

WHO AM I NOW?: A QUESTION OF CREEK IDENTITY, 1830-1907

A Thesis
by
DANIEL ANTHONY PATTERSON

Submitted to the Graduate School
at Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

December 2013
Department of History

WHO AM I NOW?: A QUESTION OF CREEK IDENTITY, 1830 - 1907

A Thesis
by
DANIEL ANTHONY PATTERSON
December 2013

APPROVED BY:

Lynne M. Getz
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Tammy Wahpeconiah
Member, Thesis Committee

Edward Behrend-Martinez
Member, Thesis Committee

Lucinda M. McCray
Chairperson, Department of History

Edelma D. Huntley
Dean, Research and Graduate Studies

Copyright by Daniel Anthony Patterson 2013
All Rights Reserved

Abstract

WHO AM I NOW?: A QUESTION OF CREEK IDENTITY, 1830s - 1907 (December 2013)

Daniel Anthony Patterson
B.A., Appalachian State University
M.A., Appalachian State University

Chairperson: Lynne M. Getz

In regards to Native Americans, the notion of “federal recognition” is important, but also problematic. Federal recognition is problematic in that it generally does not take into account socio-cultural factors regarding identity. In other words, there is a certain institutionalized paradigm that allows one to be ascribed, or marked, as a “real” Native American. Ever since Europeans first came into contact with Native groups, Native identity became muddled. For the most part, paradigms of Native American identity have been fixated on white, Anglo-American notions of what is Indianness. This paper hopes to contribute to this recent trend in the study of identity by examining how historical circumstances during the nineteenth century prompted a shift in the way one particular Native American group, the Creeks, based their identity.

The Creeks, along with the Choctaws, Chickasaws, Cherokees and Seminoles, were displaced from their ancestral homelands to Indian Territory

by the Indian Removal Act of 1830. Prior to their removal, the Creeks based their concept of identity on socio-cultural factors inherently based upon a matriarchal infrastructure. It will be argued that prior to European contact, to be Creek meant that one adhered to the socio-cultural practices of the group. Through the examination of interviews of the inhabitants of the Creek Nation conducted in the 1930s and in the late 1960s – early 1970s, as well as an examination of the writings of some prominent Creek authors of the period, this paper aims to discuss how the paradigm of Creek identity dramatically shifted during the nineteenth century after their removal to Indian Territory. It will argue that Protestantism, education, the Civil War, and the enrollment of the Creeks onto a federally endorsed tribal roll altered the Creeks' perception of their identity. It will show how, by the dawn of Oklahoma statehood in 1907, the adherence to former socio-cultural norms was no longer an adequate demarcation of Creek identity. It will further argue that, by 1907, for one to be Creek meant that the outside world – that is the world of non-Creeks – saw that person as Creek.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction... ..	1
Chapter 2: A New Land, A Different Standard.....	14
Chapter 3: The Effects of War & Immigration.....	24
Chapter 4: Enrollment.....	42
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	57
Notes.....	66
Bibliography.....	77
Vita.....	84

Chapter 1

Introduction

People were always asking him what he thought of the Indians, what were their chief characteristics, and it was nonsense. He didn't know. You could say that jack-rabbits had long legs and were swift runners, hoppers rather, but there was no single trait he knew of to describe all Indians. Even the first thing you thought of, color, had almost as many variations as there were single Indians. The one thing he had never seen was a red Indian.

- Max Leon, *The Surrounded*

Americans have always pondered what actually defines the identity of Indians.¹

Title 25 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Part 83 (25 CFR 83) sets forth the present criteria governing the federal recognition of an Indian group. According to William W. Quinn, Jr., “These regulations presuppose that a single Indian group has existed since its first sustained contact with European cultures on a continuous basis to the present: that its members live in a distinct, autonomous community perceived by others as Indian; that it has maintained some sort of authority with a governing system by which its members abide; that all its members can be traced genealogically to an historic tribe; and that it can provide evidence to substantiate all of this.”²

The notion of “federal recognition” is important, but also problematic. It is important because of the services and monetary aid offered to federally recognized Native groups. The majority of federally recognized Indian groups follow the same criteria for their membership guidelines. In other words, there is a certain institutionalized paradigm that allows one to be ascribed, or marked, as a “real” Native American. Federal recognition

is problematic in that it generally does not take into account socio-cultural factors regarding identity. While focusing on the identity formation of the Washoe Nation of Nevada and California, Pauline Turner Strong and Barrik Van Winkle suggest that there is continual conflict between the two discourses of social identity within Native American groups which results in unofficial members who culturally self-define themselves after they are excluded from tribal rolls, participation in tribal politics, federal services and the general sense of belonging. Strong and Van Winkle also argue that “The objectification of official identity as the individual 'possession' of a certain amount of blood – congruent with the 'possessive individualism' of the dominant society – both contradicts and undermines the Washoe's social and situational understanding of identity.”³

Ever since Europeans first came in contact with Native groups, Native identity became muddled. Many researchers have focused on the inter-mixing of Europeans, and later Anglo-Americans, as the main factor that began to blur the lines of distinction – if such lines of distinction actually existed. Scholars have also pointed out the importance of socio-cultural factors that contribute to Indian identity. Some scholars, such as Talcott Parsons, have examined the importance of cultural markers, such as language, in regard to Native American identity. Parsons suggests that a particular prominent aspect of cultural identity has been language. Language, in turn, has been closely associated with a relatively diffuse conception of a common cultural tradition. This has been both oral tradition, and, in more evolved societies, a tradition embodied in documents of written language – in the broadest sense, a literature. Parsons further indicates that ethnic groups are traditionally mutually exclusive. This, according to Parsons, would be rigorously and uniformly the case, however, only insofar as they are consistently endogamous. There are many cases,

however, of the marriage of members of different ethnic groups. There may be, in such cases, a certain optional rather than ascriptive character to ethnic identity. Parson further argues that there is a tendency to select particular criteria and to use these as identifying symbols for what the people who constitute the group actually are.⁴

Other researchers focused their attention on pan-tribal Indian identity. William W. Quinn, Jr. proposes that there is a recent trend for individuals with no documented evidence that supports Indian ancestry to claim some type of Native American heritage. He also suggests that romantic notions of Indianness have enamored individuals, and collective groups for that matter, whether they can arguably claim any biologic Indian ancestry. Individuals and collective groups have integrated these romantic notions into what they believe to be Native American identity.

Quinn asserts that these groups who have claimed heritage to a specific Indian tribe actually see themselves as multi-tribal while borrowing traditional cultural aspects from various Native groups to create a group that others perceive as Indian in what he calls “reverse acculturation.” Reverse acculturation, as Quinn, Jr. defines it, is a process whereby groups and their members “aspire retrochronologically to their images of pan-Indian culture wherein chiefs wear war bonnets, everyone wears moccasins, naturalism is sacrosanct, and the 'Indian way' is practiced. This is often accompanied by an apparently perfunctory depreciation of modern material culture.”⁵ These arguments regarding pan-tribal Indian identity, as Quinn, Jr. demonstrates, focus on the historical romantic notion of Indianness. Phillip J. Deloria argues that, historically, Americans had a propensity to define themselves by what they were not. More significantly, Deloria suggests that the figure of the Native American has held and continues to hold an essential position in American culture. Deloria

argues that the national definitions of American created by white Americans “have engaged racialized and gendered Indians in curious and contradictory ways.” He further argues that “Savage Indians served Americans as oppositional figures against whom one might imagine a civilized national Self. Coded as freedom, however, wild Indianness proved equally attractive, setting up a 'have-the-cake-and-eat-it-too' dialectic of simultaneous desire and repulsion.”⁶

Still other researchers have taken a more postmodern approach to the nature of this debate. Some scholars, such as Pauline Turner Strong and Barrik Van Winkle, have argued “Nevertheless, 'Indian blood' - and especially its more differentiated, tribe-specific varieties – is a hegemonic discourse within and against which indigenous identity is defined.”⁷ Michael Yellow Bird has argued that most Native Americans prefer to define themselves through tribal affiliation which signifies a mode of cultural identity empowerment and that self-definition through tribal affiliation may also be reflective of contemporary American anti-colonial discourse which seeks to force “colonizers” to recognize the multiplicity of indigenous peoples.⁸

For the most part, paradigms of Native American identity have been fixated on white, Anglo-American notions of what is Indianness. Recent scholarship has pointed out that, historically, the predominant white, Anglo-American discourse concerning Indian identity has been fluid – that is it has evolved with the larger formation of a general American identity – because there was a need to form a common ground so that the two groups could coexist. While focusing on the the *pays d'en haut* region of the Great Lakes, Richard White has suggested “But in this world the older worlds of the Algonquians and of various Europeans overlapped, and their mixture created new systems of meaning and of exchange.”⁹

Some other scholars such as Karen Blu, Donald H. Unser, Jr. and George Pierre Castille have paid particular attention to how Native Americans have defined themselves based on the perceptions of outsiders. Karen Blu argues there are two major types of Indian identity. One is an articulate, well-formulated aspect, which is essentially an explanation, an intellectual account of the origins of the group couched in terms that are meaningful to relevant outsiders, such as local whites and people in the federal bureaucracy. The second aspect is inarticulately expressed and only loosely or ill-formulated, an often unselfconscious moral and emotional blueprint of “who we are.” Blu argues that Native American identity is created and maintained through the complex interaction of Indian ideas and activities with those of their neighbors over a period of time.¹⁰

While focusing on the socio-cultural relationship among African Americans and Native Americans during the nineteenth century, Donald H. Unser, Jr. asserts that liaisons between Indians and black slaves produced children who were ascribed with increasing regularity to Negro or mulatto identities. After removal, in order to avert official efforts that endangered their autonomy and identity, Indians distanced themselves from blacks and whites. He observes that as racial bifurcation deepened over the 19th century, relations between American Indians and African Americans became more strained within the communities, and, subsequently, outside observers began to overtly disapprove of these cross-racial associations.¹¹

