is understood not primarily as a tool for assimilation (as directly suggested by the English version of the address), but rather, can be seen and understood as a means to ensure accurate representation of the tribe within the general American public.

In one of the most intriguing comments that appear in the Cherokee version of the *Phoenix*'s mission, Boudinot states,

This day is ours and now the Cherokee Phoenix will be heard and the news will go into Native homes all over. And all that can help us, the good that can happen to us, I will think the Cherokee Phoenix will tell it. [...] The prominent people thought that it would be a good idea for us to learn this printing we have in hand and we won't lose anything by it. There are only a few of us around here and they always want to take us out of our lands, it is clearly evident in what the Georgians tirelessly say. You will come to understand all of these issues when you read the Cherokee Phoenix.²¹

In the section above, Boudinot outlines the central motivation of the newspaper and the intended impact it would have for Cherokee readers with particular emphasis on the goals to inform the Cherokee people and prepare the Nation to engage in critical dialogue, to resist oppressive policies, and most importantly, to inspire advocacy for the rights of Cherokees and their government both within and outside of their tribal boundary. No successful resistance happens when a community is uninformed, and within his first address, Boudinot communicates the importance of this to his fellow Cherokee people. In the final section of his first address in the

²⁰ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828. No. 1. (Appendix 1)

²¹ Ibid.

Cherokee language, Boudinot urges his fellow Cherokees to support the mission of the *Phoenix* as a community and to recognize its importance in the context of their developing political climate. He states,

Now I ask you friends, we must come together to help the Cherokee Phoenix. Let us not disregard it. Do not just let it die. I mention this to you, therefore we all shall hear it. I am Buck.²²

Boudinot's use of his traditional Cherokee name, Galagina (Buck), to conclude his first message to Cherokee readers of the *Phoenix* is significant. Through signing his message with his Cherokee name, Boudinot signified to his people that he, despite his education and social position within the Nation, remained connected and rooted in the Cherokee culture and society. Throughout the existence of the *Cherokee Phoenix* newspaper, Boudinot and other significant individuals such as John Ross consistently used their traditional Cherokee names when addressing the Cherokee community in the language, reinforcing the cultural connection between themselves and the Cherokee populace.

When compared to the partnering statement in English, the Cherokee article reveals that two distinct conversations occurred simultaneously within the first edition of the newspaper. The first dialogue printed in English directed solely toward a white audience and centrally concerned with the topic of civilization and the issue of funding for the publication, and the second printed in the Cherokee language, acted as a rallying call for action, political education, and community buy-in from the Cherokee people. As the related articles above exhibit, to treat the Cherokee representations of bilingual content in the *Phoenix* as translated versions of what appears in English is a significant miscalculation— one that has and continues to result in considerable distortion of the role and nature of Cherokee language content in the *Cherokee Phoenix*.

²² Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828. No. 1. (Appendix 1)

Moreover, the two distinct conversations uncovered above effectively illustrate together the full scope of the *Phoenix*'s mission as originally envisioned by Cherokee leaders. As previously discussed, the paper provided an immediate solution to the need for public representation and the education of both non-Indians and Cherokees alike on issues concerning removal and the political struggle with the state of Georgia. Moreover, it also served as a medium that allowed individuals like Boudinot to encourage unity and commitment from the Cherokee community to the Nation's agenda. The need for public representation, however, was a two-fold strategy. Not only did the paper allow the Nation to widely disperse its viewpoints and arguments concerning the various issues related to the prospect of removal, it allowed them to do so in a public manner, on the record, wherein their views could no longer be misrepresented by U.S. officials. As the removal struggle developed over the next eight years, this aspect of the role of the newspaper within the Nation's defense against removal became increasingly vital and was clearly articulated and evident within a number of Cherokee language articles printed in the paper (some of which discussed in the following chapters of this study).

In acknowledging the clear distinctness of the above articles, one must question the extent to which the Cherokee language may have been utilized as a tool to support dissimilar, and even to a certain extent, conflicting goals of the newspaper and its Editor. For example, in his opening Cherokee statement, Boudinot offers the *Phoenix* as an answer to the long held wishes of Native peoples, specifically the Cherokee, for 'good' things to happen to them and their communities. Boudinot's comments within the Cherokee language version of the prospectus indicate that 'good,' in this instance, should be understood in direct connection to issues of sovereignty, autonomy, and the perseverance of Cherokee people and their way of life. This argument, in particular, stands in clear contrast to Boudinot's English version of the prospectus. In the English

article, Boudinot emphasizes the connection between assimilation and any ‘benefit’ the Cherokee would experience as a people and positions the *Phoenix* as a key element for such development. In recognizing the divergent nature of the two arguments, one must question what motivated Boudinot to push forward such contradictory messages within the newspaper’s first edition. Is possible that Boudinot strategically played up the civilization-focused assimilative mission of the *Phoenix* directly to his white readers in hopes of securing their financial support so that he could continue to pursue his primary mission of informing, politically educating, and uniting his people in the defense of their right to autonomy? Or did the Editor, a conflicted and complicated individual himself, simply have paradoxical motivations and visions for the newspaper? Boudinot, on the one hand, projecting an accommodationist agenda he very much believed in, while on the other simultaneously promoting Cherokee autonomy and tribal resistance to American intrusion and injustice. To fully understand such motivations and how they impacted the nature of the *Phoenix* in this respect, particularly to how Boudinot himself influenced it, a more significant amount of Cherokee content from the *Phoenix* must be critically examined. The following chapter provides a look into how both traditional leaders within the community and political figures like Boudinot utilized the *Phoenix* to share their personal views and concerns directly with the Cherokee people through the use of their language.

CHAPTER TWO: “THEY BELIEVE THE EARTH ENCIRCLES THEM”: GEORGIA AND THE GROWING THREAT OF REMOVAL

By the time Elias Boudinot and those involved with the formation of the *Cherokee Phoenix* published their first newspaper in 1828, Georgia was a primary and growing concern for the Cherokee leadership. While citizens from other states such as North Carolina and Tennessee also posed threats to the integrity of Cherokee borderland security and jurisdiction, the state of Georgia and its citizens had maintained a unique aggressiveness toward the Cherokee. Despite the numerous treaty agreements in place between the United States and the Cherokee Nation, Georgia’s citizens continuously broke the tenets of such agreements on the Georgia frontier through illegally entering and settling on Cherokee lands. Citing Georgia’s Compact of 1802 with the United States (formerly known as the *Articles of Agreement and Cession*), Georgia citizens argued that their actions were justified by the portion of the original agreement that stated that the federal government would purchase all Native lands within the contemporary borders of the state in exchange for the state yielding its lands between the Chattahoochee and Mississippi Rivers. The initial agreement made within the compact seemed, at the time of its passage, feasible to most U.S. officials as many assumed that through the civilization process, the Cherokees and Creeks whose ancestral homelands rested within the Georgia territory would relinquish their lands as they progressively became assimilated into more western ways of living.

Following two attempts by federal commissioners to encourage removal west in years prior, Cherokee leaders were, perhaps more than ever, intimately aware of the legitimate threat removal posed to the Nation. The first attempt made by federal officials in 1808, under the guidance of Indian agent Return J. Meigs, ended with what some might have considered a minor

victory for the removal agenda. Offering homes and financial assistance in exchange for their land and their removal to the Arkansas Valley, federal officials urged Cherokee leaders to encourage removal west or, in turn, agree to cede their lands and become citizens of the state. Under Georgia's laws, the latter action would mean, however, that Cherokees would have to accept being relegated to a position of second-class citizenship within the state. While tribal leaders and a vast majority of Cherokees rejected this proposition, a year later, a group of Cherokees signed a removal agreement and promptly migrated west to Arkansas territory. A leader from this newly formed Arkansas group would later write letters for the *Cherokee Phoenix* (included in this chapter under the section titled 'News From the West') that detailed the trials the group faced in the western territory, such letters accentuating the connection said leaders felt to their people remaining in the traditional homelands.

The government's second attempt to initiate removal took place in 1817; their actions met with vehement backlash from the Cherokee National Council after the leaders' initial refusal to negotiate was subverted by a secondary agreement signed under false pretenses with rebel chiefs acting outside the bounds of their authority. Although Cherokee leaders attempted to repeal the nefarious agreement (which ceded territory in both Tennessee and Georgia, and stipulated that Cherokees remaining in said states had to accept not only American citizenship but also land allotments), they were ultimately unsuccessful. Embittered by the federal government's inability to secure the prompt removal of all Cherokees and Creeks in the region, Georgia state senate leaders convened in December of 1823 to present a formal memorial demanding the extermination of any remaining Indian land possessions by the federal government. When little progress had been made by 1826, Georgia politicians yet again called on then-President John Quincy Adams to remove all remaining Indians in the region. Through

strategically targeting their efforts on the already much fractured Creek Nation, by the end of 1826, Georgia leaders had successfully secured the removal of the Creeks through pressuring federal officials to sign treaties with tribal leaders by any means necessary. As Creeks began voluntarily leaving the state out of fear of violence, and finally through forced removals at the hands of the federal government, Cherokees stood as the final barrier between Georgia and the fruitful lands in the northern part of the state. As it became apparent to such officials that the Cherokee were not as willing as their Creek counterparts to cede portions of their territory (or flee west out of fear of borderland violence), despite the civilization ‘progress’ many had made in recent decades, the United States government had to reconcile its newfound position wherein they had to “either renege on its promise to Georgia or break its treaty pledges to protect the Cherokees.”¹ Despite the Creeks’ failure to remain in their homelands and the intensifying rate at which the U.S. government was attempting to secure the same fate for the Cherokee, Cherokee leaders’ determination and commitment to preserving the presence of their people in the territory and the Nation’s claim to land did not cease.

It was in this moment in which the Cherokee National Council convened to formalize the laws of their Nation, including what would become the first Constitution of the Cherokee Nation. The laws and codes that developed within this stage of Cherokee governance (some of which were mentioned in the previous chapter) progressively addressed the tenets of land ownership within the Nation and put in place stipulations to protect Cherokee territorial authority such as the law that forbade the sale of land to the U.S. government. In response to such actions, Georgia legislators would pass yet another resolution that this time, directly attacked the Cherokee Nation’s legitimacy. In 1827, Georgia’s leaders launched a legislative campaign that, in one fell

¹ Denson, *Demanding the Cherokee Nation*, 21.

swoop, declared the Cherokee's central government unconstitutional under American law and proclaimed that the state held sovereignty over all lands within its boundaries. Georgia leaders asserted that the state, therefore, had the right to "take possession of the country occupied by Indians whenever and by whatever means it pleased."²

It was in this same moment wherein the *Cherokee Phoenix* became, as scholars Theda Perdue and Michael Green suggest, "the centerpiece of the Nation's effort to keep the story of its rights and suffering before the public."³ The political and social tensions that defined this period would be reflected in the reporting and conversations documented within the pages of the *Cherokee Phoenix*, particularly within the dialogue that took place between Cherokee leaders and their community in their traditional language. As both Perdue and Green note, the *Phoenix's* central purpose "to keep the Cherokee people informed on public issues" was a significant aspect of the publication throughout its existence, however, until now, how Boudinot and other Cherokee leaders communicated such information to the Cherokee community outside of the English language has remained unknown to historians. While the first chapter of this thesis addressed both the intentions behind the creation of the newspaper and how it was marketed to both white and Cherokee readers, this chapter is primarily concerned with how the Cherokee community utilized the newspaper. The translated articles highlighted in the following pages showcase how Cherokee leaders, both mainstream political figures like Boudinot and traditional community figures alike, used the publication as a means to disseminate information to the Nation as a whole, to issue warnings to the Cherokee populace, and how they intentionally used the *Phoenix* as a way to document and share the perspectives of the most respected members of the tribe. The following articles reveal the full extent to which the *Phoenix* was a publication

² Theda Perdue and Michael Green, *The Cherokee Nation and the Trail of Tears*. (New York: Viking, 2007), 58.

³ *Ibid.*, 75.

deeply rooted in intimate community matters and concerns, and not merely a propaganda tool meant to demonstrate Cherokee civilization to the outside world.

A Headman's Opinion on American Leaders

Boudinot and other Cherokee leaders often made use of the writings of top American officials and political icons within their arguments published in the *Cherokee Phoenix*. In the first edition, Boudinot prints a letter written a year prior by the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, Thomas McKenney, to the Secretary of War, James Barbour. In the letter, McKinney details his thoughts concerning the Cherokee's development of a national system and constitution, arguing that the Cherokee "ought not to be encouraged in forming a constitution and government within a State of the Republic, to exist and operate independently of our laws."⁴ McKinney infers that if such developments were pursued further by Cherokee leaders, that such actions would warrant the Cherokee's prompt removal to the West. Boudinot outlines a response to McKinney's letter, attaching to his condemnation of McKinney's disapproving attitude toward the new Cherokee national government a letter written nearly twenty-years before by Thomas Jefferson. Boudinot argues that the Jefferson letter supports the Cherokee's position in forming the Cherokee Nation, using the letter as evidence that "[Cherokees were always led to believe] that we were related to the General Government, and not to the states."⁵

Directly following the Jefferson letter is an article presented in the Cherokee language. With no context given in English, nor an accompanying date included, the typical English reader might assume given how it is presented with quotation marks around its first large paragraph, that the Cherokee article is connected in some way to the previous letters. When read in Cherokee, however, one finds that the article is in no way connected to the letters. The article is,

⁴ *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828.

⁵ *Ibid.*

instead, an excerpt of a message addressed to the Governor and state legislature of Georgia by a headman of the Nation with an attached commentary addressed to the community. The headman's argument detailed in this article is robust and compelling in and of itself, but what truly makes this excerpt from the *Phoenix* remarkable is the formal language and metaphorical grounding utilized in the statements. Through specific stylization and deeply intentional word choice, the headman employs a style of language unique both within Cherokee culture as well as from most other Cherokee content presented in the *Phoenix*. As Cherokee language speaker Tom Belt and scholar Margaret Bender note, headmen were often selected and recognized "for their ability to speak truthfully, artfully, with completeness, and in a way that offered comfort."⁶ The style of language utilized in the Cherokee article from the newspaper mirrors the type of oratorical language often heard at traditional tribal councils, at ceremonies, as well as among leaders at stomp grounds. As Belt and Bender note, formal Cherokee language "is more morphologically complete than casual [Cherokee] language, with all relevant verbal and nominal affixes included and with careful, slow pronunciation that emphasizes meaningful intonational patterns."⁷ The formal language employed by the headman in the following article provides a unique insight into how traditional Cherokee leaders processed and spoke on their perspectives and understandings about the developing conflict with Georgia and the early possibility of removal within a culturally-grounded Cherokee worldview.