George Pierre Castille argues that for many reasons the dominant society – in this case represented by the federal government – has historically and will continue to base Native American identity not on the self-identity of a Native group but rather on the perception of outsiders. Castille summarizes this panoptic demarcation of identity by the

dominant group by suggesting “Proof of historical continuity is insisted on, not on the group's own unbroken sense of peoplehood, but the extent to which they have consistently made it visible to others. They must be 'seen' in the records of government, common reports, churches – somebody other than themselves must vouch for them and not lose sight of them.”¹²

This paper hopes to contribute to this recent trend in the study of identity by examining how historical circumstances during the nineteenth century prompted a shift in the way a particular Native American group, the Creeks, based their identity. The Creek Indians are one of the Native American groups that comprise the Five Civilized Tribes. The Creeks, along with the Choctaws, Chickasaws, Cherokees and Seminoles, were displaced from their ancestral homeland to Indian Territory by the Indian Removal Act of 1830. Historically, scholars have classified these Native tribes into one cultural group.¹³

The main evidence used for this examination are the words and memories left behind by the inhabitants of the Creek Nation through two sets of interviews. One set of interviews, which were conducted in the late 1930s under the supervision of the Work Projects Administration (WPA) is known as the Indian-Pioneer Papers. The other set of interviews, the Doris-Duke Collection, were conducted in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Both collections are housed in the Western History Collection at the University of Oklahoma.¹⁴ Also, the writings of such Creek authors as Alice Callahan, Charles Gibson and Alexander Posey offer a unique glance into how some late-nineteenth century Creeks conveyed their thoughts regarding the evolution of Creek identity. This paper aims to discuss how the paradigm of Creek identity dramatically shifted during the nineteenth century after their removal to Indian Territory.

Prior to removal, Creeks based their idea of identity on socio-cultural factors inherently built upon a matriarchal infrastructure. It will be argued that prior to European contact, to be Creek meant that one adhered to the socio-cultural practices of the group. These socio-cultural practices included matrilineal residence patterns, matrilineal clanship, and domestic and familial socioeconomic roles such as the gendered division of labor. Language, of course, was very important to Creek socio-cultural identity. However, language, as an identity marker, will not be incorporated into the scope of this study.¹⁵

During the nineteenth century, various forces influenced a shift in the paradigm of Creek identity. It will be shown how Protestantism, education, the Civil War, and the enrollment of the Creeks onto a federally endorsed tribal roll altered the Creeks' perception of their identity. By the dawn of Oklahoma statehood in 1907, the adherence to former socio-cultural norms was no longer an adequate demarcation of Creek identity. For a person to be Creek meant that the outside world – that is the world of non-Creeks – saw that person as Creek. At the beginning of the twentieth century, to be Creek meant that one's name appeared on the 1906 Dawes Roll. But before the changes in Creek identity which took place in the nineteenth century can be addressed, a bit of Creek history before their removal to Indian territory must first be discussed.

Prior to European contact, the Creek Nation was a confederacy of Muskogean-speaking peoples.¹⁶ Linguistic scholars named the entire Muskogean language Creek.¹⁷ It must be understood that the term Creek is not indigenous. British explorers called these people "Creeks" on account of the numerous streams within their territory. However, these people referred to themselves as Muskogee, referring to the language they spoke. Prior to European arrival, the Creeks occupied the greater portion of present-day Alabama and

Georgia. An exact time for the formation of a Creek Confederacy is not afforded to historians due to a lack of any historical record from the Creeks themselves. However, when De Soto's army came through Creek territory in 1540, a confederacy already existed.¹⁸

The heart of the Creek's territory was the Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers, the two largest tributaries of the Alabama River, and the Flint and Chattahoochee Rivers. The Creeks also claimed lands eastward, from the Savannah River to the St. Johns River and all the islands of the Apalachee Bay, as well as the lands northward to the southern tip of the Appalachian mountains. Scholars historically have divided the Creek Confederacy, or Nation, into two sections – Upper and Lower. The Upper Creeks resided along the Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers whereas, farther southward, the Lower Creeks resided along the middle and lower Chattahoochee River on the present-day Alabama - Georgia border.

The first genuine historical accounts of the Creeks came from the British as the Creek Confederacy allied themselves with the British in the Apalachee Wars of 1703-1708. During the early years of American colonization, Great Britain, France and Spain competed for trade with Native Americans. For the Creeks, trade relationships developed with European settlers as a result of their close proximity.¹⁹ The 1763 Treaty of Paris which ended the Seven Years War all but eradicated French influence in North America while Spanish influence, eliminated from Florida, continued to exist only in Louisiana and the western frontier. With the reduction of French and Spanish influence in North America, the British gained the favor of Native Americans which strengthened trade between the two. Following the 1763 Treaty of Paris, the Creeks allied themselves with the British colonies of South Carolina and Georgia.²⁰

Towns were the basic governmental structures of Creek society.²¹ Several clusters of homes – numbering from four to eight each – composed Creek towns. Smaller towns usually numbered between twenty to thirty homes while larger towns had as many as two to three hundred homes.²² Each cluster of homes represented a different clan. The Creeks generally divided their clans into either peace or war clans. Clan membership regulations varied among Creek towns. There were also smaller settlements, or villages, which had no political organization. The principal leader of a town was the *micco* who was chosen from a particular clan. No particular clan provided a hereditary lineage for choosing a *micco* amongst the entire Creek Confederacy – various towns used various clans for *micco* lineages. Sometimes clan lineage shifted when conditions arose, such as when a town suffered poor fortunes or when the former lineage died out. Each town also had a council as part of its governing infrastructure. The purpose of the town council was to advise the *micco* who, lacking absolute authority, was the figure-head or spokesman of the town council. The *micco* and the council met daily in the town square to discuss public matters. A decision regarding public matters actually rested with the council although the *micco* had great influence over its decision.²³

Prior to European and Anglo-American influences, women played an instrumental role within the Creek familial structure. Creek descent and inheritance was matrilineal, meaning that children traced their genealogy through the mother. It also meant that, upon the death of a Creek male, his sisters or his sisters' daughters inherited his possessions. These examples indicate that Creek society, prior to European contact, was matriarchal and matrilineal. However, external factors contributed to a shift in Creeks' matriarchal-based

socio-cultural features which, later in the nineteenth century, dramatically altered their concepts of identity.²⁴

As previously stated, prior to having any sort of relationship with the United States, the Creeks had long-standing trade relationships with the British, French and Spanish colonials. European traders had increasingly settled along the eastern frontiers of the Creek Nation in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The increased trade with the British not only altered traditional gender roles and inheritance practices within Creek society, it also introduced new social constructions – interracial marriage and mixed-blood children. With the establishment of Georgia as a British colony in 1733, traders from Augusta and Savannah not only established their own homesteads within the Creek Nation but increasingly married into Creek families. Within the matrilineal structure of Creek hereditary customs, Creeks considered the children of interracial relationships between white traders and Creek women Creek by birth.²⁵

Many Native American families acknowledged the benefits that intermarriage with white traders gained. Politically powerful Creek families promoted intermarriage with white traders to gain access to newly introduced European manufactured goods.²⁶ There were also advantages for white traders who took Creek women of distinguished families as their wives. As Kathryn E. Holland Braund indicates “At the most basic level, marriage to a Creek woman linked the outsiders to specific clans that supported them, protected them, and guaranteed a certain number of customers from the clan network. At a more intimate level, Creek women provided companionship, served as interpreters, and helped their [white] husbands learn the language and the customs of their people faster.”²⁷

European and Anglo-American traders also brought African slaves to Creek territory. Slavery was not a new concept to Muscogees. Servitude was a practiced institution by Creeks before European arrival. Prior to the encroachment of traders from the east, Creeks ritualistically killed their war captives. Creek families who had lost members during previous skirmishes also frequently took women and children captives into their households as “slaves.” These “slaves” virtually performed the same tasks as Creek women and children. If Creeks did not eventually return these “slaves” to their respective tribes, they were most often adopted into their captor’s clan. Even though Creeks adopted female captives into their families and clan networks, it cannot be said that these adopted captives inherited the same political or economic rights as their subjugator. The offspring of Creek males and captive indigenous females did not inherit the slave status of their mothers. In other words, slavery was not an inheritable status among Creeks. Mixed-raced children of black men and Creek women suffered no discrimination within Creek society. As stated previously, social status was passed down through the mother in Creek society at this time during the 18th century. “Thus the child of a Creek woman was always a Creek regardless of the race or nationality of the father.”²⁸ However, as will be shown, Creek attitudes regarding the inheritance of status, especially as it concerned slaves, changed during the nineteenth century.

At the conclusion of the American Revolution, roughly six hundred white men of either European or American decent populated Creek towns. As indicated, white Europeans and Anglo-Americans not only introduced the Creeks to African slaves, but they also introduced the Creeks to other forms of economic commodities. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, cattle ranching posed just as much of a threat to Creek society as had trade for European manufactured goods a century prior. According to the historian

Claudio Saunt, “Cattle not only threatened the ecology of Creek hunting grounds but also represented a new and prolific kind of private property that could be accumulated in vast quantities. Both as new possessions and as intruders, cattle threatened the very identity of the Creeks.”²⁹ Most of these new ranchers who now called the Creek Nation home in the mid-eighteenth century were the mixed-raced offspring of white traders and Creek women. These mixed-race individuals not only inherited the trades of their European or American fathers but also their fathers’ notion of private property in regard to land and slaves. By the 1760s, the mixed-blood sons of these interracial marriages between white traders, farmers and ranchers and Creek women had obtained high statuses within Creek society. Furthermore, by the 1770s, a relatively small number of Creeks who were not yet cattle ranching also began to acquire black slaves.³⁰ This suggests that economic stratification had taken root within Creek society and that lower-class males, those who were still earning a living in the deerskin trade, attempted to mimic the practices of the higher-class mixed-blood Creeks who were ranching and growing cash crops.