Responding to the then-recent cessions of Creek lands in the southern part of the state and the tribes' abrupt removal, the headman addressed the Governor of Georgia and the state legislature, providing his thoughts on the morality of the American's actions and his concerns about the integrity of their relationship with his people. Published in Cherokee language under

⁶ Belt and Bender, "Speaking Difference to Power," 188.

⁷ Ibid.

the title, “Parts of the Speech to the Georgia Governor and the delegates of Georgia,” the headman asserts,

When that that belongs to the Creeks in Georgia, according to the Georgia survey, becomes yours, the Cherokees’ land you think will also become yours, I believe. That what you say is yours, that you were given to live in long ago [including this new land obtained from the Creeks], we believe it to be ours. This therefore was not spoken of, these commitments were not bound and a trade for these towns that became theirs was not made, or by our laws we did not change it.⁸

The lands referenced by the headman in the above quote are most likely those outlined in the land cession agreement within the Creek’s Treaty of Washington— a treaty forged in 1826 between Creek leaders and the U.S. government during the contentious aftermath of the signing of the fraudulent removal treaty of Indian Springs in 1825 by Creek Chief William McIntosh.⁹

The headman inferred that once the second agreement was made with the Creeks, that he believed it to be probable that the Georgia leaders might have thought that the same process of land cession could be successfully applied to the Cherokee. The headman, however, reminded Georgia’s leaders that not only the land that they currently inhabited, but also that which they took that belonged to the Creeks, was all at one point in time part of the ancestral Cherokee territory, and therefore, that the tribe still had a claim to it. In his speech, the headman indicates that this particular history was ‘not spoken of’ during the process of making such agreements and infers that the Cherokee and their traditional procedures were not properly considered during the negotiations. He continues,

As for your concept of ownership, it will not change. We cannot change what the Georgians do not believe, until God changes it. If you think to allow the Cherokees to live today on what is theirs, if you truly believe that and if that is what you think, believe it to be permissible under your laws. But that which you think is yours, you cannot

⁸ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828. (Appendix 2)

⁹ For more information regarding the Creek removal treaties and the cession of Creek lands in the late 1820s, see Christopher D. Haveman, *Bending Their Way Onward: Creek Indian Removal in Documents*. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2018), Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Treaties: The History of a Political Anomaly*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), and Michael D. Green, *The Politics of Indian Removal: Creek Government and Society in Crisis*. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985).

include. And to now think you can allow us to live on what is ours, if you experience growth, you will increase and arrive more.¹⁰

In this segment of his statement, the headman suggests that an inherent contradiction existed between American and Cherokee concepts of ownership, the former being something binding and final by contract, and the latter a continuous connection between people and place. This type of philosophy, he suggested, was something the Americans were unable to properly comprehend by their manner of thinking— a cause, perhaps, for the then developing strife between the two groups. The headman also emphasized in his speech an observation that when they felt the need for more land, the Americans seemed not to care who held claim to it, that if the land were ‘theirs’ according to their concept of ownership, then others’ rights, connections, and claims to such territories would immediately dissolve.

The headman continues he speech to the Georgians, noting that,

To think or to have compassion for the Cherokee only becomes a prayer. We cannot be in proximity because where you want to reside on the land, the Cherokees believe is theirs. Now for them to take the land and think “who are we robbing”; or someday to let it go if they do not want it, without consequence, and to give people something different than what belongs to them and to treat them differently. Then they are wrong about what they believe belongs to them.¹¹

With this statement, the headman suggests that any goodwill or hope that the Georgians or Americans say they feel for the Cherokee people, is only that, a feeling— their ‘prayers’ not supported nor translated into appropriate or tangible action. In issuing a moral condemnation on the American ideology of ownership and practice of expansion, the headman suggested that the Georgian’s (and other Americans by relation) connection to the land was equally limited and flawed. Ending his statement before the leaders of Georgia, the headman cautioned the state’s leaders to how they would approach future relations with the Cherokee people. He articulates,

¹⁰ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828. (Appendix 2)

¹¹ Ibid.

[the Americans] thought they would plow us under. This is what they have thought about the Cherokee, and this is what might happen. If someone injures us in this way, they do not care about the Cherokee. [We, in return,] would not seek or want anything good to happen to them.¹²

The headman reveals to the Georgia policymakers that if they attempted to do to the Cherokee what they did to the Creek, that the Cherokee people would no longer trust nor be willing to work peacefully with them. On the contrary, according to his assessment, the Cherokees would wish their downfall.

In the paragraphs that followed this quoted excerpt from the speech, the headman expanded on his thoughts and opinions concerning the character of the Georgian leadership to the Cherokee audience.¹³ He stated,

This is what was said to the Georgia Governor. But it appears as though he is not a real leader, given what he said, how he changed his mind, and by the way he spoke about our land. He greatly wants our land; it is not possible for the people of Georgia to leave that thought alone it seems, they believe that the earth encircles them.¹⁴

By his assessment that Georgians believe the ‘earth encircles them,’ meaning more or less that they believed the riches of the earth existed solely for one’s personal pleasure and use, the headman again asserted that the American concept of ownership and connection to the land was inherently incompatible with Cherokee values. His suggestion that the Georgians carry an obsession over land and the notion of expansion, moreover, was included in his commentary as a warning to the Cherokee people that the budding conflict between the two groups would only prove to grow in intensity over the coming years. In an effort to provide guidance to the Cherokee readers of the newspaper, the headman offers a final word of advice. He writes,

¹² Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828. (Appendix 2)

¹³ Due to the fact that the same style, tone, and general structure of the language that appeared in the quoted portion of the speech is also employed in the commentary section of this article, the translators felt it probable that the same person authored both sections. It is possible, however, that another Cherokee speaker could have written this section rather than the headman, although it should be noted that the speakers involved in this project felt strongly that the type of language used did not fit the typical diction of Elias Boudinot.

¹⁴ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828. (Appendix 2)

We cannot win, if we separate our land; even if we are of one mind and we together go against our ways and split into two our laws that we have. If we love each other, no leaders can make us leave. And the Governor that has seized us that lives in Georgia, we will play with him.¹⁵

Urging his people to hold tight to the core cultural values that bound them together and made each individual responsible to another and to the land, the headman argued that the natural laws of their community could not be broken (or split) in the face of the opposing American ideological values and practices. His statement, ‘we will play with him,’ is a particularly powerful claim when one pays attention to the root of the word utilized. The word representing ‘play’ in the Cherokee language in this particular instance, ‘*yidedanelodi*,’ is rooted in the same word often used to reference the type of ‘play’ that would be engaged during a game a stickball—a considerably aggressive and often violent game-like war activity practiced by the Cherokee. Through employing this particular word, the headman suggested to the Cherokee readers that the Nation was prepared to actively and aggressively challenge the state of Georgia.

To end his commentary, the headman issued a word of caution to his people. He stated,

It’s clear in [the Governor’s] speech he wants us to go somewhere else; a better place on the earth; but it will not be the way he is saying, it will be the beginning of a difficult time. [...] And when they say that land will be individually owned, this land we are keeping as directed by our headmen is already yours. Their words are not as strong as the earth.¹⁶

When encouraging his people to not fully accept or trust the words of the Georgia Governor, the headman makes a particular point to apply such warning to the claims the Governor had made concerning the western territory. He prophesizes that if they were to accept emigration and leave their homeland, the Cherokees would face hardships of various kinds for numerous years. He reminded his people that the land they claimed control of and inhabited was not merely allocated

¹⁵ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828. (Appendix 2)

¹⁶ Ibid.

to them by the opinions of states or government leaders, but rather, by a connection that was first given to them by the Creator (the knowledge of which is upheld by the headmen of the tribe). He argued in his commentary to the Cherokee populace that the very idea that American leaders have the sole power to allocate or recognize Cherokee land ownership goes against the natural way of being known to the Cherokee. His assertion that the opinions of the Georgian leaders are simply ‘not as strong as the earth’ is an indication that the leader viewed the agency of land and the knowledge of cultural truths to be the true dictates of one’s connection to a particular place, in deep contrast to that of the law or dominant social opinion. He closes his commentary with the following statements. He writes,

But for the white man to prosper here in America we have to be relegated to the wilderness, he says, and it has to be decided when and where to hunt and when and where to plow. But he hasn’t heard that we have already chosen the places where we will plow. Will we go into the forest and sleep? This road to the forest that we are traveling, we will delay this because there has been a sun for a long time. And we know there is nothing good to find, if you are only in charge of wilderness.¹⁷

With the inquiry, ‘will we go into the forest and sleep,’ the headman questioned if his people were willing to bend to the wishes of the Americans and leave their homeland without resistance. Although he acknowledged in his statement that the possibility of removal was quite real for the tribe, he informed his Cherokee readers that the ‘road to the forest’ (or the road to the unknown in the West) would be delayed as long as possible. His use of the metaphor of there being ‘sun for a long time’ meant to represent the fact that the leaders of the Nation had long been aware of the American’s intentions to expel the Cherokee from their homelands and had prepared themselves to engage in the struggle to remain.

The article above is an incredible example of how some Cherokee leaders made use of the *Phoenix* to connect with their community. Not only does the headman share with his people

¹⁷ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828. (Appendix 2)

what he said to Georgia's leaders, but he also uses the medium to share his more intimate thoughts, concerns, and wishes for how he hopes the Nation responds to such situations. Given the level of reverence that would have been applied to the words of a headman during this time, particularly in a moment of political and social crisis, one must question why Boudinot chose not to translate the above article into English. Was he fearful of misrepresenting the sentiments of the headman? Or did he perhaps think some of the statements made in the commentary were perhaps too combative toward Americans? While either is entirely plausible, perhaps a more useful endeavor than the questioning Boudinot's motives behind leaving the article to stand alone in Cherokee would be to unpack his choice to print it in the first place. What purpose does an article such as this serve, specifically in the context of the first print issue of the newspaper? To be sure, this was the first time wherein a speech and commentary of this nature was printed and distributed in this manner. One might conclude that (especially in the context of being the first print edition of the newspaper), having content that was not only relevant and culturally important to Cherokee readers, but also something authored by an individual of incredible significance in the Nation was crucial in proving to the community the usefulness of the *Cherokee Phoenix*.

News from the West

From the earliest days of the newspaper, the extent to which the Cherokee government had its hand on the *Cherokee Phoenix* was evident. From its inception, the *Phoenix* was founded and defined as a tool for the Cherokee government to share relevant laws and information to the Nation. Boudinot notes this mission within his first address when he states,

As the Phoenix is a national paper, we shall feel ourselves bound to devote it to national purposes. 'The laws and public documents of the Nation,' and matters relating to the

welfare and condition of the Cherokees as a people, will be faithfully published in English and Cherokee.¹⁸

Government documents, congressional speeches, treaties, and personal correspondences represent a vast majority of the content published in the *Phoenix*, both in English and in Cherokee. Just as Cherokee government leaders like John Ross used the newspaper to publish his sentiments regarding relevant issues affecting the tribe, traditional community leaders too utilized the *Phoenix*, the previous section demonstrating one example of such activity. As the tension with Georgia continued to grow in the final years of the 1820s, and with it the reality of removal, Cherokee leaders looked to the *Phoenix* to organize and inform their people— both those writing from within the Nation, as well as those monitoring the developments at home from outside the Nation’s boundary. Throughout the first two years of the newspaper’s existence, Boudinot publishes three letters in Cherokee from a Cherokee leader residing in the Arkansas Valley that detail to those remaining in the traditional homelands the issues plaguing the Cherokee who had already emigrated to the West.

By 1828, the year when the first letter from the Arkansas leader appears in the *Phoenix*, small contingents of Cherokees had been voluntarily emigrating to the Arkansas borderlands for nearly three decades. The largest of such movements occurred in 1810 when one thousand Cherokees emigrated west, and in 1819, when an additional two thousand Cherokees moved following the signing of fraudulent land cession agreement by the community leaders with U.S. officials.¹⁹ As scholar Kathleen DuVal suggested in her distinguished work *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent*, for many Cherokee during this period, emigration west was understood as not only a means to “escape the rapidly changing East,” but

¹⁸ *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828.

¹⁹ Perdue and Green, *The Cherokee Nation*, 117.

also way to maintain the community's autonomy and "resist acculturation."²⁰ Although geographically disconnected from their relatives remaining in the Cherokee Nation, leaders and community members that comprised the new Arkansas Cherokee (Sequoyah, the creator of the Cherokee syllabary, among them) very much remained connected to their extended families and communities back East and maintained a certain level of concern for the issues affecting those remaining in Georgia as their territorial and constitutional conflict intensified. In the letters published by Boudinot authored by the Arkansas leader 'Dagwadihi' meaning 'Catawba killer,' whom Boudinot refers to in English as 'the Glass,' the leader details to the Cherokees in the East the reality of life in the West many feared would soon be part of their future.

In his first letter dated August 17th, 1827, published in the April 17th, 1828 edition of the *Phoenix* under the English title "LETTER FROM ARKANSAS", the leader writes in the Cherokee language, "This is the way things are. In that far away place it is interesting the way things are."²¹ In his letter, the Arkansas leader recounts an incident concerning the death of two Cherokee warriors presumably by the Pawnees, a group with whom the Cherokee had various violent encounters with following their arriving in the region. He writes,

Here on the prairie toward the West, there died two men of the Paint Clan. They were warriors of [Chief Bowles'] company. That is what happened to them. [...] In that direction war does not cease; there is always war. Truly it appears to be very dangerous—for instance, something happens to the men. Truly war is evil, but I suppose that the Pawnees who live on the prairie will never learn that. That is the way other tribes of people think. On the prairie they are always fighting.²²

To elaborate on his claim concerning the constant state of violence in the territory, he provides the details of another incident wherein two Cherokee men were murdered by members of the

²⁰ Kathleen Duval, *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 198 - 199.