Foreign socio-cultural and socioeconomic features that Europeans and Anglo-Americans introduced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had a profound effect on pre-removal Creek society. In turn, these alien features had a profound effect on Creek identity in the next century. After removal to Indian Territory, there were a number of circumstances that dramatically influenced the Muscogee view of identity. During the nineteenth century, Creek identity became blurred – Creeks, in reality, no longer could identify themselves by socio-cultural constructs. There were a host of socio-cultural norms, including clan ties, matrilineal practices, and matrilocal practices, which had historically defined Creek identity. However, certain forces, such as Protestantism, the Civil War and

the enrollment of the Creeks at the turn of the century, led to a dramatic change in this paradigm. The socio-cultural practices that were once very instrumental in defining Creek identity were no longer as valid. What had become more important was to be seen as Creek by the dominant, white society. Finally, the enrollment of the Creeks onto an official census, the 1906 Dawes Roll, marked the end of not only Creek sovereignty but also their sovereignty of who they were.

Chapter 2

A New Land, A Different Standard

The Indian Removal Act of 1830 was a significant demarcation in the history of the Creeks. Most of the Creeks made the forced migration westward in the mid-to-late 1830s. In 1836, in the trek commonly referred to as the Trail of Tears, some fourteen thousand Creeks emigrated to Indian Territory. However, some Creeks remained in their former lands. Some of those Creeks eventually headed to the “new” Muscogee Nation in Indian Territory just prior to the outbreak of the American Civil War; some Creeks remained in the southeast during the war but ventured to Indian Territory during Reconstruction.

Many records, both oral and written, survive which detail the Creeks’ westward journey to Indian Territory; many of these testimonies and written accounts made little mention of wealthy Creeks, many of whom were mixed-bloods and had adapted and benefited from Anglo-American economics, who ventured westward prior to the Indian Removal Act. In 1828, Chilly McIntosh, the eldest son of the prominent mixed-blood trader and former *micco* William McIntosh, led thousands of Lower Creeks to what became known as Indian Territory. Both William and Chilly McIntosh had agreed to and signed the 1825 Treaty of Indian Springs – a treaty which culminated in the selling of much of the Creeks’ land to the United States. The Treaty of Indian Springs angered many Creeks who expressed their disfavor by lynching many of the leaders who signed the treaty. Chilly McIntosh managed to escape the wrath of the Creeks; his uncle, William, was not so lucky.¹

Other leaders of the Creek Nation followed Chilly McIntosh's example and left their towns prior to 1830. For instance, one *micco* led his townspeople, numbering in the hundreds, to Mexico. Whether the participants of these early emigrations anticipated the eventual forced removal of the Creeks from their homeland or the economic opportunities the West offered, it is difficult to say for sure. However, it has been argued that many of these "pre-Removal" emigrant Creeks were wealthy enough to afford the excursion and to start over in a new place.²

Just before the passage of the Indian Removal Act, leaders of the Creek Nation codified their laws. When the Creek National Council documented the laws of the Muscogee Nation in 1825, they also incorporated laws that specifically addressed blacks and slaves. As a direct result of outside influence, blacks had replaced female war captives as the manifestations of servitude for the majority of Creek society by the early nineteenth century. In fact, the concept of slaves as an economic commodity became common practice among the mixed-blood Creeks. As previously mentioned, prior to European arrival, Creek warriors regularly took female captives of rival tribes as slaves. Creek clans eventually adopted many of these female captives. According to Creek socio-cultural mores, when Creek clans adopted captives they became Creek and members of their adoptive clans. Records indicate that many of these adopted Creeks followed the customs and practices of Creek society. In other words, many adopted Creeks culturally became Creeks themselves.

The 1825 Creek law code regarding slaves, however, was problematic in that it did not specifically define who was a "Negro." Did the Creek National Council consider all people with physical characteristics resembling someone of African descent, whether of mixed-blood or not, "Negroes" in 1825? Concerning this matter, the historical record is

unclear. However, the incorporation of the words “our people” and “Negroes” within a codified set of laws suggests there was a definite racial distinction between Creeks and blacks – whether slave or free. The 1825 slave laws indirectly show how Creek society, and thus their concepts of identity, were beginning to slowly change. The Creek slave laws directly show how Creek leaders attempted to mimic the American South’s antebellum paradigms of racial identity. Just as importantly, the 1825 slave laws indirectly show how Creek society, and thus their concepts of identity, were slowly changing as well.

It has been discussed how the socio-cultural practices of the Creeks slowly evolved to accommodate an Anglo-American socioeconomic model. But, in fact, the majority of pre-contact Creek socio-cultural practices were not significantly altered in the first few decades after their removal to Indian Territory. One such practice was matrilineal inheritance. Prior to Anglo-American contact, Creek children inherited their social status, town membership and clan affiliation from their mothers. Many early twentieth century oral histories verified that these matriarchal-based customs persisted among Creeks in nineteenth century Indian Territory. Timmie Fife, who was born in 1850, indicated that he was a full-blood Creek Indian of the Bird clan from the Hitchitya Town.³ Another Creek, George Looney, asserted that he was a member of the Deer clan since his mother was a member of the Deer clan. Looney’s statement also suggests that matrilineal inheritance of clan membership continued among the Creeks in Indian Territory. According to Looney, “The children always take the name of the mother’s clan as their clan name.”⁴ Yet another source confirms that some Creeks continued to practice matrilineal inheritance of socio-cultural identity in nineteenth century Indian Territory. Annie Collin indicated that her mother was Creek and her father was Choctaw. Collin asserted that she was “reared”

among Creek Indians. Collin further demonstrated her tribal and clan identity by emphasizing “I belong to the Creek tribe and to the Bird clan.”⁵

The majority of Creeks in nineteenth century Indian Territory continued the practice of communal land ownership as well. Sarah Odom, a self-labeled “half-breed” Creek, indicated that “like other Creeks” her parents were farmers and “had plenty of land to cultivate because the land was owned jointly by the Creek tribe and a man could cultivate all the land he cared to.”⁶ Only wealthy Creeks, such as those with substantial herds of cattle, practiced private land ownership. Many of these wealthy Creeks were mixed-bloods, and they soon adopted the practice of using African-American slaves as an economic commodity.

During the early years in Indian Territory, gender-specific socio-cultural norms remained unchanged. For instance, cooking continued to be an important domestic occupation for Creek women. However, for the majority of nineteenth century Creeks, Anglo-American pots and pans which families acquired through the trade of surplus foodstuffs replaced pre-contact pottery-based cookware. Although secondary to farming, hunting remained an important economic activity for Creek men during the first half of the nineteenth century. Prior to European contact, hunting had been very important to the vitality of Creek families and towns. Some evidence suggests that hunting was not just a familial activity but a communal activity as well in which male members of several families hunted together. Hunting supplemented a family’s diet and provided fur and hides which continued to supply some of the clothing for a lot of nineteenth century Creek families.⁷ George McIntosh suggested that many post-war Creeks continued to exhibit some of the socio-cultural markers, such as the kinds of clothing they wore, that could be defined as

Creek. McIntosh, who was born in 1870, recalled that “Creeks loved bright-colored clothes and blankets and were fond of beads and earrings.”⁸

Many other scholars have investigated the use of cultural markers as means to define or display socio-cultural identity among groups. Celia Naylor-Ojurongbe indicates that in WPA interviews, ex-slaves of combined African and Native descent portrayed their “mixed-blood” racial identity as a way of emphasizing their cultural connection to Native Americans. According to Naylor-Ojurongbe, slaves of African descent, who did and did not identify themselves as “mixed-blood,” also presented their cultural ties to Native American nations in terms of specific cultural markers – namely clothing, language, food and knowledge of herbal remedies. Naylor-Ojurongbe also suggests that for “crossland” (those born in Indian Territory) slaves, the type of clothing worn by Creek slaves represented a way of marking or identifying “natives” as different from other “crossland” slaves. For some “natives,” the material manifestation and representation of what they perceived and identified as “Indian” clothing were instrumental to their personal claims to Native American heritage and to their individual and familial acculturation within Native American nations.⁹

It has been shown that some socio-cultural practices, such as matrilineal inheritance, communal land ownership and domestic duties, remained unaltered during the first few decades after Creek emigration to Indian Territory. However, during the same time, several factors began to influence a dramatic shift in Creek socio-cultural practices. In turn, this shift began to change how Creeks identified themselves and how others, especially non-Indians, began to view them. Protestant missionaries dramatically altered several aspects of Creek society in the nineteenth century. A substantial number of Protestant missionaries took up residence in the Muscogee Nation within Indian Territory during the 1800s and

constructed churches, schools and missions to promote Christianity. These missionaries advocated Anglo-American economics, morality, culture and language. By 1832, prior to the majority of Creek settlement, eighty-one Presbyterians, two hundred Methodists and sixty-five Baptists missionaries reportedly resided in the Muscogee Nation within Indian Territory.¹⁰

As nineteenth century Creeks began to accept the American socioeconomic and socio-cultural models promoted by Protestant missionaries, some Creek families saw education as a vehicle to embolden the socioeconomic status of their children – especially for their daughters. Initially provided solely by Protestant mission schools, an Anglo-American education not only increased the chance of economic mobility for Creeks, but it also influenced matrilineal practices. Whereas Creek women traditionally did not move away from their natal towns, later nineteenth century Creek women who became educators often changed residences in order to teach at various schools throughout the Muscogee Nation. Similarly, matrilineal practices also changed among males. Creek men formerly resided in their natal towns until marriage, wherein they relocated to the towns of their wives. During the later nineteenth century, however, some Creek men, such as Larkin Ryal, also frequently moved throughout the Creek Nation to meet the demand for Native male teachers.¹¹ A change in matrilineal practices is one example of how Anglo-American ideals, as promoted by Protestant missionaries, began to alter the Creeks' pre-established socio-cultural norms; these shifting socio-cultural practices ultimately also influenced the Creeks' view of identity. As the nineteenth century progressed, some Creeks used religion as a means to distance themselves from other non-Christian Creeks. For example, John Tiger, who was born near

Spaulding, Oklahoma in 1915, indicated that he played stickball when he was young and that he attended Creek stomp ground dancing until he became an ordained minister.¹²

Stricter slave laws also fueled an altered view of Creek identity. As stated earlier, prior to removal, Creek attitudes and social practices regarding slavery stood in sharp contrast to chattel slavery practiced by Anglo-Americans. One way in which the practice of slavery in Indian Territory changed the Creeks' socio-cultural identity standard was through a shift from matrilineal to patrilineal inheritance. Alex Haynes corroborated the notion that some slaves in Creek Territory were not full-blooded "Negroes" but that some slaves were the result of interracial relations among blacks, whites and Creeks. She indicated that "There were many times that a colored man and wife were brought [sic] by a white or Indian" and that "the colored women would then bear children for her Master, thus resulting in mixed-blood." Haynes further indicated that her father was a former slave who had been sold for three hundred fifty dollars. She also asserted that her father had at least some Creek ancestry – his mother was a quarter Creek while his great-grandmother was half Creek.¹³ However, there were also instances of harmonious interracial family situations which points to how ambiguous the social relations between blacks and Creeks were at this time. Lucy Washington, whose parents died when she was five years old, declared, "I belong to the Creek Tribe and to the Tiger clan. I have always lived with my own tribe." Yet, Washington later indicated that after her parents' death "some colored people took me and cared for me until I was grown."¹⁴

Slavery and, as will be shown later, the Civil War had a profound effect on Creek society and the Creeks' concept of identity. As previously mentioned, pro-slavery Creek leaders adopted a new set of slave laws in the 1840s and 1850s.¹⁵ In the years preceding the

Civil War, the Creek National Council hoped to restrict the number of free and enslaved blacks. Creek leaders, both for and against slavery, grew fearful of the influence of any blacks, slave or free, on the Muscogee Nation. The sheer number of black people within their territory gave them reason for anxiety. By 1860, the number of slaves within the Muscogee Nation had increased to around 1,532 while the Creek population had declined so that slaves represented ten percent of the total population.¹⁶ According to one Creek source, it was only some of the wealthier Creeks who owned slaves and, therefore, advocated slavery.¹⁷ Pro-slavery Creek leaders aimed these oppressive laws not only toward slaves but also toward free Creeks of African heritage. One such law stated that no “negro” could have sex with a Creek woman. The ordinance also directed punishment toward both parties for violation of the law. Another law also stated that Creek men could not marry “black” women. In 1859, the Creek government adopted a law that forbade Creek clans from adopting “blacks.” As one historian noted, by enacting slave laws, Creek lawmakers “intended to codify a social movement, their dark response to the antebellum South and removal.”¹⁸ The slave laws effectively created two classes of citizens, either black or Indian, and excluded everyone of African heritage from consideration as a Creek citizen even though many Creeks previously considered them as their own according to former socio-cultural definitions. A Southern-American antebellum slave code incorporated by Creek leaders still did not precisely define what constituted someone as “black.” Creek leaders based their paradigm on a racial, or “by blood” criterion, but the laws were not specific as to how much “blood” constituted someone as Creek or black. Whether mid-nineteenth century Creek lawmakers considered anyone with at least some African descent as black is unclear.¹⁹

Some laws were specifically geared toward the reduction of the black population within Creek boundaries. For instance, the Council proclaimed that slave-owners could free their slaves only if they removed them from the Muscogee Nation. It may be argued that the attempt to remove free blacks from Creek social relations indicates that many Creeks wanted to separate themselves – even though some Creeks were of African blood – and thus their identity from African-Americans. Perhaps Creek leaders wanted to distance themselves as far away as possible from the concept of servitude. If so, this indicates that Creek leaders were concerned about how they would be viewed by outsiders – specifically by white, Anglo-America but also by other Native American groups.

Anti-black legislation, however, did not have a profound effect on intermarriage among Creeks and free blacks – whether of mixed-Creek ancestry or not – leading up to the American Civil War. Tiya Miles has argued that interracial marriage in the slave quarters and in free communities of color meant that the black population and Indian population were overlapping and expanding and that the slave population included more and more persons of black and Native descent. Miles argues that whites stood to gain at the reduction of the Native American population. “Black” people did not have the rightful claim to American land that Native people had. To define Indians as “black” meant there would be fewer “real” Indians with whom land deals and treaties had to be negotiated. Miles further argues that the depravities and ideologies of slavery, when adopted by Native people, had the potential to warp kinship ties between Indians and black-Indian relatives.²⁰ Katja May has argued that whites and Indian-white mixed-bloods avoided intermarriage with African-Americans and black-Creeks. May also asserts that no (Indian-white) mixed-blood head of household married anyone of African ancestry. The negative attitude towards black-white

intermarriage seems to have been mutual. Yet, according to May, intermarriage with native black-Creeks was relatively common; one in five interracial marriages involved a black-Indian spouse. May indicates there was little socioeconomic interaction between black-Indians and (white-Indian) mixed-blood Creeks; however, black-Creeks were close to the black immigrants with whom they intermarried more frequently.²¹

The Civil War, as will be shown, had a lasting effect on not only the social relations between blacks and Creeks, including intermarriage, but also the way in which Creeks sought to identify themselves. It will be shown later that in the late nineteenth century, when non-African Creeks applied the term “freedmen” to all black Creeks, they relegated all black Creeks to the status of either freed slaves or the descendants of freed slaves. Some scholars argue that this action forever remapped the Creeks’ racial boundaries and attempted to erase free Creeks of African descent from the history of the Creek Nation.²²

Chapter 3

The Effects of War & Immigration

Once the war began, leaders of the Five Civilized Tribes futilely attempted to maintain neutrality. However, formidable pressures propelled the Indian Territory nations toward the Confederacy. Native American slaveholders felt threatened by a Union victory. Most of the Indian agents operating in the territory prior to the war were Southerners or slavery-sympathizers who used their influence to win support for the Southern cause. In contrast to the federal government, the Confederate states treated the Five Civilized Tribes as independent nations and offered them citizenship and statehood. Ultimately, the Confederacy's promise of more favorable treaties enticed the tribes to join. By mid-October 1861, the Confederacy had negotiated treaties with each of the five Indian nations. Despite circumstances favoring an Indian-Confederate alliance, significant segments of the tribal populations supported the Union cause. Some tribal leaders felt obligated to honor previous treaties with the federal government. Also, pro-Confederate treaties which committed entire Indian nations without the full consent of tribal leaders angered many Native Americans.¹

At the time the tribes signed treaties with the Confederacy, African slaves living among the tribes were not citizens of the tribe and, therefore, would not have become citizens of the Confederacy. It may be argued that many Creek leaders, prior to the onset of the war, were wealthy, mixed-blood slave-owners who had accumulated much of their wealth from

the practice of slavery. These mixed-blood Creek leaders had adopted not only American economic values but also an American ideology regarding racial hierarchy. However, a good many Native Americans in Indian Territory, including a large number of Creeks, opposed slavery and saw the war as an opportunity to end the “peculiar institution.” Ultimately, Union sympathy divided the Muscogee Nation.²

Before 1861, anti-slavery Creek leaders allowed fugitive slaves from surrounding states to reside in their lands.³ Even though many Creeks supported the Union cause at the outset of the war, the reasons behind Union sympathy were varied and ambiguous. Not all Creeks who aligned themselves with the Union were abolitionists. However, slavery became the dominant driving force behind racial hostilities in Indian Territory during the Civil War. As Claudio Saunt asserted “By 1861, no corner of Creek society remained unaffected by race and slavery.”⁴

Intra-tribal divisions over slavery, loyalty to the United States, and attempts by both the Union and the Confederacy to exploit this dissension quickly brought the fighting to Indian Territory. Large numbers of pro-Union Creeks, Seminoles, and Cherokees emigrated to Union-friendly regions like Kansas and Arkansas. Confederate and pro-Union Indian regiments fought bloody battles and engaged in guerrilla warfare in an attempt to obtain control of the land and people. Ultimately, pro-Union forces dominated the area, and, on June 23, 1865, the Confederate Indian Commander Stand Waite surrendered to Union troops, which ended the Civil War in Indian Territory.⁵ The Confederacy’s defeat substantially influenced the socio-cultural structure of Creek society during the latter half of the nineteenth century. It will be further argued that as a result of these socio-cultural shifts during the latter half of the nineteenth century, the Creeks felt a stronger need to be seen as “Indian” to

outside observers. This need arose, in part, because the Creeks needed to be seen as “non-African” for protection – mainly for the protection of their sovereignty.