²¹ Letter from Arkansas, August 17, 1827, in Jack Fredrick Kilpatrick and Anna Gritts Kilpatrick, "Letters from an Arkansas Chief, 1828-1829," *Great Plains Journal* 1 (1965), 27 - 29.

²² Ibid.

Osage tribe— another group for which the Cherokees in the territory had almost constant disputes with. He states,

Here on the Red River there are living a few of our Cherokee kinsmen. Last summer three men died. As they were walking, out hunting, the Osages caught up with them and killed them. This sort of happenings I continue to consider amazing. I suppose that at this time we cannot keep this hidden, I think; for it is plain that it is this way that I tell you, friends. [...] This is the way things are. In that faraway place it is interesting the way things are.²³

The Arkansas leader's characterization of the West suggests that the place is an environment Cherokees remaining in the homelands should avoid, if possible. Moreover, the leader notes in his letter that even following the Secretary of War's order to the various tribal groups in the region that "asked [the respective tribal groups] to take care of each other," that the territory remained in a state of chaos despite the federal intervention.²⁴ He writes, "It is not peaceful. Truly they are still aiming at each other [despite these orders]."²⁵ This statement, in particular, is incredibly significant, especially when considered beside one of the arguments made by the headman in the speech discussed earlier in this chapter. Just as the headman warned his people about the western lands Georgia's leaders spoke highly of as a destination for their possible emigration, arguing in his commentary that 'it will not be the way he is saying, it will be the beginning of a difficult time,' the letter published from the Arkansas leader provided evidence that the promises of U.S. officials were indeed not credible. He concludes his first letter with the statement, "This is what I have just told all of you, friends, for all of you to hear; for it makes one think when things are happening around. That is all. I greet all of you, friends."²⁶

²³ Letter From Arkansas, August 17, 1827.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

Just over a year later, the Arkansas leader wrote a second letter in the Cherokee language for the *Phoenix* that reiterated the violence and other pressing issues Cherokees in the territory faced, of which was also printed and translated into English by Boudinot in the October 29th, 1828 edition of the newspaper. Similar to the first letter published, the leader recounted in his letter stories of violent conflict, murder, and distrust between the various tribal groups in the territory. He discusses rumors circulating through the community of impending war in the “Spanish territory,” stating that “[in] the West there is much war. There is no prospect of peace. What you hear of bloodshed is true.”²⁷ What makes the leader’s second letter printed in the *Phoenix* particularly interesting is that following each account of a Cherokee murder, a total of six recounted in the letter, he provides the clans for which each of the deceased belonged. The information given in the report would have been relevant to those Cherokees who still observed the clan commitment of ‘blood law’— a “system of justice” traditionally practiced by Cherokees that “typically involved the clan members of a homicide victim enacting vengeance (usually death) on the murder, or a member of the murderer’s clan.”²⁸ Through providing this information, the Arkansas leader called on the connection of those in the East to those in the West. His writing, then, provides an example of how the Cherokee model of peoplehood remained despite the existence of social, political, and geographic fractures within the society.

In the third and final letter that appears from the Arkansas leader, published in Cherokee within the February 11th, 1829 edition of the *Phoenix*, he provides yet another account of a murder— this time directly speaking to clan commitments and blood law. He explains,

Some men did a very amazing thing— they recently killed each other. [...] One person was slightly drunk. They fought. They were brothers. One of them was not drunk. He defended himself with a knife. [...] Another one intervened. Without knowing that he

²⁷ Letter from Arkansas, October 29, 1828, in Jack Fredrick Kilpatrick and Anna Gritts Kilpatrick, "Letters from an Arkansas Chief, 1828-1829," *Great Plains Journal* 1 (1965), 30 - 31.

²⁸ Smithers, *The Cherokee Diaspora*, 119.

was being knifed, he fell. Then he knew. When they looked at him they saw that he was knifed one. He was carried away. Then they were discovered. Then the killer fled. He ran home. Then the woman spoke: "All of you have veered away from your clan-places! He has done evil to my son!" she stated.²⁹

Following the statement made by the mother of the man killed, the Arkansas leader explains that the next morning three men went in search of the killer, found him, and shot him. Through providing this information, the leader was thus assuring the community back East that balance had, once again, been restored. His letter printed in the *Phoenix* speaks to both the connection that the two groups maintained, both culturally and socially, as well as the fact that certain aspects of Cherokee culture that individuals like Boudinot reported to be abandoned by the tribe in the same period were very much still present within the Cherokee social structure and culture.

The Arkansas leader ends his final letter to the *Phoenix* with the following message. He writes,

Now! My friends, all of your Councilmen and all of your chiefs, all of you keep striving to help a person to grow; and both of us that are called Cherokees, all of you people, all of your chiefs, it must not be that the Cherokees are divided in two, become different. I am thankful how well you observe the word of the tribal governments urgings. We must hear from each other.³⁰

His focus on clan relationships and duties, paired with his urgings that the leaders of two groups maintain contact and relationship with one another showcases how the Arkansas leader felt it necessary for the two groups to remain connected and in support of each other as both faced political and social hardships in their regions. For the Cherokees remaining in the East, the leader's words bolstered the arguments made by their leaders concerning movement west, the image of the borderlands painted by his letters one of continuous violence, danger, and hardship.

²⁹ Letter from Arkansas, February 11, 1829, in Jack Fredrick Kilpatrick and Anna Gritts Kilpatrick, "Letters from an Arkansas Chief, 1828-1829," *Great Plains Journal* 1 (1965), 31 - 32.

³⁰ Ibid.

The land in the West, as a result, became seen as a place Cherokees remaining in the homelands should avoid at all costs.

Boudinot's Report

Just as the headman and the Arkansas leader used the *Cherokee Phoenix* to provide information and detail their beliefs to the Nation, so too did Elias Boudinot. Although not an official Cherokee government representative, as Editor of the *Phoenix*, Boudinot often acted as the voice of the Nation's leaders within the newspaper. While he consistently offered his individual opinions on the matters of removal and the conflict with the state of Georgia, Boudinot frequently chronicled the activities and business of the Nation's leaders. The following article published only in Cherokee language from the July 31st, 1830 edition of the *Phoenix* is an example of such reporting.

With Andrew Jackson now in the White House, removal was more than ever an imminent and undeniable threat to the Cherokee Nation. An ardent believer that the Cherokee constitution violated the U.S. constitution, as the latter prohibited the formation of a state within the boundaries of another, President Jackson championed the assault against the Cherokee Nation. In his first annual address, Jackson opened his remarks to Congress with a detailed summation of his removal policy, which would also be the first legislative recommendation sent to the legislative body by the new President. Jackson's position concerning the removal, specifically regarding the Cherokee, was particularly controversial. As scholars Theda Perdue and Michael Green note, the debates within the American public during this time concerning removal progressively became "less about Indian removal than [they] were about Cherokee removal."³¹ Because the Cherokee were widely considered to be the most 'civilized' Native tribe in the

³¹ Perdue and Green, *The Cherokee Nation*, 66.

country, many Americans felt that the Cherokees “deserved to be praised and petted and left alone on their lands so they could assimilate into American society.”³² Jackson’s relentless pursuit for the Cherokees’ removal and his support of Georgia’s controversial tactics to paint the Cherokee as greedy ‘savages’ became a rallying point wherein opponents of Jackson coalesced in support and defense of the Cherokee. The debates that took place in the House and Senate over Jackson’s removal bill would be remembered years later by those present as “the most contentious, protracted, acrimonious, and bitter” of the century.³³ After weeks of these contentious debates, Jackson’s efforts against the Cherokee would ultimately prove successful on May 28th, 1830, when the Indian Removal Act officially passed in Congress.

Published just over a month after the passage of the Indian Removal Act, the following address written and published by Boudinot in the Cherokee language covers multiple political developments impacting the Nation during the summer months of 1830. Along with the issue of removal bill, Boudinot also addresses the growing intrusion of Georgian settlers following the discovery of significant gold reserves within Cherokee territory. As Georgian intrusion into Cherokee lands intensified as a result, so too did Georgians’ interactions with Cherokees— their encounters becoming increasingly hostile and violent. In the opening of his article, Boudinot informs his Cherokee readers that John Ross had received two papers from the Secretary of War that communicated Jackson’s growing concern over the developing issues with Georgia, Boudinot commenting in response “I make him out to be a liar.”³⁴ He writes,

This document we received says that a person of importance says when soldier troops are in occupation of Cherokee country, and verify all the money people are mining out, to chase them away, that [the Secretary of War] wants for you to assist them. Let’s be careful this summer, let’s not make matters difficult with our actions [...]. He says that he is to chase off all the miners, I think the deer and Cherokee are included in this.

³² Perdue and Green, *The Cherokee Nation*, 66.

³³ *Ibid.*, 64.

³⁴ Belt and Blackfox translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. July 31, 1830. (Appendix 3)

Is he meaning to chase us off? To give away our portion [of territory]. He is making a good effort to make it clear that he is malicious [and] he is trying very hard to acquire it— he is trying to make it hard on us by making us tired— he is extremely mistaken.³⁵

Boudinot urges the Cherokees in the area to be cautious around the soldiers, that contrary to what Jackson and the Secretary of War say in the document, that he believed the Cherokees were in danger of being ‘chased off’ from their territory. In the remainder of his report, Boudinot further detailed his concerns over the situation and the government’s response in connection to the more significant issue of removal. He stated,

Though then seeing everything, the way [Jackson] is thinking, is not what he is saying. Our nation that we have, it is meant for us to have— the law that we keep, he means to break apart. Will it defeat us? Are we being led to think that we are going to get it in increments after we tire at some time— when we moved all one hundred miles. He does not want good to happen to us. He is setting it up to be a trick— if the Nation doesn’t have enough money, they will try us in the Supreme Court, is it possible that is what he is thinking. There is less than what we have previously been given. What if that defeats us? Friends, we who care about each other, and care about the Cherokee name, I’m asking you, is this what will defeat us?³⁶

In the excerpt of his commentary above, Boudinot suggested that Jackson’s support of troops entering Cherokee territory to ‘protect’ the gold reserves from Georgian trespassers was, by his assessment, a probable tactic to secure a federal presence in the territory to prepare for eventual removal procedures. With miners extracting nearly “two thousand dollars of gold a day” from the area, by preventing Cherokees access to areas rich with gold deposits within their territory, the government effectively cut off a major source of wealth for the Nation— money that was very much needed to support their developing legal battle in the Supreme Court.³⁷ Without sufficient funds, the Nation would not be able to pursue its defense to the extent its leaders wished. To his

³⁵ Belt and Blackfox translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. July 31, 1830. (Appendix 3)

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Perdue and Green, *The Cherokee Nation*, 74.

repeated rhetorical questions of impending defeat, Boudinot argued to his Cherokee readers that despite such development that the Nation's strength was only growing. He writes,

Jackson's frustrated behaviors are getting less, as we are stronger— he is trying hard to make us weak. It is good for those that are witnesses helping us, [the escalation of his behavior against us is not diminishing our supporters.] [...] What is bad about what is associated with Jackson will not defeat us, if our thinking stays strong, their efforts to treat us this way, to debase us, if they take away the gold that is carried by those that live there, or they chase us off from where we mine money, we will not do this for very long.³⁸

Here Boudinot notes how Jackson's attacks and harmful behavior toward the Cherokee in his effort to secure their removal had not diminished the existing public support for the Cherokee cause— a claim supported by subsequent estimates that suggest at the time of the Indian Removal Act that approximately “half of the American people opposed removal.”³⁹ Boudinot then implied that such developments, in particular, would prove to hurt Jackson's political future. He states,

Therefore, Jackson has been severely criticized about his leadership, but now in my opinion he won't be reelected if he wants to win it. [Henry] Clay from 'the place where the cedars are' who is well liked, I think he will win. If he wins, he will probably make it possible for us to get out of this situation. He already made his thinking clear, Clay said that the land is ours. Let's not be afraid.⁴⁰

Henry Clay, one of Jackson's most prominent political rivals, who had announced his intent to run against Jackson in the 1832 election, was a significant anti-removal advocate in Congress and actively opposed the removal bill in 1830 in hopes of fracturing Democratic power in Pennsylvania.⁴¹ Clay's support of the Cherokee and his public condemnation of Jackson and the policies pushed forward by the administration gave Cherokee leaders a powerful source of confidence, a fact illustrated by Boudinot's prediction above. Due to Clay's political influence

³⁸ Belt and Blackfox translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. July 31, 1830. (Appendix 3)

³⁹ Perdue and Green, *The Cherokee Nation*, 64.

⁴⁰ Belt and Blackfox translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. July 31, 1830. (Appendix 3)

⁴¹ Perdue and Green, *The Cherokee Nation*, 65.

and his committed campaign against Jackson and his tactics against the Nation, Boudinot argues to his readers that there is no reason for their community to be fearful of the near future.

As each of the Cherokee articles above demonstrate, the *Phoenix* was indeed a significant source of information for the Cherokee community in regard to both political developments as well as social matters affecting the community. Through the employment of the Cherokee language, Cherokee leaders and community figures created a space within the newspaper wherein leaders could engage in dialogue, share their specific beliefs, concerns, and arguments, and ultimately connect with a broader Cherokee audience. Such aspects of the *Cherokee Phoenix* would continue to be present in the Cherokee language portions of the newspaper during the most significant moments of the Removal era— the two Cherokee Supreme Court battles that took place in 1831 and 1832. While a plethora of Cherokee leaders and political figures made use of the *Phoenix* to share their viewpoints and concerns pertaining to the conflict with Georgia and the issue of removal, none did so more than the paper’s editor, Elias Boudinot. As the following chapter addresses, in the moments directly following consequential developments in the Nation’s struggle to prevent removal, Boudinot utilized the newspaper to emphasize the need for unity within the community and to disseminate clear instructions to the Cherokee people regarding their collective response to such developments.