As a direct consequence of defeat, the Five Civilized Tribes collectively signed new treaties with the federal government in 1866 which abolished slavery in Indian Territory, demanded the reformation of tribal governments, and required the Five Civilized Tribes to cede the western halves of their lands to the United States.⁶ The federal government opened this ceded region, called Oklahoma Territory, for settlement by other Indian tribes and, in 1889, to non-Indians. The Land Run of 1889, as it is commonly referred, introduced approximately fifty thousand non-Indian immigrants to Oklahoma Territory. The following year, Congress passed the Organic Act of 1890 which established a regional government in Oklahoma Territory and set the boundaries for Oklahoma and Indian Territories.⁷ The federal government also compelled the Five Civilized Tribes to grant rights-of-way to railroads seeking to cross their lands, a concession which exposed Indian Territory to hordes of uninvited outsiders. Frequently in defiance of Indian and federal laws, white homesteaders were the largest non-Indian group to enter the territory.⁸

Even though the new treaties with the United States emancipated slaves in Indian Territory, the federal government permitted each tribe to determine if, and in what manner, it incorporated former slaves into its political and social infrastructures. The federal government had trouble enforcing some provisions of the treaties including the enfranchisement of African-Americans into the tribes. Some tribes were willing to emancipate their black slaves, but they did not want former slaves as full citizens of their tribes. The tribes were afraid of someday being classified as colored and, consequently, of

losing their status as an Indian tribe along with the titles to their reservations to the United States.⁹

As a condition of their treaty with the United States, the Creeks adopted a new Constitution in 1867. One of the purposes of this new Creek Constitution was to address citizenship issues in regards to newly freed slaves. Prior to 1867, tribal officials regulated Creek citizenship criteria. However, this new constitution afforded the power to decide on applications for citizenship to the tribal courts for Coweta, Muskogee (Arkansas), Eufaula, Wewoka, Deep Fork and Okmulgee districts. Anyone claiming membership had to submit petitions and supporting affidavits to the courts.¹⁰

All of the Five Civilized Tribes extended certain privileges and protection to their former slaves. Within the post-war Muscogee Nation, a new lot of Creek leaders opted to allow freedmen to apply for citizenship with full civil and political rights. During Reconstruction, the newly appointed Creek leaders also allocated land to freedmen. In fact, Creek freedmen more easily acquired land in Muscogee Nation than their counterparts within the other four nations of Indian Territory.¹¹ The majority of Creek freedmen settled in three all-black towns – Arkansas Colored, Canadian Colored and North Fork Colored – around the fertile river bottoms of present-day east-central Oklahoma. Some freedmen became entrepreneurs and were noticeably economically successful during Reconstruction. One former Creek slave operated a prosperous hostelry near Cane Creek by 1878. In fact, the economic prosperity of Creek freedmen and the Creek Nation's reputation for racial tolerance lured former slaves from other tribes to the Muscogee Nation.¹²

As previously stated, freedmen enjoyed full rights as Creek citizens. These rights included representation in both houses of the Creek National Council.¹³ Creek freedmen

routinely voted in bloc and eventually allied themselves with one of the major Creek political parties, the Sands Party, which narrowly won the election of 1875 for principal chief with the help of freedmen voters. The Sands Party endorsed the “old” customs and laws of the Muscogee Nation. The Sands Party often competed with the Checote Party, headed by Samuel Checote, who was declared principal chief by the Creek Convention in 1871 after a dispute between the two parties over the election process. The Checote Party endorsed the “new” customs and laws of the Creek Nation as set forth by the Creeks’ new constitution.¹⁴ Some Creek freedmen even became prominent players in Creek politics. The Creek legislature even appointed one freedmen, Jesse Franklin, to the tribal Supreme Court in 1876.¹⁵ For much of the post-war period, the Muscogee Nation allowed their former slaves, regardless of their citizenship status, to reside without molestation within their territory; in contrast, the Chickasaw and Choctaw Nations zealously labored for the removal of their ex-slaves. The extent of Indian-black social interaction was clearly the most significant gauge of post-war acceptance of former slaves in Indian Territory. In this regard, Seminoles and Creeks were the most progressive. In fact, some historians have argued that Creeks and freedmen intermingled freely during the post-war period, as evidenced by the number of interracial marriages.¹⁶

Due to the way in which freedmen actively participated within the evolving Creek socio-cultural superstructure, as evidenced by economic prosperity, political activism and intermarriage, it may be argued that freedmen felt that they were truly part of Creek society, that they were members of a the Muscogee Nation, and that they were, in fact, Creek. Celia E. Naylor-Ojuronbe has indicated that however much relations were mutual and mitigating to the experience of slavery, slaves and ex-slaves among the Five Tribes always dealt in a

condition of “dual belonging.” “They had belonged to Native American owners, but they were also persons who were a part of, and belonged to, Native American communities in Indian Territory.” Naylor-Ojorongbe demonstrates that, after emancipation, recently freed slaves in Indian Territory reconstructed their identities as freedpeople by creating and exhibiting a national identity and nationalism in connection with specific Native American nations. Naylor-Ojorongbe concludes that unlike “crossland Negroes” who relocated to Indian Territory, “natives” were born and raised in Indian Territory – the extent of their cultural interactions, oftentimes intensified by their blood relations, established a group of persons of African descent whose cultural and social ties were with Native Americans.¹⁷

For instance, Alex Blackston, whose parents were both slaves prior to the American Civil War, indicated that his parents married each other “according to Creek Indian laws and settled down” after the war. Blackston also stated that he had attended stomp dances as a child where “The Creek Indian and the negroes like myself all mixed, mingled and danced together.”¹⁸ Regarding newly freed slaves in post-Civil War Indian Territory, Donald A. Grinde, Jr. and Quintard Taylor have suggested “Culturally, these freedmen resembled Indians among whom they lived rather than ex-slaves in the defeated Confederacy. They spoke the various languages, ate Indian foods, wore Indian clothing, and followed local religious customs. They organized small communities patterned after those of the Indians.”¹⁹

It seems that during Reconstruction, there was a bond – a socio-cultural harmony – between freedmen and Creeks which reinforced the notion that socio-cultural ties outweighed one’s racial makeup. However, the debatable socio-cultural harmony between freedmen and Creeks did not last very long. As will be shown, Protestantism, education and

immigration had a direct influence in altering the socio-cultural harmony among the peoples of color of the Muscogee Nation in the decades following the Civil War. Indirectly, these influences modified the way in which Creeks constructed their identity.

The need to revamp their identity was not a unique socio-cultural phenomenon to only Creeks or the other native groups of Indian Territory. After the war, there was an overwhelming need to rebuild America – to create a better America – socio-culturally. The Progressive Movement aimed to heal America via a Protestant ethic; a way to subdue corruption and cleanse the American spirit. But throughout American history, as some scholars have pointed out, the use of violence has been at the core of the re/creation of American identity. The decades following the Civil War were no exception. As the idea of American purification deepened throughout Anglo-American society, so did Anglo-American dreams of expansion and empire. America needed to expand its religious values and dominance in the West, and eventually overseas as well. The need to rebuild America after the Civil War resulted in a wave of Anglo-American aggressiveness at home and abroad. According to Jackson Lears, in post-war America, “memories and fantasies of heroism encouraged faith in regeneration through war.”²⁰

Post-war Anglo-American aggressiveness, by way of westward expansion, was one means through which American Progressives attempted to enforce assimilation onto frontier Native American groups. However, the Anglo-American need to attempt to assimilate Native Americans was not a novel concept. One way in which the assimilation of Native Americans was attempted was through cultural intermediaries – a broker – someone who lived among the Indians, knew their customs, could speak their language, and could teach them the ways of the white man. According to Margaret Connell Szasz, cultural brokers have

served several functions, “Some bridged native worlds marked by separate and distinct identities. Others forged bounds between native and outside cultures. Even those who entered the pathway through circumstances beyond their control gained multicultural perspectives along the way.”²¹

But the role of cultural broker was not limited to strictly non indigenous people living among Native American groups. Mary Jane Warde has suggested that some Creeks also accommodated an Anglo-American socio-cultural milieu which served to benefit the Creeks. Warde asserts that as a diplomat and member of the Creek national government for sixty years, George Washington Grayson acted as a cultural broker, interpreting for the Creeks the language, policies and demands of Anglo-Americans. Warde further indicates that throughout the last half of the nineteenth century, Grayson urged the Creek people to adopt the educational, economic, religious and political systems of the Anglo-American majority. Grayson and his contemporaries, argues Warde, used terms such as “mixed-bloods,” “full-bloods,” and “freedmen” to categorize Creek citizens according to their lifestyle, political views and perspective on what was best for the Creek people. According to Warde, Grayson’s American education, business skills, experience with the Okmulgee Convention and wide acquaintance with other Indian Territory citizens had prepared him to defend the Creek Nation as a politician, diplomat and cultural broker just as he had defended it as a warrior during the American Civil War. Warde argues that territorial tribes-people, conscious of intensifying post-war Anglo-American aggressiveness, developed a new Indian identity and defensive unity that transcended tribal boundaries. However, unlike some cultural brokers, Grayson experienced no crisis of identity in spite of his mixed descent.

Warde stresses that Grayson demonstrated the dual identity – Indian as well as national – that emerged in the face of Anglo-American aggression in post-Civil War Indian Territory.²²

Reconstruction, the introduction of the railroad and rapid Anglo-American immigration increased the widespread building of Protestant missions and churches and federally-supported schools in post-Civil War Indian Territory. Protestantism implicitly affected matrilineal practices among nineteenth century Creeks. Many Creek converts left their towns in order to reside closer to their Christian churches. Linda Collins, a self-proclaimed non-Christian, full-blooded Creek reported that “Christian Indians like to have their homes near their churches.”²³

Church affiliation not only influenced residence patterns among some later nineteenth century Creeks but also, consequently, fueled the deterioration of clan and kinship ties among those Creeks. In examining kinship and clan ties among post-war Creeks, Choctaws and Cherokees, Alexander Spoehr has argued that the decline of the clan, the contraction of the kinship system, the disappearance of formal behavior patterns based on the clan and the disappearance of the kin tie as a means of integrating the local group are all expressions of a single trend – the ever decreasing social importance of kinship. Spoehr also indicates that, among these three tribes, the kinship relation was used less and less as a mechanism for extending and establishing personal relations throughout the town and tribe as the basis for organized consanguine groups, such as lineage and clan, which in turn underlay forms of marriage, education, Native justice, ceremony and ritual and as a general organizing principle around which so much tribal life revolved. Spoehr concludes that kinship, as a widely extended means of integrating these societies, underwent a progressive decline with a corresponding individualization of behavior. The town households underwent dispersion

with the church community tending to supplant the town as a form of local integration. Furthermore, political centralization, in the form of tribal organization, weakened the clan and, to some extent, the town. Spoehr argues that these changes reflected the presence of the settler, missionary and government agent.²⁴

Education was also a primary factor in the variation of the Creek socio-cultural model which also fueled the way in which others viewed those who considered themselves as Creek. As the nineteenth century wore on, education became more and more important as an ascriptive characteristic of Creek identity; it was easier to be seen as a Creek in the perceptions of outsiders because to be educated meant that one had adopted the socio-cultural values of the predominant and ruling white-American norm. In other words, education was a tool that could be used to separate his or her identity from that of a newly freed slave. After the Civil War, Creeks were defenseless not only against white immigration, but also against a bigoted view of racial hierarchy. Education, firstly promoted by missionaries and then by the federal government, became a vehicle to promote this white-American socio-cultural view.

In the early 1800s, the federal government gave subsidies to schools established by missionaries. The federal government expanded these responsibilities as a result of provisions in treaties made up to 1880 and, in some additional cases, where treaties carried no provisions for education.²⁵ Baptist, Presbyterian, and Episcopal missionaries established several schools in the Creek Nation prior to the war.²⁶ Early mission schools included the Tallahassee Manual Labor Boarding School that was established under the supervision of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions in 1842, the *Koweta* mission school (Coweta Mission School) established in 1843 by the Presbyterian minister Robert Loughridge, and the

Asbury mission boarding school (later the Eufaula Indian Boarding School) originally established by the Episcopal Church in 1849.²⁷

In the 1860s, many missionaries and their teaching staff throughout Indian Territory had to abandon their schools and students because of the war. However, during Reconstruction, new mission schools emerged within the Creek Nation. The Creek National Boarding School (also known as Levering Mission or Wetumka Boarding School) opened in 1880 under the combined efforts of the Southern Baptist Convention and Creek leaders. Also in 1880, Professor Almon Bacone and the American Baptist Home Mission Society opened Indian University (later Bacone College) in the Cherokee Nation. In five short years, the college needed to expand and, thus, moved to a new location within the Creek Nation. Bacone College still operates today as a four-year liberal arts college in Muskogee, Oklahoma.²⁸

Education particularly allowed Creek women, and to an extent Creek men, to pursue teaching jobs which provided upward mobility in a nineteenth century American socioeconomic model. It may be argued that institutionalized education was socioeconomically liberating for Creek women. After attending the Tullahassee Mission, Mary Lewis Herrod became a teacher; she was the first woman to instruct in the Creek national school system and the first person to teach English to Creek students at these schools. Other Creek women pursued careers as teachers in the Muscogee Nation after they attended either parochial or government schools as children and young adults.²⁹ Belle Gray Conner, who was born in 1882 and could speak Muscogee fluently, indicated that she had attended various Indian schools as a child because her mother was a teacher, so her family moved frequently. Conner further indicated that only “Indian” children attended these

schools where the instructors taught in English.³⁰ Kate Shaw Ahrens, born in 1864 to a white father and a full-blood Creek mother, illustrated how Creeks began to adopt post-bellum, Southern American views on segregation. Ahrens indicated that she attended an all-girls school as a child and that she “was amazed when Negro delegates were seated with white delegates at a convocation at school.” Ahrens attended college in Missouri, after which she returned home and worked at a boarding school for Creek girls in the Muscogee district for a period before teaching at the government school at the Poncas Agency.³¹

By 1877, the Creeks had established three boarding schools within their territory for Creek freedmen and the orphans of freedmen. Creek freedmen wanted their children to be educated too, so they utilized their considerable political strength at the local level and lobbying efforts at the national level to secure education for their children.³² Some Creek leaders were uneasy about the education freedmen received within their borders. It may be argued that Creek fears were not unwarranted. Even though the Five Civilized Tribes paid the entire administrative cost of the territorial school system and a disproportionate share of its maintenance, Indian enrollment in 1904 was 10,041 or 15% of the total. Black enrollment of 11,556 had surpassed Indian enrollment for the first time while white enrollment was 54,853. It seems that there was concern among Creeks and their leaders over their minority status. It may also be argued that as their minority status grew, so did their fears of someday having their rights, and possibly their land, taken. It became much more important to the Creeks in the latter half of the nineteenth century to be seen as a Native American group, to be seen as Creek Indians in the eyes of the white-America, instead of being seen as just another minority group.³³ For Creeks, this need arose, it can be argued,

because the Creeks understood they would need the help of white America in order to protect the remainder of their lands from encroachment and settlement.

By the 1880s, large-scale railroad construction commenced across Indian Territory. Construction crews created virtual instant cities such as Tulsa and Ardmore. Other non-Indian towns became important shipping centers for coal, timber, cattle and agricultural products. Nearly all of these towns were unincorporated, had no legal standing in the Indian nations and were populated by non-Indian interlopers. Rapid railroad construction and development, along with the previously mentioned Land Run of 1889, prompted the rapid legal and illegal immigration of uninvited outsiders into the Muscogee Nation. This influx of outsiders – both white and black – not only altered the Creeks’ political, economic and socio-cultural views, but it also affected how they constructed their identity as an Indian people.³⁴

In Indian Territory, deer and buffalo were the primary hunted game until over-hunting dramatically decreased their numbers. Many Creeks blamed white poachers for the limited availability of game in Indian Territory in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Creek males no longer regularly hunted meat and hide sources; this, in turn, limited Creek males’ economic contribution to their families. Consequently, the lack of wild game also hindered women’s contribution to the Creek household economy in that it limited their role in the preparation of hides. Reflecting on a time when buffalo, deer and turkey were readily available food sources, a mixed-blood Creek who was born in 1866, asserted “The white man came and killed the game in a greedy fashion. The days of good game hunting in Oklahoma are gone forever.”³⁵

The introduction of mercantile, or general, stores also decreased the importance of hunting as an economic function for both Creek males and females. The introduction of a large-scale cattle trade in the nineteenth century did not introduce Creeks to the concept of market economy, but the growing expansion of the cattle trade did increase the number of general stores in Indian Territory. Subsequently, many more Creeks bought domestic items and food from general stores. As previously mentioned, the Creeks involvement in deerskin trade during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had introduced them to the idea of European economics. White immigrants opened the majority of mercantile stores in Indian Territory. James Parkinson, a white immigrant from Kansas, opened the first general store in Red Fork, a district of the Muscogee Nation, where he sold “food supplies, dress goods, men’s clothing, furniture, lumber, hardware, chinaware and farm implements” to ranchers passing through the Muscogee Nation on their way to railroad terminals that transported western cattle to eastern slaughterhouses. Another white immigrant, James A. Patterson, opened the first mercantile company in the town of Muskogee in the early 1870s.³⁶

As it has been discussed, the decades following the Civil War was a period of dramatic alterations for the Creeks. The Muscogee Nation was not exempt from post-bellum America’s Progressive rebirth. This social, cultural, and economic rebirth brought rapid changes to the Creek Nation. Railroads and rapid immigration forever altered Creek identity; so too did the Progressive zeal to Christianize and educate the Creeks. All these outside forces – immigration, economic changes, missionaries and institutionalized education – created a dynamic environment in which the traditional socio-cultural notions of Creek identity became blurred after the war. Many Creeks struggled with these rapid and numerous changes and what they meant to their own notions of identity.

Literature offers a unique glance at the socio-cultural struggles of the late-nineteenth century Creeks and the alteration of their identity. Alice Callahan, who was born in Texas in 1868, is considered by most scholars to be the first American Indian female novelist. Her father, Samuel Benton Callahan, was one-eighth Creek. Samuel Callahan's parents had been forced move to Indian Territory in 1833 along with others of the Creek Nation. He was prominent in Creek politics, edited the *Indian Journal* and served as the first superintendent of the Methodist-sponsored Wealaka Boarding school. Alice Callahan attended the Wesleyan Female Institute in Virginia. In 1891, she worked as the editor of *Our Brothers in Red*, a Methodist newspaper published in Muscogee. During the 1890s, she taught at the Wealaka Boarding School and Harrell International Institute.³⁷

Callahan's short novel, *Wynema: A Child of the Forest*, was published in 1891. The book received little notice until 1955 when Daniel F. Littlefield, Jr. and James W. Parins mentioned it in a bibliography about Native American writers. One of the novel's subplots is a romantic affair between Wynema, a Creek Indian, and a white man. Although intermarriage between whites and Creeks was not uncommon in the post-bellum era, it encroached on the hysteria over miscegenation governing much of the population and culture of the period. Also, the novel's brief allusion to and elision of the role that blacks would play in the plot of nation and reconciliation mark the limits of common ground imaginable for Callahan.³⁸

One of the most important aspects out about *Wynema* is the absence of black characters which points to the dramatic shift in Creek attitudes toward tribally enrolled blacks as well as black immigrants to Indian Territory, referred to as "state Negroes" during the Reconstruction era. Susan Bernardin has suggested that "In its ambivalent embrace of

Euro-American models of acculturation at the expense of Native sovereignty, the text remains hesitant about the future national and cultural identity of American Indians.” It may be argued that by omitting black characters from her story, Callahan wanted to make sure her audience, which at the time was mainly whites, was not confused about who was a Creek, or in a larger sense who was an Indian. By not mentioning black people at all, it is as if, according to Callahan, they did not exist. Black people may have resided in the Creek Nation, but they were not Creek.³⁹

In conclusion, it is undeniable that the Civil War, Reconstruction and post-war immigration had a considerable impact on the socio-cultural composition of late nineteenth century Creek society. In turn, these socio-cultural changes significantly influenced the paradigm of Creek identity. As previously mentioned, one of the consequences of the Civil War was the cession of the western portion of the Muscogee Nation to the United States. This tract of ceded land became part of the collective locality known as Oklahoma Territory. In 1889, the federal government opened Oklahoma Territory up for settlement by non-Native Americans – including white and black homesteaders. The treaty the Five Civilized Tribes signed at the conclusion of the war also dictated that the nations of Indian Territory open up their lands for railroad construction which served to link eastern markets to the newly established Oklahoma Territory. Consequently, railroads rapidly brought immigrants – both white and black – to both Oklahoma and Indian Territories. According to Donald Grinde, Jr. and Quintard Taylor, “Whites who established homesteads on tribal lands, frequently in defiance of Indian or federal laws, were the largest non-Indian group to enter the [Indian] territory.”⁴⁰