CHAPTER THREE: “DO NOT LET YOUR HEARTS WEAKEN”: THE CHEROKEES’ INTERNAL BATTLE AGAINST REMOVAL

As the Cherokee Nation moved into the 1830s, the new decade brought new challenges to the Cherokee’s resistance to removal. With the Indian Removal Act now law, the nature of the Cherokee’s battle against removal transformed significantly. Over the next three years, the Nation’s struggle to protect the autonomy of its government increasingly became a legal one. Their tactics were no longer exclusively grounded in campaigns for public support on the grounds of Christian benevolence and morality, but instead challenges based in notions of constitutionality, precise treaty law, and proper legal ideological justification. As Cherokee Nation leaders moved their defense into the courtrooms of the United States, Boudinot turned his focus toward the Cherokee people. As the following Cherokee language articles from the *Phoenix* suggest, as the Nation formalized its defense against Georgia, Boudinot became increasingly concerned about the community’s dedication to the Nation’s strategy, and most importantly, he questioned their strength to maintain the vital image of a unified people and Nation. From both outside and within the tribe, rumors, fears, and questions arose about the unity of the Cherokee people in their opposition to removal. Leaders of the state of Georgia asserted that Cherokee traditionalists supported removal but were being silenced by a bicultural accommodationist minority within the Nation’s leadership whom they believed to be the lone force behind the tribe’s anti-removal agenda. Moreover, state leaders suggested that white missionaries living among the Cherokee were dubiously guiding the anti-removal cause in partnership with community leaders and figures such as Boudinot and Ross. Leaders of the Cherokee Nation, as a result, became acutely aware of the need to project a unified image of

their people for their continued defense against Georgia. In the years immediately following the passage of the Indian Removal Act, Boudinot turned to the *Phoenix* to clearly and directly communicate to the Cherokee people the need for social unity and uniformity in action to support the Nation's campaign against removal.

The translations examined in this chapter provide a more in-depth look at how Boudinot, specifically, utilized the newspaper to address and inform Cherokee readers on matters relevant to the Nation and how he projected such concerns into the messages he sent to his Cherokee readers over the period of three years. The emotional appeals Boudinot made within the pages of the *Phoenix* to his fellow Cherokees in moments of considerable uncertainty and fear reveal the extent to which community solidarity remained a significant factor in the Nation's defense against Georgia, as well as how individuals like Boudinot reserved their intimate confessions and viewpoints for the Cherokee language sections of the newspaper. The following articles illustrate how Boudinot shaped his arguments concerning the conflict with Georgia and issues over jurisdiction within the territory in a manner that placed the unity of the community at the center of the struggle and the concern for the peoples' safety among the top priorities of those leading the charge.

Remembering the Words of Former Leaders

Following the passage of the Indian Removal Act, the *Cherokee Phoenix* faithfully published in English for six editions the arguments made against the removal bill by Senator's Theodore Frelinghuysen of New Jersey and Peleg Sprague of Maine. Frelinghuysen, who led the congressional opposition to Jackson's Indian policy, gave a six-hour-long speech over three days condemning the bill for its lack of moral integrity and constitutionality. In his speech, Frelinghuysen argued that the Cherokee's extensive treaty history was proof that their

sovereignty existed both “above and beyond” that of the United States and the state of Georgia.¹ In support and defense of his argument, Frelinghuysen stated, “True, Sir, they have made treaties with both, but not to *acquire title* or jurisdiction; these they had *before*—ages before the evil hour, to them, when their white brother fled to them for an asylum.”² Frelinghuysen’s argument concerning Cherokee sovereignty, mirrored in many ways to that of the Cherokee National Council, suggested that Jackson’s proposed policy was, and would prove to be if passed, a significant divergence from American precedent. Moreover, the New Jersey Senator was not shy in his belief that the issue of race constituted his oppositions’ primary justification for supporting the bill’s authority to abrogate Cherokees from their land. Early in his speech, Frelinghuysen questioned, “Do the obligations of justice change with the color of skin? Is it one of the prerogatives of the white man, that he may disregard the dictates of moral principles, when an Indian shall be considered?”³ Boudinot’s inclusion of speeches like Frelinghuysen’s within the *Phoenix* was part of a conscious effort to highlight the existence of allies within the U.S government and acted as means to bolster the legitimacy of the Nation’s arguments against Jackson and his support of Georgia’s unconstitutional extension of jurisdiction into the Cherokee territory. Such content showcased to *Phoenix* readers, both white and Cherokee alike, that the Cherokee’s perseverance in their battle against the President was supported by many and would ultimately prove to be a vindicated endeavor for all to support.

To further exemplify Jackson’s actions as spurious to American law and precedent, Boudinot often placed the removal policy and the Jackson administration’s support of Georgia’s tactics in contrast to the policies of former President George Washington, a figure revered by

¹ *Speech of Mr. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, Delivered in the Senate of the United States, April 6, 1830* (Washington, DC: National Journal, 1830), 9.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

both Americans and many Cherokees. Boudinot utilized Washington in his writings within the *Phoenix* as a symbolic figure to demonstrate the contrast between his leadership and ideological approach to that of Jacksons. Following the print of Frelinghuysen's and Sprague's speeches, Boudinot incorporating sections of a letter the former President wrote to Cherokee leaders in 1796 within a Cherokee-only article. This instance was not, however, the first time this particular letter from Washington appeared in the pages of the *Phoenix*. Washington's message, commonly known among historians as the 'Beloved Cherokees' letter, appears in the newspaper three separate times— the first in English and second in Cherokee printed in the same issue and the third appearing in the Cherokee-only commentary mentioned above. While the third appearance of the letter is the central focus of this section, the previous two occurrences are significant in their own respect.

First reprinted in English within the March 20th, 1828 edition of the newspaper, Boudinot cited the 'Beloved Cherokees' letter under the title "WASHINGTON AND THE CHEROKEES" as part of a discussion about the civilization agenda as it pertained to the Cherokee. Before the letter, Boudinot includes a short commentary wherein he argues that "it has been common of late days, amongst the great men of the United States, to say much on the subject of Indian civilization, and do but very little, towards accomplishing this desirable thing."⁴ Arguing that effective civilization policy required a "correct theory" in order to be truly successful (a 'theory' that included the acknowledgment and defense of tribal land and treaty rights according to Cherokee leaders), Boudinot pointed toward Washington's administration as a shining example of such successful diplomacy and cited Cherokee as evidence of such. He writes,

the following talk will exhibit to the reader, the plan of improvement which [Washington] recommended to the Cherokees, and it may not be amiss to state, that their present

⁴ *Cherokee Phoenix*. March 20, 1828.

situation proves beyond a doubt, that this plan was not mere declamation. The happy effects of it are now to be seen in almost every house.⁵

Boudinot's use of the 'Beloved Cherokees' letter in the 1828 issue was clearly an attempt to exhibit to white readers the receptivity of the Cherokees to civilization generally, as well as to showcase the longstanding relationship between Cherokee leaders and the most respected leaders of the United States that rested on the United States' recognition and defense of Cherokee land rights. Immediately following the English version of the letter, a Cherokee version of the letter follows without Boudinot's editorial commentary. In both the 1828 printed versions of the message, however, Boudinot interestingly omits one paragraph from the original 1796 letter concerning literacy among the Cherokee. Washington's original text reads,

Beloved Cherokees, instead of beginning with books, I wish you first to learn those things which will make books useful to you. When you shall have learned to till the ground, to build good houses, and to fill them with good things, as the white people do, then, like them, you will find the knowledge of books to be pleasant and useful. But first you must learn how to obtain the necessaries of life in plenty. The most essential are food and cloathing. Tolerable houses you can build already—but you may learn from the white people to make them better and more lasting.⁶

Why would Boudinot omit this section? In considering especially that Boudinot himself was not only one of the most highly educated Cherokees of the time, but also the principal advocate for Cherokee literacy, it is perhaps not surprising that Boudinot omitted the section above as Washington's argument stood in direct opposition to both Boudinot's personal aspirations and the *Phoenix*'s core mission of promoting literacy among the Cherokee people. Such reasons must have led Boudinot to view the paragraph as harmful or contradictive to his hopes for his people,

⁵ *Cherokee Phoenix*. March 20, 1828.

⁶ From George Washington to Cherokee Nation, August 29, 1796, *Founders Online*, National Archives, <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Washington/99-01-02-00897>

as in the third and final appearance of the letter in the newspaper in 1830 he, yet again, intentionally omits the section.

When the ‘Beloved Cherokees’ letter appears in Boudinot’s Cherokee commentary following the passage of the Indian Removal Act in 1830, the editorial use of the document takes on a distinctively alternative purpose than the two previous uses. He begins his commentary with the following statement,

Now, I asked all of the sitting members of the white people’s government, what do you think I have done wrong. Cleary I think they are all intending for [Jackson] to move you off the land you are sitting on. [I told them that they] are confused about my work because it has nothing to do with those of [them] who are sitting easy. He, who was there, admonished me. It did not take long for me to understand what he said.⁷

Following this introduction, Boudinot narrates Washington’s original letter. Positioning Washington’s words in the context of the passage of the Removal Act and Georgia’s relentless assault on the Cherokee government, Boudinot utilizes Washington’s original instructions as a means to encourage Cherokees not to cease their daily activities so to continue to expand the people’s agricultural pursuits and to make use their collective land in a manner that Americans would recognize as appropriate. He writes,

We were told by Washington, when they realized why we were there, in the clearest possible way they instructed us. This is what they were telling me, they told us to try to excel in our farming in the beautiful land we live in. To grow livestock for food so that our food does not deplete. Growing food on your land that is yours and finding value there on your land, for your crops not to dwindle and your value to grow, when the people realize that on your land you are raising the value. Therefore, trying to work harder like this clearly it is more beautiful to live here in my land. Everyone working in the fields, they are finding a lot of worth in what is grown. If you do what I tell you it won’t be long now you will be in a good way just like the white people. I stay up to date on the state of the natural resources, what you are all doing all the time is bad and is starting to diminish daily. But in the future when the natural resources melt away, one would think that if what you all follow and depend on disappears, you real people will also disappear. Now that you are almost disappearing with

⁷ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*, July 31, 1830. (Appendix 4)

It appears that this is the only large article published in the Cherokee language in the *Phoenix* that Boudinot did not include any punctuation for. The translators and author attempted to separate the language into complete thoughts as much as possible and added punctuation for readability.

the only thing you depend on, the natural environment, one would think about what I am pointing out to you, your fields and your stock to not dwindle, that is your food. The leaders told me and we met about the land that we let go of. And what was left over, they confirmed their commitment to allowing us ownership. We can't forget what the government leaders told us, and I'm holding on to that and I can't forget what they instructed. I'm adhering to what I was informed about with conviction, and I've also been working from that conviction.⁸

Boudinot encourages his Cherokee readers to continue to develop their agricultural enterprises, both for the individual value such activities create as well as for the simple reason that many of the natural resources they all once depended solely on were continuing to decline. In his comments, Boudinot endorses the civilization agenda as a good thing that had proven to not only make the Cherokee territory “more beautiful to live in” but also argues that it is a factor that could contribute to Cherokee perseverance in the future. Moreover, he connects the continuance of such activities to some governmental leaders' commitment to supporting Cherokee claims to land and treaty rights, suggesting that if the tribe can prove they make use of the land they claim, then their ownership over it could not logically be denied to them in the eyes of the federal government. As scholar Theda Perdue noted in *Cherokee Editor*, “Boudinot portrayed the Cherokees as a ‘civilized’ people in part because he believed their society was in the process of complete transformation but also because he knew that a charge of ‘savagery’ by whites might lead to their extermination.”⁹ Boudinot notes in his commentary that this exact type of thinking was what he had been motivated and guided by, and he suggests to his fellow Cherokees in the context of removal, that such thinking would prove to be incredibly vital to their continued existence in the territory as a nation.

Boudinot concludes his commentary with the following explanation. He writes,

The leaders of the federal government the plans that they made are continuing to do well. But in Cherokee territory, it is this way. The leaders of the federal government, as to the

⁸ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*, July 31, 1830. (Appendix 4)

⁹ Perdue, *Cherokee Editor*, 21.

Cherokee laws that they met on and what they said, we will always depend on the Treasurer to not ruin what we said. [Cherokee leaders] are firmly holding on to what they said when they sat, and what was said to the leaders [of the federal government]. Now what will it be that I have helped you when someone was abusing you where you live or when someone has taken your land and obscured your ownership, it is going to devalue what was traded for it. Don't let someone deceive you from what is yours, the land that you have. And don't give your land near the community or land that is tied to the community to an outsider.¹⁰

Here Boudinot notes that while the 'civilization' plans originally outlined by Washington continued to progress in the Cherokee territory, that he felt as if the fate of the Nation would always be uncertain given how the tribe could be easily misrepresented by U.S. officials like that of the unnamed 'Treasurer.' He notes that despite whatever 'progress' the community had made agriculturally or toward the visions originally outlined by Washington, that those who supported the Removal bill would attempt to obscure the Cherokees' rightful claim to their territory and 'abuse' them in the process. He encourages his Cherokee readers by informing them, however, that the leaders of the Nation are continuing to honor the old commitments made between their councils and American founders. His final warning to 'not let someone deceive you from what is yours,' then, suggests that Boudinot felt it imperative that Cherokees were aware of the tenets of the old agreements and that they understood that such agreements put in place formal recognition of their rights now being denied to them by both the state of Georgia and the Jackson administration.

Over the next two years, Boudinot's articles to the *Phoenix's* Cherokee readership would increasingly speak to such concerns. He increasingly used many of his subsequent commentaries to issue warnings to the community about land rights, legal information, and the need for individuals to remain steadfast in their defense over what was rightfully theirs. Such assertions

¹⁰ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*, July 31, 1830. (Appendix 4)

from Boudinot reached their peak during the months surrounding the two Supreme Court cases, Boudinot communicating in his responses to such cases his concern over the community's unification and commitment to the Nation's struggle against removal. The following articles, published originally in the Cherokee language, are key examples of how Boudinot communicated such concerns to his fellow Cherokees during the most significant and trying moments of the Cherokee removal struggle.