While slight in comparison to white immigration, black immigration into the Muscogee Nation and Indian Territory as a whole was also substantial during the post-war decades. By 1890, the majority of blacks, or those whom U.S. census officials classified as “black,” residing in the Muscogee Nation had immigrated from bordering states. Many former slaves immigrated to the Muscogee Nation for the economic potential it provided; some came to work for railroad companies while others came to work on the large farms of wealthy, mixed-blood Creeks. A substantial number of both white and black immigrants entered the Muscogee Nation without the consent of the Creek government. Tiya Miles and Sharon P. Holland assert “For black sojourners, Indian Territory shone like a beacon at the end of a long tunnel of racism and exploitation.” It was in the development of all-black towns within Indian Territory at the end of the nineteenth century that “the language of Indian Territory as the black paradise began to emerge.”⁴¹

The socio-cultural changes which occurred in the post-war Muscogee Nation also altered the Creek political infrastructure. Claudio Saunt argues that post-war Creek sovereignty was built upon a racial and economic hierarchy. Within three decades following the Civil War, Creeks were no longer the majority group in the Muscogee Nation. “Less than twenty-five years after the Civil War, the Indian had become a minority in his own land.”⁴² By the late 1880s, the Creeks, whom historians have noted as traditionally more racially tolerant compared to other Native American groups, displayed open animosity towards blacks including freedmen, recent African-American immigrants and even Creeks with African ancestry.⁴³ Creek freedmen, in an attempt to reinforce their identity and rights within Creek society, briefly imposed social sanctions against marriage with blacks from neighboring states. However, these distinctions broke down in the face of increasing

hostility from both Creeks and whites toward Creek freedmen and, by extension, all blacks.⁴⁴ According to David A. Y.O. Chang, “Creek freedmen asserted (among other things) both that they were members of the Creek Nation and that they had a special and separate place within that nation.”⁴⁵ During most of the nineteenth century, the term “full-blood” was used as a marker of socio-cultural orientation rather than racial make-up. Some Creeks were considered “full-blooded” despite some non-indigenous ancestry. This rapid influx of black immigrants created a rift, often expressed in terms of national identity, between black settlers and Creek freedmen.⁴⁶ However, as the nineteenth century came to a close, many Creeks sought to distance themselves from their freedmen kin. At the beginning of the twentieth century, socio-cultural ties were no longer a valid marker of Creek identity.

Chapter 4

Enrollment

As soon as the war was over, dissension arose within Creek society over whether to fully enfranchise their former slaves. Some dissenters believed freedmen, even those with Muscogee lineage, were not Creek. As previously discussed, many factors in the latter half of the nineteenth century fueled this debate as more and more Creeks became dissenters. The enrollment of the Creeks by the U.S. government was the final factor in the reformation of Creek identity. As will be shown, the enrollment process required all Creeks, whether willing or not, to have their identity based on what some other group, in this instance the federal government, considered to be Creek. After enrollment, one could not base his Creek identity on socio-cultural norms. One was Creek if and only if his name appeared on the Dawes Roll.

The identity of former slaves was a major point of disagreement throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century. In 1867 J.W. Dunn, the Creek agent at Fort Gibson, prepared a roll of 1,774 blacks he felt entitled to citizenship. Tribal officials argued that many of these people returned to the Creek Nation too late to take advantage of the treaty and that others were “state Negroes” who came to take advantage of economic opportunities. Some Creek leaders also charged that officials of the three “colored towns” tried to include the names of ineligible citizens on their town rolls.¹ In April 1882, the Creek tribal courts ordered the taking of a general census of the Muscogee Nation; soon after legal challenges

over citizenship erupted. A little more than a year later, the Creek National Council transferred, via the Act of November 29, 1883, the power to determine citizenship from the tribal courts to a Committee on Citizenship.²

In 1887, the federal government sharply influenced Creek citizenship criteria by way of the General Allotment Act. The act empowered the President of the United States to dissolve all Native American nations, to divide the lands that Native groups held communally into small tracts, and to dispossess these tracts to individual members of those Native groups.³ The federal government called this process “allotment in severalty.” Former Senator Henry L. Dawes, who played a major role in getting the 1887 General Allotment law passed, became chairman of this commission which bore his name. The federal government made its presence known in the Muscogee Nation shortly after the passage of the General Allotment Act.⁴

By 1892, the movement for Oklahoma statehood was in full force. In 1893, an appropriation bill for the Office of Indian Affairs authorized the President to appoint a commission to negotiate with the Five Civilized Tribes to bring about the allotment in severalty of their land. In effect, the General Allotment Act institutionalized private land ownership among Native American groups. Initially, the General Allotment Act exempted the Five Civilized Tribes because of previous treaties associated with their removal from the Southeast. Originally, this legislation exempted the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek and Seminole tribes primarily because any change in title to their lands raised a tangle of legal questions. The federal government collectively referred to these Native groups as the Five Civilized Tribes because they had adopted many of the economic, social and governmental practices of Anglo-America. Also, many whites perceived these groups as so

different from other tribes that some questioned whether they were “real” Indians. In the end, however, it did not matter how far these “civilized” tribes had come on the road to assimilation because they occupied over twenty million acres of valuable land sitting almost dead center in the American heartland bent on economic development.⁵

The federal government's insistence that freedmen be enrolled was a constant source of contention between tribal officials and the Dawes Commission and among Creeks themselves. The Dawes Commission authorized the Muscogee Principal Chief Legus C. Perryman to have triplicate copies of the 1890-1891 census typewritten and certified with one copy forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior. The 1890-1891 census listed a total of 13,842 citizens, including 4,203 former slaves whom the Creeks enfranchised after the Civil War. In comparison, an 1890 federal population census documented approximately 18,000 people living in the Creek Nation, including 3,000 non-citizen whites.⁶

For two years the Dawes Commission tried in vain to get any of the Five Civilized Tribes to negotiate themselves out of existence. The election of Isparhecher, an illiterate full-blood who did not speak English, as Principal Chief of the Creeks in 1895 sent yet another clear signal to the Dawes Commission that the Creeks wanted no part of allotment. In the election of 1895, all of the candidates for Principal Chief of the Creeks spoke out strongly against the Dawes Commission. In 1896, a discouraged Henry Dawes told a congressional committee that after three years of effort he had virtually accomplished nothing. Congress, under increased pressure from supporters of Oklahoma statehood as well as business groups who pushed for economic development, decided to proceed with allotment without the tribes' agreement. Senator Orville Platt introduced an amendment to the Indian Office appropriation bill that authorized the Dawes Commission to “hear and

determine the application of all persons who may apply to them for citizenship” and “determine the right of such applicant to be admitted and enrolled.”⁷ On June 10, 1896, Congress signed the resulting amendment into law. This bill marked the beginning of the end of tribal autonomy and the dawn of federal sovereignty over the Creeks and the other Native Americans of Indian Territory.

On August 4, 1896, the Creek National Council established a Special Census Commission to make a census of the “colored citizens.”⁸ Just one day later, Chief Justice T.J. Adams of the Creek Supreme Court issued a ruling which stated that the National Council could recognize any person entitled to citizenship but had no power to grant citizenship because that would vest a person with property rights at the expense of the existing citizens. The ruling would have struck almost three thousand freedmen from the Creek rolls, but they were too numerous and well organized to be denied.⁹

That same year, the Dawes Commission circulated written notices informing the inhabitants of the Muscogee Nation that applications for citizenship were mandatory in order to verify allotment for all Creek citizens. As Kent Carter lamented “An application had to include a signed and sworn statement containing all the facts supporting the claim, and the applicant had to prove that a copy had been furnished to the tribal chief, who had thirty days to respond.”¹⁰ White bureaucrats, armed with assistants and interpreters, headed the process of enrolling Creeks onto an “official” tribal roll for allotment purposes. The Dawes Commission included the sex, age, residence and race – demarcated by full-blood, mixed-blood or freedmen – on citizenship applications.¹¹

There were ambiguous feelings among the Creeks about allotment. The evidence does not allow for any generalized suggestions of why some Creeks favored allotment or

why some Creeks opposed it. It cannot be said that the majority of full-blooded Creeks opposed allotment. It also cannot be said that most mixed-blood Creeks supported allotment. Not all Creek freedmen wished to be enrolled. The reasons why Creeks either stood for or against allotment are too varied and is not within the scope of this argument. What is important is that it did happen. The enrollment of the Creeks for allotment purposes, as we will see, was very problematic and oftentimes very careless. But more importantly, the enrollment of the Creeks changed the way Creeks perceived their identity. A Creek could no longer base his or her identity on former socio-cultural norms, but rather one needed to be seen as Creek by an outside force, in this instance, the Dawes Commission.