Boudinot's Response to the *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* Decision

The Cherokee's legal strategy against Georgia's effort to dispossess the Nation of its land and deny its sovereignty began taking shape shortly after the passage of the Indian Removal Act when Georgia legislation that extended the states' jurisdiction into the territory of the Cherokee Nation came into full effect in June of 1830. Although Cherokee citizens had somewhat frequently been tried in Georgia's courts prior to the jurisdiction extension, now unable to testify in their own defense according to Georgia law, the legislation presented more the one threat to the Nation. John Ross and the National Council spent months procuring attorneys willing to serve Cherokee clients and were ultimately successful in recruiting the celebrated and nationally known attorney William Wirt to begin research on a possible federal case against Georgia on behalf of the Cherokee government. Nearing the fall of 1830, Wirt sent his brief to the Cherokee leaders, which was promptly published in the *Phoenix* by Ross' orders, wherein he argued that Georgia's legislation extending the states' civil and criminal jurisdiction over the Nation was, in fact, unconstitutional. While in the process of determining the best strategy to circumvent the state courts and get Cherokee's case directly into the Supreme Court, the opportunity Wirt needed to move his case forward arose.

In the fall of 1830, the Georgia Guard arrested a Cherokee man by the name of Corn Tassel for the murder of another Cherokee man on Cherokee lands. Given that the murder occurred within the Nation's territory, Wirt now had proper evidence to build his case around challenging Georgia's jurisdictional claim. After several hearings of the case in lower courts, a judge issued a ruling that proclaimed that the Georgia Assembly had acted within its rights in extending its jurisdiction and that the arrest and trial of Tassel were legal. Wirt immediately appealed the ruling to the Supreme Court, asking that the ruling be overturned and that the Court halt Tassel's impending execution. Chief Justice John Marshall granted Wirt's request and subpoenaed the Governor of Georgia, George Gilmer, to appear before the Court in January of 1831. Following a special session in the Georgia legislature, Gilmer and his colleagues elected to ignore the subpoena and proceeded to hang Tassel for his crime. Three days later, Wirt, on behalf of an incensed Cherokee National government, filed a case before the Supreme Court that would later become known as *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*.

On behalf of the tribe, Wirt sought an injunction from the Court against Georgia's laws extending the state's jurisdiction into Cherokee territory on the basis that such laws violated Cherokee treaties. Wirt argued that the Court was within its power to suspend the states' enforcement of such laws under Article III of the U.S. Constitution, which allowed the Supreme Court to hear cases between states and foreign nations. The Court, however, refused to hear the case on the assertion that the Cherokee Nation was not a foreign nation according to the legal definition but rather, according to Chief Justice John Marshall, a 'domestic-dependent Nation' to the United States. Although the ruling in the *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* case did not clearly provide an answer to the legitimacy of Cherokee sovereignty and absolute jurisdiction within their territory, Cherokee leaders such as John Ross were invigorated by the ruling and returned to

the Nation hopeful that future cases would come down on the side of the Cherokee. While Ross was confident that the ruling would prove beneficial to the Cherokee as their legal case against Georgia developed, commenting in English that he believed the decision was a key indicator that “[the Cherokee] cause will ultimately triumph,” Boudinot’s initial reaction to the ruling published in the English language was far more subdued.¹¹ While he, like Ross, celebrated the Court’s acknowledgment of the distinctiveness and rights of the Nation as a separate entity to that of Georgia, Boudinot remained concerned about the Nation’s inability to sue over matters of jurisdiction and stated that the state of the Nation was “certainly no enviable position.”¹²

In one of the first Cherokee language commentaries to appear in the *Phoenix* following the Supreme Court’s decision, Boudinot reports on the Court’s ruling and addresses the shared uncertainty many Cherokees felt in the direct aftermath of the case. He writes,

They will not defeat us, the papers that were filed by the judges to give to us, they did not oppose us. We did not lose the land, but you will think of it that way. We will continue our commitment to the land that is ours that we have, do not let your hearts weaken, let us redirect our regression and strengthen our commitment to our homeland. Keep plowing and make your fields bigger, and keep building, and keep growing your food for your neighbors and for your children. This is what our leaders are telling us.¹³

Boudinot acknowledged that for many Cherokees that the ‘domestic-dependent’ ruling felt like a defeat, that it now seemed to many that the tribe and its land would be at the mercy of Georgia, its jurisdiction, and its citizens. He stressed to his readers the need to remain dedicated to the Cherokee cause and how critical it was that the community not let the disappointment ‘weaken their hearts’ or dissolve their commitment to maintaining their claim over their homelands. At the direction of their leaders, Boudinot instructed his fellow Cherokees to continue with their lives and to behave as if nothing had changed— to expand their crops and to continue to build to

¹¹ Perdue and Green, *The Cherokee Nation*, 83.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*, May 7, 1831. (Appendix 5)

assert their presence in the region. Following these statements, Boudinot raises a series of rhetorical questions to his readers. He states,

Friends, what do you think? Are you now giving up, now that we are up against it trying to hold on to the land that belongs to us? Now are your hearts weakening? If this is the situation, then what do you want to do? We hear that someone is saying that we are going to quit. Friend, where will you go? To the place where the forts are?¹⁴ The land for us there is not easy. You will not find assistance there if you fail. Jackson will not give us money.¹⁵

Pleading with his Cherokee readers to not lose faith in their Nation's battle, Boudinot points to the disadvantages of life in the West. Citing the struggles already known to the Cherokee about life in the borderlands, as clearly communicated to them in the Arkansas letters discussed in the previous chapter, Boudinot reminds his fellow Cherokees not to allow themselves to romanticize that life there would be any easier than the hardships they currently face in their homeland.

As Boudinot ended his commentary, he urged his Cherokee readers to remain committed and supportive of the legal battle their leaders were pursuing. He states,

We only fight among ourselves someone is saying. What would we find out there if we do it, would it be possible to overcome. We cannot succeed— if we do that to each other, they would surround us and our lives will be included in what we owe. It would not be good. It would be very bad for our wives and children if we did that. I see our only possible course is to make clear to our beloved leaders our determination to hold on to our lands, to not lose our property, our homes, our fields. If our lands are taken out of our hands, and it is determined that we run away- and if we are truly to lose our lands, the white man will take it out of our hands, we would not receive assistance from them. If we are together and arm ourselves with guns, and in doing that we would throw away value, and we could not help the needy ones that live in Georgia. Friends— let us continue on with strength where we are headed. It might truly happen for us— unless the one we call Jackson who is treating us bad- the next council meeting the leaders can speak to assisting us. To me, our thinking is that he has no basis to assist us, we will only be chastised if they do not take the lands from our hands and if our commitment to our land

¹⁴ The Cherokee phrase, 'dotsuyadadvge,' loosely translates to 'where it is sticking up.' The phrase was often used to reference the traditional palisades that once surrounded forts. When Boudinot references 'the place where the forts are,' he is referring to the most western part of the United States' land claims where Cherokees were expected to emigrate.

¹⁵ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*, May 7, 1831. (Appendix 5)

continues. It will be a long time before that happens– when we become tired, for us to succeed if we do not tire before then– but it will be a long time and process if we uncommonly hesitate to move forward, let us not miss striking the mark before they defeat us.¹⁶

Boudinot sends a clear message to his readers that it was essential that they remained united in their opposition to removal and committed as a whole to the defense strategies developed by their leaders. In the aftermath of the Supreme Court’s decision, Boudinot argued that the Nation needed to remain focused on their central mission and to not act out of fear or put an end to their efforts against Georgia’s attacks simply because the ruling felt like a loss. In his final line, he infers that such actions would surely ensure Georgia’s defeat of the tribe. The struggle to maintain and encourage unity within the tribe would prove a difficult pursuit in subsequent years as Georgia’s sustained its attack on the Cherokee Nation without pause.

Boudinot’s Response to the *Worcester v. Georgia* Mandate

Following the *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* decision, Georgia continued her assault against the Cherokee. To separate the Nation from their longstanding advocates, particularly white missionaries living within the community, the state of Georgia set out to enforce its law that stated that any white person living among the Cherokee Nation after March 1st, 1831, who had not taken an oath of obedience to Georgia or had not received a specific permit from the Governor to remain, was subject to imprisonment and four years hard labor in the state penitentiary. While a handful of missionaries elected to take the oath or move out of the contested territory, many refused and challenged Georgia to act on her threats against them. In March of 1831, operating under the long-held suspicion that missionaries were the primary advocates encouraging the Cherokees to resist removal west, the Georgia Guard entered the Cherokee territory and arrested twelve missionaries for illegally residing among the tribe.

¹⁶ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*, May 7, 1831. (Appendix 5)

Fearing that the missionaries were planning a test case on the grounds of Cherokee sovereignty, the same judge who sentenced Corn Tassel to death, released the missionaries.

Four months later, on July 7th, 1832, under orders from the Governor, the Georgia Guard entered the Cherokee territory yet again and arrested Reverend Samuel Worcester, Doctor Elizur Butler, and nine other missionaries. As the Guard moved them to Gwinnett County for trial, the detainees were viciously harassed. Butler, for example, was reportedly chained by the neck to the Guard's wagon and forced to walk the eighty-five-mile journey to their final destination. In September of that year, a Georgia judge heard the case, and following a fifteen-minute deliberation, a jury found all eleven guilty. Fearing bad press for imprisoning men of the church, the Governor offered the men to either leave the state or take the oath of obedience to the laws of the state. While nine of the missionaries accepted his offer, Butler and Worcester refused, giving the Cherokee Nation and its legal team the case they needed to return to the Supreme Court.

The Cherokee's argument concerning their territorial and legal sovereignty within the *Worcester v. Georgia* case would prove to be more effective than their previous case brought before the Court. Following days of deliberation, on March 3rd, 1832, Marshall issued the 6-1 decision that declared that the charges against Worcester be annulled as Georgia's claim to jurisdiction sat in opposition to both U.S. constitutional and treaty law. In his judgment, Marshall concluded that the Cherokee Nation was "a distinct community occupying its own territory, with boundaries accurately described, in which the laws of Georgia can have no force."¹⁷ In the March 24th edition of the *Cherokee Phoenix*, Boudinot published an article in English detailing the decision under the title "GOOD NEWS." He writes,

The last mail brought us the most gratifying intelligence of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States; in the case of Samuel A. Worcester and E. Butler vs. the State of Georgia; it will be seen from the extract of a letter, and a copy of a judgement which

¹⁷ *Worcester v. Georgia*, 31 U.S. 515, 561.

follows, that the Court has sustained the right of the Cherokees to the utmost extent. They have declared the law of Georgia extending her jurisdiction over a portion of our territory unconstitutional. The question of Indian rights is now decided by the highest tribunal in the United States, and Georgia, as a member of the Union, will, we presume, yield to the mandate of the Supreme Court [...]. We have been struggling only for our rights, and the fulfilment of the promises of the General Government to protect us in our rights as stipulated in our numerous treaties with her; it is now therefore between the State of Georgia and the Supreme Court.¹⁸

While Boudinot, according to his comments published in English, appears to be pleased with the Court's decision (although still cautiously aware that Georgia had yet to abide by the judgment and rescind their claim to jurisdictional control), his Cherokee language commentary published directly after the above article takes a notably different tone.

Boudinot begins his address with an account of the Supreme Court's mandate that had recently been sent to the Governor of Georgia. After quoting a portion of the document which stated the details of the case against Worcester and Butler and communicated the decision by the Court as it pertained to Georgia and her jurisdiction, Boudinot writes the following in Cherokee language. He states,

Therefore this is the paper that was given to the judge from Georgia. This judgment was not just for the ones that are incarcerated to be released. This law is for all of those that Georgia has taken over to their side from what is our Cherokee lands. They were treated differently from what they told when the first confused white man crossed over the water and began, and the doctrine that they met and made said agreement on, when they finished searching, it became clear that Georgia was doing something different. It has become clear and we have judged that we are to take care of each other among ourselves that is the highest mandate of our law, but peace won't come quickly. The people of Georgia will firmly understand this and therefore they will disperse the soldiers. And so now if they do this we will see them and think they are playing. Friends, let us be calm and not go against them. Now it is dangerous.¹⁹

Boudinot's comments suggest that he viewed the Court's ruling as an affirmation of the Cherokee's long-held assertion that they had always acted and been acknowledged by white

¹⁸ *Cherokee Phoenix*, March 24, 1832.

¹⁹ Belt and Blackfox Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*, March 24, 1832. (Appendix 6)

society as a distinct people and nation. With his statement, “it has become clear and we have judged that we are to take care of each other among ourselves that is the highest mandate of our law,” Boudinot communicates to his Cherokee readers the concept of legal sovereignty now put in place for the Nation. It is evident in Boudinot’s final paragraph that he remained very concerned about the Nation’s relationship with Georgia, and despite the Court’s ruling, felt strongly that the Cherokee people and the Cherokee Nation remained in a state of uncertainty and danger when it came to their relationship with the state. Boudinot infers that it was likely that Georgia, either the state or its citizens, would take up arms to defend their claims against the Nation and that for the community to use the Court’s ruling as backing to fight the Georgians would be foolish. With his warnings concerning the prospect of peace and the danger he felt the community would face in the days to come, Boudinot urged the Cherokee readers to take caution and to recognize that their struggle was not yet over despite their success in the Supreme Court.

Boudinot’s response is particularly interesting when compared to his comments in English, as well as in comparison to the comments he made just a year prior in the aftermath of the *Cherokee Nation* decision. Although the *Worcester v Georgia* case was the first real win the Nation had received, Boudinot sends a very leveled and wary message to his Cherokee readers. Was he concerned that Georgia would retaliate against the community because of their triumph? Or did he fear that Cherokee Nation citizens would openly go against Georgians and jeopardize the recent achievements that Nation had made in the eyes of the public now that they had legal justification to do so? What Boudinot’s response does indicate, however, is that in the wake of the *Worcester* ruling, Boudinot was unusually concerned about the tribe’s future and the safety of his people.

In the months following Boudinot's *Worcester v. Georgia* response article, he would begin to develop substantial reservations about the Cherokees' conflict with Georgia and their continued commitment to resisting removal. Five months later, in August of 1832, Boudinot would resign as Editor of the *Phoenix* following a dispute with the Nation's leaders whom he had encouraged to entertain negotiation and who, as a result, forbade Boudinot from publishing such opinions in the newspaper. When read in this particular context, the article above may represent some of the concerns and fears that would push Boudinot in later months to entertain the idea of removal— a policy he had for so many years, ardently and vigorously opposed.

CONCLUSION

Boudinot's departure from the *Cherokee Phoenix* came at a time wherein the internal divisions and tensions within the Cherokee Nation were coming to a head as leaders faced continued harassment from both Jackson and the state of Georgia despite the Supreme Court's ruling. With their opponents' continued commitment to removal, the public representation of the voice of the Cherokee people remained an essential aspect of the Nation's fight to remain. Boudinot's resignation as Editor of the *Cherokee Phoenix* proved, however, to have a substantial impact on the Nation's publication. In the two years that followed his leave, under the eye of the new Editor, Elijah Hicks, the quality of the *Phoenix* dramatically declined. A majority of the publication's content consisted only of reprinted or borrowed articles from other newspapers, and the amount of Cherokee language content within the newspaper substantially decreased over time. Hicks struggled to gain and maintain the necessary mass of subscribers to support the cost of production for the publication, and on May 31st, 1834, the final edition of the *Cherokee Phoenix* left the print house in New Echota.

Despite John Ross's best efforts to ensure his people that removal could be avoided and the Nation's efforts to protect their land and government would prove successful, certain circles of the Cherokee community began to become sympathetic to the prospect of removal by 1834. In the same year, John Ridge, Boudinot's cousin, surfaced as a leader and spokesman of a small group of powerful Cherokees who preferred removal over continued resistance against Georgia and Jackson. On November 28th, Boudinot and fifty-six other members of the group gathered on the Ridge's plantation and drafted a memorial requesting a permanent territory in the West wherein the Nation could retain its government. The actions of the group, known as the Treaty

Party, created a lasting divide within the Nation, most notably between those supporters of Ross and those belonging to the Ridge-Boudinot faction. Following the Treaty Party's memorial, Ross and other Cherokee national leaders sent protests to the government proclaiming the Treaty Party's actions invalid and misrepresentative of the wishes of the majority of Cherokee in the territory. In the early months of 1835, Assistant Chief George Lowery collected and sent over fourteen thousand signatures to U.S. officials in a petition against the Treaty Party. Amid such developments, Ross remained committed to bringing the *Cherokee Phoenix* back to print. By 1835, Ross had a plan in place to relocate the *Phoenix* operation to Red Clay, Tennessee, wherein the Nation's publication could reside outside of the reach of Georgia. When Ross sent a wagon to New Echota in the summer of 1835, however, the printing press had already been seized by the Georgia Guard with the assistance of Stand Watie (Boudinot's cousin)— its location still unknown today. Ross' final defeat would come at the end of the year when, despite the clear majority of Cherokees siding with Ross, Boudinot and members of the Treaty Party met in New Echota and signed the final removal treaty.

The horrors of forced removal became a reality to Cherokees residing in Georgia, North Carolina, and Tennessee over the three years that followed the ratification of the Treaty of New Echota in 1836. Although an exact number of Cherokee deaths as a direct result of the removal remains challenging to determine, scholars have concluded that low estimates suggest that at least four thousand Cherokees died on the journey, with some arguing that more appropriate estimates sit closer to eight thousand.²⁰ The carnage and trauma of the removal affected every single Cherokee family, leaving many surviving Cherokees in search of a sense of retribution

²⁰ Perdue and Green, *The Cherokee Removal*, 168.

For a detailed study of Cherokee removal-related mortality, see Russell Thornton, "The Demography of the Trail of Tears Period: A New Estimate of Cherokee Population Losses" in *Cherokee Removal: Before and After*, ed. William L. Anderson (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1991), 75 - 95.

upon their arrival in the new territory in the West. Despite John Ross' best efforts to maintain peace within the Nation, as Thurman Wilkins writes in his book *Cherokee Tragedy: The Ridge Family and the Decimation of a People*, "men who had lost wives and children or other relatives in the expulsion could no longer honor Ross's plea for forbearance toward the signers of the treaty" upon their settlement in the region.²¹ Such men organized in secret to condemn the signers to death on the charge that the group had violated the statute forbidding the selling of Cherokee land to whites through their participation in the treaty negotiations. In the early morning hours of June 22nd, 1839, coordinated parties of Cherokee men set out into the Nation's new territory under the express purpose of locating and murdering key members of the Treaty Party— Elias Boudinot among their top targets. Sometime after 9:00 am that morning, Boudinot, who was in the process of constructing his family home beside longtime friend and colleague Samuel Worcester, was approached a small group of Cherokee men in search of medicine for ill family members. As Boudinot led the men to an adjacent mission building to retrieve the medicines they requested, he was violently attacked by one of the men who stabbed him once in the back and followed by the others who struck Boudinot in the head with a tomahawk approximately seven times.

The shocking turn of events that led to Elias Boudinot's death and his trajectory from being the once voice of anti-removal resistance within the Cherokee Nation to ultimately a signatory of the Cherokee removal treaty at New Echota is a story difficult to reconcile. Although it is easy to paint Boudinot as a traitor who signed the removal treaty in an effort to protect his own family and assets in spite of the wishes of the majority of the tribe, it is undeniable that what fueled Boudinot's actions was his Cherokee nationalist identity and his steadfast commitment to retaining

²¹ Thurman Wilkins, *Cherokee Tragedy: The Ridge Family and the Decimation of a People*. (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986), 333 – 334.

and maintaining the formal Nation the tribe had built and fought to protect over the previous decade. His role within the Cherokee removal struggle was one centered around language and activism. Boudinot's Cherokee language writings from the *Cherokee Phoenix* are arguably the most significant pieces of Boudinot's legacy, yet, they have been neglected by a vast majority of scholars of various disciplines for decades. The majority of studies published on Boudinot and his life story have privileged his English writings over his Cherokee to illustrate certain ideas about who the man was, what his motivations and goals were, and how his perspective and position shaped his role in the Cherokee removal struggle. What his Cherokee language writings offer is the chance for scholars to complicate such interpretations with particular deference for the Cherokee worldview as embodied and carried within the language. Attention to how Boudinot shaped his arguments concerning the topics and issues of removal, sovereignty, and injustice in the Cherokee language to his Cherokee readers is a part of Cherokee removal history scholars must no longer neglect. What this thesis has attempted to demonstrate is that Boudinot's Cherokee writings within the *Phoenix*, along with the various letters and commentaries published by him authored by other individuals, provide newfound insights into how Cherokees processed and responded to the threat of removal as a community. By investigating the Cherokee content from the newspaper, the extent to which Cherokee leaders utilized the *Phoenix* to represent the Nation on a nation scale, inform Cherokees about political issues, and publicly document the viewpoints of the Nation in an effort to hold U.S. officials accountable becomes evident. Moreover, such study reveals how Cherokee leaders used the publication to push messages directly to the Cherokee populace that encouraged unity and individual resolve in moments of defeat and uncertainty.

While the focus of this thesis remained on how the Cherokee content from the *Cherokee Phoenix* adds new and interesting avenues for analysis within the broader narrative of the Cherokee removal, the translations conducted as part of its research are also of possibly great significance to current language revitalization efforts taking place within modern Cherokee communities. The translations not only serve as an extensive source of word documentation, they also provide those working within the sphere of revitalization the linguistic context and structure in which such words were selected and utilized by speakers of the language. With few first-language Cherokee speakers remaining, most of whom are elderly, the opportunity to have a historical source that documents how first-language speakers wielded the language is incredibly precious and useful for language learners. The Cherokee content from the *Phoenix*, then, should be considered of great value to both the historian, anthropologist, and linguist.

The Cherokee people have long been seen as a people in constant transition. Over time they have also become distant, one-dimensionalized figures often used to illustrate an assimilation-based Native American history. Through more nuanced examinations of sources like the *Cherokee Phoenix*, born out of arguably the most formative and turbulent years of the Cherokee Nation, an alternative narrative of the Cherokee world of the early nineteenth century emerges. Re-positioning our perspective to consider the true innovation employed by Cherokee people like Elias Boudinot to shape their circumstances using the tools available to them, particularly the use of their language, is vital in understanding how key individuals acted in pursuit of securing and maintaining the rights of their community in times of great conflict. In regard to the *Cherokee Phoenix* specifically, what is uncovered from such study is a more holistic understanding of the publication that honors the original impact of the newspaper to the Cherokee people. The *Phoenix* was not only of great significance and worth to the formal leaders of the Nation, but a

publication that multiple levels of Cherokee society valued and made use of to foster solidarity within the tribe.

Considering the ways in which the existing literature has addressed the *Cherokee Phoenix*, the select translations presented in this thesis suggest that through more intensive research and language work, a promising future for studies of the *Phoenix* exists. However, with the modern state of Cherokee language fluency in crisis, this ‘promising future’ becomes more out of reach with each lost Cherokee speaker. If our goal is to comprehend the complexities of the *Phoenix* fully, the process to do so must begin now. If not, we risk the loss of these neglected and extremely important sections of the *Cherokee Phoenix* forever, and with them, Cherokee voices of the past.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY:

Belt, Tom and Wiggins Blackfox. Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828. No. 1

- Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. February 21, 1828. No. 2
- Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. July 31, 1830. No.1
- Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. July 31, 1830. No.2
- Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. May 7, 1831.
- Translation. *Cherokee Phoenix*. March 24, 1832.

Cherokee Phoenix, February 28, 1828. Georgia Historic Newspapers. Digital Library of Georgia. <https://gahistoricnewspapers.galileo.usg.edu/lccn/sn83020866/>.

- March 20, 1828.
- March 24, 1832.

Speech of Mr. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, Delivered in the Senate of the United States, April 6, 1830. Washington, DC: National Journal, 1830. Internet

Archive. <https://archive.org/details/speechofmrfrelin00freliala/page/n3/mode/2up>

From George Washington to Cherokee Nation, August 29, 1796, *Founders Online*, National Archives, <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Washington/99-01-02-00897>

Worcester v. Georgia, 31 U.S. 515

SECONDARY:

Belt, Tom and Margaret Bender. "Speaking Difference to Power: The Importance of Linguistic Sovereignty" in *Foundations of First Peoples' Sovereignty: History, Education, and Culture*, ed. Ulrike Wiethaus. New York: Peter Lang, 2008: 187 – 196.

Bender, Margaret. *Signs of Cherokee Culture: Sequoyah's Syllabary in Eastern Cherokee Life*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Carrol, Clinton Roy. *Re-Imagining Community: Political Ecology and Indigenous State Formation in the Cherokee Nation*. University of California, Berkeley, 2011.

Cushman, Ellen. *The Cherokee Syllabary: Writing the People's Perseverance*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011.

Denson, Andrew. *Demanding the Cherokee Nation: Indian Autonomy and American Culture, 1830 – 1900*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004.

Duval, Kathleen. *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Garrison, Tim Allen. *The Legal Ideology of Removal: The Southern Judiciary and the Sovereignty of Native Americans*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2002; 2010.

Green, Michael D. *The Politics of Indian Removal: Creek Government and Society in Crisis*.

Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985.

Guble, Rose. "Unlearning the Pictures in Our Heads: Teaching the Cherokee Phoenix, Boudinot, and Cherokee History," in *Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story: Teaching American Indian Rhetorics*, eds. Joyce Rain Anderson, Rose Guble, and Lisa King. Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2015: 96 - 115.

Holland, Joe and James Pate, *Cherokee Newspapers, 1828 - 1906: Tribal Voice of a People in Transition*. Tahlequah: Cherokee Heritage Press, 2012.

Haveman, Christopher D. *Bending Their Way Onward: Creek Indian Removal in Documents*.

Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2018.

Justice, Daniel Heath. *Our Fire Survives the Storm: A Cherokee Literary History*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006.

Kilpatrick, Jack Fredrick and Anna Gritts Kilpatrick. "Letters from an Arkansas Cherokee Chief: 1828-29." *Great Plains Journal* 5, no. 1, 1965: 26 - 34.

Luebke, Barbara. *Cherokee Editor: The life and times of Elias Boudinot, Father of American Indian Journalism*. Createspace Independent Publishing Platform, 2014.

Martin, Robert G. "Cherokee Phoenix: Pioneer of Indian Journalism" *The Chronicles of Oklahoma* 25, 1947: 102 - 118.

McKie B.P., Scott. "Tri-Council Declares State of Emergency for Cherokee Language." *The Cherokee One Feather*, June 27, 2019. <https://www.theonefeather.com/2019/06/tri-council-declares-state-of-emergency-for-chokeee-language/>

McLoughlin, William. *Cherokee Renascence in the New Republic*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1896.

Meredith, Mary Ellen and Howard L. Meredith. *Reflections on Cherokee Literary Expression*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2003.

Parins, James W. *Literacy and Intellectual Life in the Cherokee Nation, 1820-1906*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2013.

Perdue, Theda and Michael Green, *The Cherokee Nation and the Trail of Tears*. New York: Viking, 2007.

– *The Cherokee Removal: A Brief History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2005.

Perdue, Theda. *Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983.

– “Rising from the Ashes: The Cherokee Phoenix as an Ethnohistorical Source”

Ethnohistory 24, no. 3, 1977: 207 - 218.

Prucha, Francis Paul. *American Indian Treaties: The History of a Political Anomaly*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Sandefur, Timothy. “Sequoyah and the Vital Nature of the Written Word” *The Objective Standard* 13, no. 3, 2018: 53 - 69.

Smithers, Gregory. *The Cherokee Diaspora: An Indigenous History of Migration, Resettlement, and Identity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.

Strickland, Rennard. *Fire and the Spirits: Cherokee Law from Clan to Court*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1975.

Hopkins, Sara Snyder. ““Going Over” and Coming Back: Reclaiming the Cherokee Singing Book for Contemporary Eastern Cherokee Language Revitalization” *In Press*. 2019.

Thornton, Russell. “The Demography of the Trail of Tears Period: A New Estimate of Cherokee Population Losses” in *Cherokee Removal: Before and After*, ed. William L. Anderson. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1991: 75 - 95.

Wilkins, Thurman. *Cherokee Tragedy: The Ridge Family and the Decimation of a People*.

Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986.

Wogan, Peter. "Perceptions of European Literacy in Early Contact Situations" *Ethnohistory* 41,

1994: 407 - 429.

APPENDIX 1: *Cherokee Phoenix*, February 21, 1828 - Translation #1

AAY EGθd0-0 DθU0-0dA DhBθCθ θ0-θ0 θR TGθFθDLΛJ OθSFθDY, Dθ Dhθd\$βEθDL
gohigi gvwanalenvdv anadanvtesgo aniyvwiya nanvnadv osv iyunalisnenedi unadulisgi, ale anisgayegvsda
T\$VFA.θ DL.θ, θB TF\$FθDLΛJ FR, TGZ AθF θShθBLθ, T\$VFA.θ,
igatseligohi anehi, osi igegalisdanedi gesv, iyuno goweli yidunileyvdanv, igatseligohi,
Dθ TER TYθh.θθDL FRT.
ale igvsv igiwonihisdi gesvi.

“For a long time Native Americans have thought about how they want something good to happen for them, and the reputable people of our region, for good to happen to us, if they could print a paper, of our place, and that would be in our own language.”

θθDYθDYh TGΛFR, O’hEθG.θ Dθ DβF DθU0-0dY, Dθ dΛW T\$SY JhWθY, \$θqAT AθF
Nasgisgini iyunelisv, unigvwiyuhi ale ayeli anadanvtesgi, ale tsunela igadugi dinilawigi, gananugoi goweli
\$ZPθ DθV.θ, EhVθqθDL SOVi \$AWJP, iyΛV.θ S\$Wθi \$ZPθ J\$θBVΛ
ganohedv ayidohi, gvnigwonusdi deudov galvladitlv, vginetselvhi degalawiv ganohedv digaleyvdodi
DYGθLθ, θVθ θD \$θ0-Λ θSCθ-iB T\$F, Dθ DTVF GWY.
agilosodiya, nagwo hia galenvda widetsvnnvsi igali, ale agwatseli tsalagi.

“This is what the leaders and national intellectuals have thought, and the councils of our eight districts, this newspaper comes forth carrying the name above, I have been sent by our council to print, now we begin this my friends, and my Cherokee.”

\$AWΛθDYh R.θ TGθhθ0-θ βF T\$VF TYθh.θθDL JFVθhVΛ AθF hθFθDLθ θRθDYh
galvladisgini ehi iyuanisanvhi yeli igatseli igiwonihisdi digegiwonidodi goweli nitsulisdanv osvsgini
T\$FθDLΛLθ RYβθθΛθT TΛGWY, YWTBθ θLθSGT AθF Oθ-R O’hθh.θθDL FR RFPθ.
igalisdanediyi egiyelvnanelei iditsalagi, gilaiyv dv widanadelogwa goweli unvsv uniwonihisdi gesv egeliselv.
“He above created our language to command us by writing that tells what happened but we’re going to think good about it we Cherokee, he meant for us to have it up to now so that we could learn to talk so that the people will have it to talk about it themselves so he thought.”

θΛθG IEGΛd0-0 L θ\$θ\$Z DhBθCθ dθVF ShhGiRT.
hilvhiyu dagvwadalenvdv tla yigadvvano aniyvwiya tsunatseli dunisinhvsvi.
“It has been a long time I have not heard that native people are proficient.”

DBθDYh TΛGWY SULLθ-Λ, Dθ O’GWθ-θ TYθDL\$ΛΛ TGZ O’VθGR θB θYβΛ.
ayvsgini iditsalagi dedadalenvda, ale utsatanvhi igisdadelvdi iyuno udohiyusv osi yigiyelv.

“As for us, we Cherokee have started it, it will help us a lot it we believe it to be true.”

Dd AD JsdBLo JFYQHVJ HrsfodUhs.
ale hia digaleyvdanv digegiwonidodi nitsigalisdaniga.

“And this printed paper will be our instruction.”

AJFVb UhbOR, Dd LZdBLoE v, JYHf BOLE hSi TOA HfYAODJ OdVb
goweligwoye danisinasv, ale danoleyvdisgv quo, diginili yvwinegv nigav invhi tsigegigonadvdi nasgwoye
AJAGv HrsodO qOoS DOLA, AJFf HhbOR F4T; THV DLA F4T;
hilvhiyugwo nitsigasdv nunasde anadisgo, goweli nidanisinasvna gesei; inagegwo anchi gesei;
SLV Dd JOqO F4T, Dd LgV HEGOJ F4T.
ganegagwo ale tsunanuna gesei, ale dahnawagwo nigvwananvdi gesei.

“If only they are literate, and what they print, they say that whites are far ahead of us but the way that you all are they once were, they were not literate; they were wild, they dressed in buckskin, they were war-like.”

AJZ qOod TJfWvV hSjG Vv SHS, Dd VvA UhA, Dd SHGR, Dd HfG
gohino nunasdv idigatahagwo nigadiyu tsegwo dunidu, ale tsegwohi daninelv, ale dunilogesv, ale tsiyu
DOfv JhhLoJ VvA Dd JOvHAjG, Dd OGW OvVHAJ OhGd Dd HA. Hf DHGLO, A,
amegwo ale tsiyu amegwo tsuninidasdi tsegwohi ale tsusgwanigodiyu, ale utsata usgwanigodi naniwadv ale
HA. Hf DHGLO, Bf E4fOdJ HfRO.
nigohilv aniwadisgo, yeli gvsehohvsdi nigesvna.

“And now their towns are big, their homes are big, as are their plowed fields, and their ocean ships are big and amazing to look at, and the things that they have discovered are amazing, yet I can’t express it all.”

AJFodYh OhodSfO, JsdBVJVZ.
. goweligwosgini unisdelvdv, digaleyvdodigwono.

“And so this writing has helped them, and it can all be printed.”

ADodYh KGdO HfVHfBL GWY JdAJHO, TjBODv OR TfodLjLb dyBf,
hiasgini tsotsalenv tsidotsileyvda tsalagi tsulehisanvhi, idiyvviyagwo osv igalisdanediya ogiyelv,
OdVv Dd HA. Hf VhODG. J4odJ.
nasgigwo ale nigohilv dotsikanawadisedi.

“But since we have begun printing the Cherokee Phoenix, it has been good for us native people, and so we will always be looking for things.”

“This printing press cost eleven hundred dollars.”

ጸገር ስላለው ግንባታው ለአንድ ሺህ አምስት ሺህ ዶላር ነው።

Hiasgini nigadv ugolohisdi iyuno tsalagi tsulehisanvhi tsugvwalodi nigesvna yigi.

“The Cherokee Phoenix will be less then it could be unless it is paid for.”

ገንዘብ ለማግኘት ለሁሉም ሰው ገንዘብ ማግኘት አለበት።

Analigohvs gesdi aines gesdi sagwo nasgino giyoligwo unaguyvhvsdi nivalisdis gesdi.

“Therefore, they will go together to pay for one.”

ግንባታው ስላለው ግንባታው ለአንድ ሺህ አምስት ሺህ ዶላር ነው።

Tsalagi tsulehisanvhi igadv yvwinegv gesesdi, igadv tsalagi, aseno itsulagwo uninohedi gesesdi nigav ግንባታው።

usgwanigodi.

“The Cherokee Phoenix will be some in English, some Cherokee, but both will tell of amazing things.”

የግንባታው ገንዘብ ለአንድ ሺህ አምስት ሺህ ዶላር ነው።

Sunadodagwasdi igohidv advdi tsigi, nagwo sagwo tsalagi tsulehisanvhi tsogileyvdodi gesesdi.

“It is a weekly, and we print one Cherokee Phoenix.”

ግንባታው ስላለው ግንባታው ለአንድ ሺህ አምስት ሺህ ዶላር ነው።

nasgino sudetiyvdv hisgasgo taligali nivalisdis gesesdi nasgi hia gilo hisgasgo taligali tsalagi

ግንባታው ስላለው ግንባታው ለአንድ ሺህ አምስት ሺህ ዶላር ነው።

tsulehisanvhi ditsinagi elis gesesdi, igvwenvdvgwono aguyis gesesdi, tali adelv uguiy vdi gesesdi.

“And then in one year there will be fifty two issues, fifty two issues of the Cherokee Phoenix there will hopefully be for you all to get it, at the beginning one will have to pay, it will cost two dollars.”

ግንባታው ስላለው ግንባታው ለአንድ ሺህ አምስት ሺህ ዶላር ነው።

Gitlilono udetiyvhisadiv oni aguyis gesesdi tsoine ayeli uguiy vdi gesesdi.

“Someone in one year will pay third of the pay.”

ግንባታው ስላለው ግንባታው ለአንድ ሺህ አምስት ሺህ ዶላር ነው።

Gilono datsinesi udvvnv gesesdi asuligogesdi, akinohedi sgini, gesesdi, nudale adediysgv notsalenisgvna ግንባታው።

gesesdi.

itselisdi itsadanatedi, iyuhno yitsinequoga, ale gada yiditsilugogv yitsadelohosga.

“If you think to allow the Cherokees to live today on what is theirs, if you truly believe that and if that is what you think, believe it to be permissible under your laws. But that which you think is yours, you cannot include. And to now think you can allow us to live on what is ours, if you experience growth, you will increase and arrive more.”

ӨZ GWY 110-11113 FRT 1SVF60.133V° FR OGR.

Nano tsalagi didanvtedidiyi gesvi digadolisdiyiquo gesv uwasv.

“To think about the Cherokees only becomes a prayer.”

1L1Ө 1SVF60.1 FR BSh60V6° 1G.1W.160.1 FR SV OӨVФ 1H.1316.

Vtladina digadolisdi gesv yvganisododv ditsaneladisdi gesv gado unatseli tsuniyelvha.

“We cannot be in proximity because where you want to reside on the land, the Cherokees believe is theirs.”

ӨV° D6 OӨRV° OӨLӨ1, 1H.1360.13 1A 1.11146; D43Z 13.130V° 1H.1360.1 Ө60V°

Naquo ale unasvquo unadanatedi, tsuninihisidiyi gago gedidaniseha; aseyino hilvhiuquo tsuniyohisdi nasquo

D4 1ӨSФ60EӨ 33Y; 160YH30° D4V°V°, 0-G.16 60YH FFr.11 OӨVФ 1L D6 3FE.11.

ase nunadulisgvna yigi; tlasgininonv asequoquo, nvwadale sgini getsinedi unatseli gada ale yigegvnedi.

“Now for them to take the land and think, ‘who are we robbing’; or someday to let it go if they do not want it, without consequence, and to give them something different than what belongs to them and to treat them differently.”

1D.1Z OӨVФ 1H.131 ӨH.160.1V°.

Hiayeno unatseli tsuniyelv unilidasdiquo.

“Then they are wrong about what they believe belongs to them.”

ӨC D6 T601. FFr.11, 1GY3 D6 HFRӨ.

Utli ale iyosda getsinedi, vyugihi ale nigesvna.

“To give them more and better, is only sickness and nothingness.”

6Ө1E D6 EG.Ө3B.1 HFRӨ FRT, D6 O0-ӨV° OӨSФ60E TCӨL.11, ӨAHz.1F.1 Ө.1FR

Yawinegv ale gvwanadasuyvdi nigesvna gesvi, ale unvsaquo unadulisgv iyunadanatedi, wigotsinohilida unelisiv

D6 ӨAHz.1F.1 Ө.1FR.

ale wigotsilogedv unelisiv.

“White people and those that they are not going to include for them ot be in control, and for them to hunt us, and they throught that they would plow us under.”

Tlasgino yutvgano gayula igasuyesv digilogedisdiyi, inageno nagwase deginisvi?

“But he hasn’t heard that we have already chosen the places where we will plow, will we go into the forest and sleep?”

Θεὸν βῆ Τῶι Τῶι Ὀλίγῳ Ὀλίγῳ βῆ Θεὸν βῆ Ἡλιόφωτοσ Ἡλιόφωτοσ
Nasgwoyeno tsenav inage widilosga widisvhisdigwo yeno nasgigwo yeno nidiulisanenv hilvhiyu
LEGLḡḡ 0ḡ.

dagvwadaledv nvdv.

“This road to the forest that we are traveling, but we will delay this because there has been a sun for a long time.”

DḡZ LATḡḡ ḡḡḡ DGḡḡ ḡḡ ḡḡḡ Τḡḡḡ, TGZ Τῶι BEḡḡḡ.

Aleno tlagoisdi osda awatvdi yigi nigadigwo idigataha, iyuno inage yvgvwiyuha.

“And we know there is nothing good to find, if you are only in charge of wilderness.”

Osiyusgini nahsquo agataha egisdelisgvi vtlasgini asi esga yinigalisdiha egisdelisgvi-
DβTPV°oDYh DWZoDf.

ayeiliquosgini atanosga.

“It is good for those that are witnesses helping us, but it is not making our backing worse– he is escalating his behavior.”

ΘoDY qoD.J fVfdoDf AqP FsfBW0~J oYzP&T.

Nasgi nusdi gadoleosga goweli gegaleyvtanvhi dvginohehvi.

“That’s the way I understand what the newspaper is reporting about us.”

ihooDYh BFY4AY TYbhV° TGZ TER OPhYJG fSLoW.

Vyosgini yvgegisegogi tsegisiniquo iyuno igvsv utlvnigidiyu yigadanvta.

“What is bad about what is associated with Jackson will not defeat us, if our thinking stays strong.”

GooV° Oh fhEtSf, fhYfP.J, DSq DβE D.L.J fhJYRof,

Nahsquo uni yinigvhnadega, yigegisotlvdi, adelv ayegv anehi yidigigieha,

Dd DSq TLooAooE fhYfVof, ilooDYh fS.A.J GooY fhEooLo.

ale adelv idasgosgv yigikehidoha, vtlasgini yigagohilv nahsgi yinigvdvneha.

“Their efforts to treat us this way, to debase us, if they take away the gold that is carried by those that live there, or they chase us off from where we mine the money, we will not do this for very long.”

Lfv°oDYh OEOG.J Hy, TGZ fhfSoo~ fhSfoDfTooJv° OfodLJoD.Jv°oDYh

Tlegagwosgini ugvwiyuhi tsigi, iyuno yinigegadvnv yigegalisgaisdiquo ulisquadisdiquosgini

Oh hffoDLJfV&T.

uyo nigalisdanelidohvi.

“A short time our leader that is, if we stay this way, they will depend on us to end the bad that is happening to us.”

tv°oDYh OGW0~J DfoDfSf TYbh OEOG.J FRT, ilZ tv° OEOG.J TEGfoDV.J fh

Hnaquosgini utsatanvhi atsisgaga tsegisini ugvwiyuhi gesvi, vtlano hnaquo ugvwiyuhi igvwalisdodi yigi

fLoLooE TG GooV° OLAooA.Jh GSpof.

gadanvtesgv iyu nahsquo udagonadvgodiyi yuduliha.

“Therefore, Jackson has been severely admonished about his leadership, but now in my opinion he won’t be reelected if he wants to win it.”

ale gada osigwu tsaha hanahnigvsiquoyogo tsalidayvdi hadvhisdisgesdi ale dininili unalidayvdi ditsetsi
Dd Uo-odfodai JG0-0 Dd D0 O'HZS0 J0Pi\$ G0Y O'APJ\$00G J0-0

Ale danvsgesdi ditsanvwo ale awi uninodena dinatlvvga nahsgi uditlvtsuganakayu dinvwo

“When your good land becomes scarce of food for you and your children who are in need to eat, Plant cotton, the women and young girls that are yours can weave it into clothing. They who own the stock of sheep can spin and weave the wool into clothing.”

Dd O'Gd'odai J0odfodai G0Y O'AP Qh\$0 \$S Dd T\$'ST0' E0LGT 0d'0odaiodfodai

Ale utsalesdi hiwisgesdi nahsgi uditlv nunigana gadu ale igagaidv gvnatlawai hadvhisdisgesdi

Gt'v' 0Li0 d0v' RAi'0odfodai Gf'odLBJ

wahnaquo hinelv oniquo egolvhvsgesdi tsalidayvdi

“Plant wheat to make better bread to eat it and raise livestock where you live and not to use it up later”

EFGT GWY 0BG 0\$Lo0 t'v' 0hYJG h\$fo'odai0E T0F RtiT O'GJ JG09h00'

Gvgeyui tsalagi osiyu higadaha hnaquo kanigidiyu nigalisdisgv inage ehnavi utsati ditsawetsisadv

FR YW 0GJ0DA Gf'odLBJ Dd O'GJ JG0\$F00' 0FT Dd G00h\$0 0FT

gesv kila hiwatisgo tsalidayvdi ale utsati ditsanugalisadv gesoi ale tsanawotsidena gesoi

“It is good that I love you, Cherokee people. It is becoming unclean because the things that live in the woods are depleting, it is making you tired and finding food becomes seemingly unattainable and you feel the cold.”

Dd Gf'odLBJ GLi0 T0FT T'0G' T\$0f'G0dai0DAv' GG0'J0 Gf'odLRJ DA0v'

ale tsalidayvdi tsanehv inagei ilvhiyu igahawasdisgoquo tsawatvdiyi tsalidasvdi agonuquo

Gh000' 0EGf'00'0DAT Dd D4 0'V0f'00\$'v'Z CR T'0G' h0\$T Vti T0FT A0Z

tsayosisdv wigvwalisahasgoi ale ase hadolehosgaquono tsvsv ilvhiyu tsinigai tsehnv inagei gohino

0hYJ0'v'Z h\$fo'odai0E T D4 hA.0i LVU0R DAGb'v' Rti T0FT D4 G0'JRh'v'

kanigidiuquono nigahusdisgvi ase nigohilv dadodaquisv agolosiquo ehnav inagei ase tsadvdisvniliquo

“And the food that lives in the forest that you find only scarcely until days end, you will have hunger for, and you will realize someday that for all that you have in the forest is becoming depleted and it becoming so daily. The riches of the forest will cease to exist for you.”

EFGT GWY 0'GhEBhA 0'SG0i0\$ K.00DVJ S0'Li0f'0d'0dai Dd J0'hJ

Gvgeyui tsalagi halonigvsiyogo hadeloquavhvga tsohisdodi dehanesgesgesdi ale tsutvni

S.0GF.0d'0dai 0BG'0Z \$L G0' Dd GVf'00' iL0f' YG BFGYb DB E00\$AJ

dehilogedisgesdi osiyuyeno gada tsaha ale tsatseligaya vtlayeli gilo yvgetsagisi ayv gvsvdelvdi

ገገፋፊ ስጦት ህጻኑን ለማወቅ ማድረግ ይቻላል

tsatseligohi detlunav dogalvdanvsgesdi uliyilidedi gesesdi

“Now what will it be that I have helped you when someone was abusing you where you live or when someone has taken your land and obscured your ownership, it is going to devalue what was traded for it.”

ደፍ ለሌላ ህግ ለማድረግ ማድረግ ይቻላል ስለ ገፍገፍ ደፍ ለሌላ ህግ ገፍ ለማድረግ ለሌላ ህግ

Ale tlesdi kilo tsitsalonuheli tsatseligegaya gada tsahvi ale tlesdi kilo inv nvdavulosvhi tsidosdadanodaneli

ፍገ ለሌላ ደፍ ለሌላ ስጦት ማድረግ ይቻላል ስለ ሌላ ህግ ለማድረግ ይቻላል

gada tsahvi ale aquo navgadugi dunolisadiv nahsquo tlesdi gada yidohiyohiselesdi

“Don’t let someone deceive you from what is yours, the land that you have. And don’t give your land near the community to an outsider or land that is tied to the community.”

ገፍ ለሌላ ስጦት ማድረግ ይቻላል ስለ ገፍገፍ ደፍ ለሌላ ስጦት ማድረግ ይቻላል

Iyuno ilvhiyu tsadulvhv tsanadinviyi gada tsahvi ale tsigvalvquo tsinatuga helisgesdi unigvwiyuhiquo

DHGfH OORAG JGZLJLJ F46DJ

aniwatsini unvsvhiyu ditsadanodanedi gesesdi

“If ever you should want to sell your land or parcel of it that they owe. You will think that the leaders of the government themselves have agreed to it.”

ደፍ ለሌላ ደፍ ለሌላ ስጦት ማድረግ ይቻላል ስለ ገፍገፍ ደፍ ለሌላ ስጦት ማድረግ ይቻላል

Ale vtle asequo getsagiedi yigi unigvwiyuhi osiyusgini getsadayvehesdi adinah kvni tsvsv

G6DA110-8 ስጦት ማድረግ ይቻላል ደፍ ለሌላ ስጦት ማድረግ ይቻላል ስለ ገፍገፍ ደፍ ለሌላ ስጦት ማድረግ ይቻላል

tsasgolvdanvhi yigi tsanadinviyi ase getsawasediquo gesesdi adinah unigvwiyuhiquo unvsv vtlasgini

ፍገ ለሌላ ስጦት ማድረግ ይቻላል ስለ ገፍገፍ ደፍ ለሌላ ስጦት ማድረግ ይቻላል

galonuhedvquo unvdoti yigi unigvwiyuhi gvquosehvgi

“They will take it away from you for nothing, unless you have clearly offered to sell it and they buy it. The leaders will not use deception, the leaders told me.”

igatvgisgo kilo dagvwoosi adisgvi.

“We hear someone is saying that we are going to quit.”

YΘPT, oPZ ΘδGδ? VJδUδP?

ginalii, halino wiyilohi? Dotsuyadadvge?

“Friend, where will you go? To the place where the forts are?”

iLδDYH Gt, δAδY YΘVP SΛ.

Vtlasgini wahna yidiha ginatseli gada.

“The land for us there is not easy.”

DδδAZ CR δGδ GpδSIVJ QWδδDET.

alesgono tsvsv yiwatv tsalisedelvdodi hvwoosgvi.

“You will not find assistance there if you fail.”

iLδDYH TYBH δAFYHQB DSΛ.

vtlasgini tsegisini yigogeginihvsi adelv.

“Jackson will not give us money.”

SUCBQV Dδ TDΛδDA YGT.

dedatliyvhvquo ale iadisgo kiloi.

“We only fight among ourselves someone is saying.”

SVZ βP δΛGδ GδDY δhSδΛI IA βP δU4AY.

gadono yeli yidiwatv nahsgi yinigadvnelv tsigo yeli yidadasegogi.

“What would we find out there if we do it, would it be possible to overcome.”

iLδDYH BFU4AY— iL BFΛδSΛ SΛ GδDY δhUδΛδJ, IrSSAVδDYH TGδδJ δhSδδU

Vtlasgini yvgedadasegogi— vta yvgedisdelv gada nahsgi yinidadvneha, tsigadegoquosgini iyusdi yinigalisda

Dδ Sδδ δSΛδδδδδ δSStOδS.

ale dedvnn yidedatloyasda yidegatuga.

“We cannot succeed- if we do that to each other, it if as if they would surround us and our lives will be included in what we owe.”

DH0-00J \$0\$JZ Oho0\$0-C S0\$0-T 0-y dSJE0 D00L00 Jh0000L0LJ J00S00 G0L0, atsinvsdi ganagadino unisganvtsv dehiyelvni nvgi tsudedigvdv asdaya tsunilvwisnenedi disdudiyi tsanetsv. **“Now, the way we have spoken and the way we have made it is different, and all that you have judged, Worcester and Butler, that you consider criminals, you declared to four years of hard labor in prison.”**

tj00Y h\$JG 0h000L JGk000V JAVJ FR S0JAL, tj00Z A00F 0h00-i\$ hnasgi nigadiyu otsiyosda tsuyukdiyaquo digugododi gesv deotsugoda, hnaquono goweli otsinvgga hnaquo **“Therefore, we are nullifying your judgment that you believe to be correct. And we are submitting what we believe to be correct.”**

tj00 O0000 J\$0A0000 0h00Y D0 tj00 0G0L0000 000Y 0000 VJAW0 TC0Lh, hnaquo utlisdv diganugowisdiyi yitsinegi ale hnaquo witsaneisdiyi nasgi nusdv dogugotanv itsvneti, SGA0 D0 J0GG0000 O0L0C J00LGSB O0G0h00 0-00L0 0000 S0A000T. duyugodv ale dikanahwadvsdi ulinetsv tisdawadesi utsatiniquo nvdvneli nusdv detsugotvni. **“To now quickly give the order to release them and to now receive our correct adjudication that we submit to you, the laws that have been ordered for you to follow are different than what you have judged.”**

Eh00 000Y 000J S0JVL KJAJ00Y K\$W0 G0h 0-yK0L T\$SY 0Y0L0000.” Gvniquo nasgi nusdi deotsudoda tsotsugodisgi tsogatana watsini nvgitsone igadugi oginetselvi.” **“Clearly that is the way we elder judges of our government have judged it, twenty-four spoke for this in our town.”**

G00Y J0D 000J A00F G000L0 JAJAJ00Y G00 R00. Nahsgi hia nusdi goweli tsatsinvelv digugodisgi tsatsiyi ehi. **“Therefore this is the paper that was given to the judge from Georgia.”**

iLJG G00Y00 OGR JF000S0 Fh00A0000 FR 000ASW0 G00000Yh h\$J J0D vtladinah nahsgiquo uwasv digetsisduhi getsinugowisdiyi gesv yinugogatanv nahsquosgini nigadi hia J0tjG0000 G00 J00000J Dh GWY T\$VPA0 FR. dikahnawadvsdi tsatsiyi tsunawohilvdi ani tsalagi igatseligohi gesv. **“This judgment was not just for the ones that are incarcerated to be released. This law is for all of those that Georgia has taken over to their side from what is our Cherokee lands.”**

O0G0h h0E0L0, O0hZ00 h\$J O000Th0RT, TE0 B0LE VJh0C TB0 J000L0T,

utsatini nigeqvelv, uninohelv nigadi unisquaniyesvi, igvyi yvwinegv dotsunisotsv iyvdv tsunalenehei, Dd hsi \$ZP6 U#A6D6 O'hZP6T G6DYZ hsi O'h6D6D6 DZMHV& EHfRT qf6DWJ G#6 ale nigav ganohedv datlohisdv uninohelai nahsgino nigav unisquadv anolunidoHV gvnigesvi nulistane tsatsiyi O'GJH 666666T.

utsadini winadvnehvi

“They were treated differently from what they told when the first confused white man crossed over the water and began, and the doctrine that they met and made said agreement on, when they finished searching it became clear that Georgia was doing something different.”

t#66DYH EHfRT hsf6DL TER TSUVF FRT G6DY#6Z G6D66 f#666 FR SDJAL, Hnaquosgini gvnigesvi nigalisda igvsv igadatseli gesvi nahsgiquoyeno wasdv galvquodi gesv deagugoda, iL6DYHZO O'f6D6 V#6 #666666 O'fHYJ TO666666 G#6 D666 D#666666 D#666666 vtlasgininonv ulisdi dohi yinvgalisda ulinigidi iunvnanvtesdi tsatsiyi anehi aniquosgini aniyawisgi Bf\$JCTJR D4#6 DJG G#6 F46D6 G6DY hD666666 U6666666666 yvgegaditlaidisv asequo adinah nahquo gesesdi nahsgi nianadvnelvhv dananelohvsgaquo TSf6Df6D6 SJJAGJ6Df6D6.

idelisgesdi dedidigowadisgesdi.

“It has become clear and we have judged that we are to take care of each other among ourselves that is the highest mandate of our law, but peace won’t come quickly. The people of Georgia will firmly understand this and therefore they will disperse the soldiers, and so now if they do this we will see them and think they are playing.”

TSfT, TLFbGT6DW iL6D6 fVU6666 G6DY96 O'GR.6 t#6 O'666666.

igalii, idalisinahista vtlesdi tsidodadatlutani nahsgiwuo uwasvhi hnaquo unayehisdi.

“Friends, let us be calm and not go against them. Now it is dangerous.”