As mentioned, a large portion of the Creek population continued to oppose enrollment and the allotment of their lands. “All Muskogee Creeks did not wish to be enrolled for allotments” reflected Alex Harjo in 1927.¹² The Reverend Samuel Checote, whom the Dawes Commission employed as an interpreter to assist in Creek enrollment, affirmed the opposition of some Creeks to forced enrollment. Checote indicated in the 1930s that enrollment was not an easy task “for some were bitterly opposed to it” and that some Creeks “flatly refused to enroll; they did not want the white man's government.”¹³

Dissension over whether freedmen should be entitled to Creek citizenship, which meant having the same rights as all other Creeks, began as soon as the Treaty of 1866 was signed with the United States. Some Creeks opposed the federal provision that entitled freedmen to Creek lands. These Creeks saw the Treaty of 1866 as another unjust deal with the United States. Hostility over the treaty's provisions grew through the end of the century. Opposition and dissension toward what many citizens of the Five Civilized Tribes considered the historically unjust treatment by the federal government was reflected through the written

word. Charles Gibson, a Creek journalist who saw this tension rise in wave upon wave, wrote in 1902, “One of those waves [dealings with whites] is called the Penn treaty, another the sale of Alabama, another the Georgia squabble, another the emigration west of the Mississippi, another the war of rebellion whereby the giant [the Native American] lost most of his property, and yet another the misinterpretation of a treaty in 1866 giving the Negro about one-third of the giant’s country without consideration of one dime.”¹⁴

According to Siobhan Senier, “The damage initiated by the Dawes Act is well-known. What is less remarked upon is the paucity of recorded late nineteenth century protests against allotment and assimilation. Indigenous dissent was written out of mainstream history and literature which registers for less conflict than one might wish.”¹⁵ Even though there is scant literary evidence regarding Native American views on this matter, one can again look to Callahan’s *Wynema* to find the voice of some late nineteenth century Creeks’ stance regarding enrollment and allotment. As Senier has suggested, “But there is a further reason why *Wynema* should be important to scholars and readers of American Indian literature and history, and that is its radical opposition to the U.S. policy of dividing tribal lands in severalty. Published just four years after the passage of the General Allotment Act, Callahan’s slim sentimental drama makes one of the only explicit literary critiques of the legislation with a chapter entitled “Shall We Allot?” and the answer a resounding no. Between the immediate sale of “surplus” lands left after the initial allotments were made, and later leasing, sales and continued theft, the indigenous land base was reduced by some ninety million acres – two-thirds of what had remained in 1887.”¹⁶

However, Senier indicates that while *Wynema* produces a rare and radical critique of allotment, it fails to supply a tribal discourse as an alternative to assimilation. Neither does

Wynema, nor any other character, provide any concomitant discussion of communal alternatives to allotment, including those culturally hybrid forms of individual and collective ownership that the Muscogees and other Native peoples were already practicing. Translating Indian culture into white terms seems to be a necessary rhetorical strategy for securing a kind of cross-cultural sympathy and respect for Indians. *Wynema* shows Whites and Indians attempting to mediate their cultures, but with more problems than successes. Senier argues it is “continued asymmetrical power relations” that interrupt the cultural exchange, an exchange the dominant class in the book is now anxiously trying to recover with those it has excluded.¹⁷ Although many Creeks, such as Alice Callahan, bitterly opposed enrollment and allotment, not all Creeks did. One well-known Creek author, Alex Posey, was a prominent supporter. Alexander Lawrence Posey was born August 3, 1873 near Eufaula in the Muscogee Nation. His father, Lewis H. Posey, was of Creek-Scottish descent. His mother, Nancy Phillips, was a full-blood Creek of the Wind clan. Alex Posey graduated from Indian University, later Bacone College, at Muscogee in 1895. That same year he was elected to the Creek House of Warriors. In 1896, he was appointed Superintendent of the Creek National Orphan Asylum at Okmulgee. Posey then served as Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Creek Nation in 1897. Shortly after, Posey left his political career for a career in writing.¹⁸

Posey’s stories concern the blacks who lived on Coon Creek, a tributary of the North Canadian River, in the Muscogee Nation.¹⁹ Posey was sensitive to the linguistic subtleties of the Creek Nation, and his stories demonstrate how finely he had tuned his ear to the dialects he heard. In both prose and poetry, Posey had written since his college days in the dialects of rural whites, cowboys, Creek freedmen and other blacks.²⁰ After 1900, Posey

turned from black dialect and worked extensively in the dialect of the full-blood who spoke English. Posey also turned from the short story and directed his talent for fiction writing toward the production of the humorous “Fus Fixico Letters.” Fus Fixico, Posey’s full-blood person, was an observer who reported on events in Indian Territory through letters to local and regional newspapers and magazines. Many letters were reports of the monologues of the character Hotgun, a full-blood Native American, or conversations between Hotgun and his younger friends. Much of Hotgun’s commentary concerned political events or the actions of white bureaucrats in Indian Territory whose names Posey delighted in corrupting into bad puns.²¹ Some prominent characters were “Toms-Big-Pie” who was Tams Bixby, a member of the Dawes Commission who also served as Commissioner to the Five Civilized Tribes from 1905-1907. “Plinty-So-Far” was Pliny L. Soper, attorney for the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway; “Secretary-Its-Cocked” was Ethan Allen Hitchcock, Secretary of the Interior from 1899-1907; “Colonel Robert L. Owes-Em” was Robert Lathan Owen, Jr., who served as Superintendent of the Union Agency from 1885-1889 and later, as a Senator of Oklahoma, helped pass the Removal of Restriction Act (1908) which made a substantial number of Native American allotments available for purchase in the former Indian Territory; and “Governor C.N. Has-It” was Charles Nathaniel Haskell, the first governor of Oklahoma.²²

Craig Womack indicates that scholars have often commented on Posey’s unique phrasing, his ability to turn around clichés or well-known aphorisms by subverting them with Creek-English, and to represent really unusual expressions in dialogue. Womack indicates that all the talk regarding the “language of the colonizer” has missed a key point – English ceased to be the language of the colonizer the minute it landed in the New World where it

acquired vocabulary from Indian tribes, Creole words from the Caribbean, African words from slaves and many other features unique to the Americas. Womack further argues Posey's dialectical writings "deprioritizes outsider discussion *about* Creeks in favour of dialogue within the community toward the end of an evolving Creek intellectual, cultural and political life."²³

Fus Fixico reported, in dialect, on events in his neighborhood and on the conversations between his fellow conservative Creeks, principally Hotgun and Tootpatka Micco. According to Daniel F. Littlefield Jr., "The Fus Fixico persona was rooted in Posey's earlier writings; Posey created Fus Fixico to fill an editorial need. By the summer of 1902, Posey realized he needed an editorial voice through which to respond to issues such as the demise of the Creek Nation as an autonomous political entity, the approach of statehood for Indian Territory, the complexities of the allotment process, and the election of the Creek principal chief that took place in 1903."²⁴ Posey's biographer Daniel F. Littlefield, Jr. has indicated that, even though Posey sometimes took issue with allotment's implementation, he strongly supported the policy in principle. It may be argued then that Posey therefore echoed the voices of the many educated, often mixed-blood denizens who spoke publicly and wrote on the issue.²⁵ Along with Drennan C. Scruggs, Posey headed the Creek Enrollment Party of the Five Civilized Tribes at the request of the Dawes Commission. It was the Creek Enrollment Party's duty to appraise the land held by the tribes in Indian Territory preparatory to the making of allotments.²⁶

In "Fus Fixico," Posey took advantage of the widely publicized activities of the Creek Snake Faction, who under Chitto Harjo, resisted the allotment process and created excitement among the mainly white residents of Hickory Ground Town.²⁷ As early as 1898 Hickory

Ground, one of the forty-eight Creek towns, became the focal point of Creek dissent against allotment. Chitto Harjo was the spokesman for the town's *micco*, and his oratory against allotment gained the attention of outside observers. Harjo urged tribal leaders not to participate in allotment. He also called for the establishment of a separate Indian government at Hickory Ground which would uphold traditional Indian customs and laws.²⁸ Armed with a copy of the treaty of 1832, he traveled around the Creek Nation from May to October 1890 where he spoke at stomp dances and other gatherings and encouraged Creeks to resist enrollment.²⁹

By 1901, the Snakes, as the followers of Harjo were known, claimed control over a twenty-five square mile radius around Hickory Ground with a following of roughly five thousand Creeks. Harjo and his followers began seizing property and whipping those Creeks who supported allotment. In response to these actions, the Creek National Council arrested Harjo and other leaders of the Snake faction. The leaders of the Snakes received a suspended sentence. After their release, Harjo and other leaders continued to meet secretly and to plot against allotment. Harjo and some others were arrested again a year later for their anti-allotment plots and condemned to the federal penitentiary at Fort Leavenworth. However, Harjo's followers continued to defy and resist allotment; their antics included the intimidation of allotment surveyors. Harjo was released from prison in 1902. After his release, Harjo formed the Snake political party; however, his bid to become principal chief of the Creeks in 1903 was unsuccessful which, in turn, ultimately ended any chance to stop the allotment of the Creeks.³⁰

There was widespread speculation throughout Indian Territory about what legislation Congress would pass if the tribes continued to resist allotment. After lengthy debate,

Congress ran out of patience with the Five Civilized Tribes and passed “An Act for the Protection of the People of Indian Territory” which became known as the Curtis Act after its sponsor, Senator Charles Curtis. The Curtis Act became law on June 28, 1898 and authorized the Dawes Commission to proceed with allotment without the tribes’ consent. The act also allowed the Dawes Commission to “adopt any other means by them deemed necessary” to carry out the allotment policy.³¹

The Snakes continued to oppose allotment by harassing the Dawes Commission’s survey parties and by resisting enrollment, but the fear of violence lessened. The Snakes resented those Creeks who helped the Commission. One Creek complained to a congressional committee that “they [the commissioners] would send the half-breeds around – the half-breed Indians – they would go out and hunt for the names of the full-blood Indians without their consent, and they would take the names down and go present them before the Dawes Commission.”³²

The Dawes Commission adopted a very narrow interpretation of its enrollment powers. This was one of the major flaws of the enrollment process. The Commission claimed that the Curtis Act limited tribal citizenship eligibility to those people who were on an authenticated roll or had been added by either the Commission or the U.S. court under an 1896 amendment. Thus, even if individuals could make a strong case that they should have been on existing tribal rolls, the commission refused to add their names to the rolls. The Dawes Commission noted in its annual report that some applicants held the “erroneous idea” that “blood alone constituted a valid claim to citizenship ... regardless of other qualifications required by treaties and the constitution, laws, and usages of the several nations.”³³

The aforementioned notion from the Dawes Commission annual report is interesting for a couple of reasons. Firstly, the idea requires one to believe that the majority of the Dawes Commission surveyors understood the “usages of the several nations” as they recorded the names, and thus, the fates of the Creek Nation. Some who worked for the Dawes Commission, such as Alex Posey, could claim Creek heritage; however, many others could not. Therefore, one cannot assume that all of those in charge of the application process fully understood Creek socio-cultural mores regarding identity. Secondly, this notion indicates that there were Creek applicants who had adopted the idea that blood quantum alone validated citizenship and, therefore, identity. For such applicants, the socio-cultural paradigm which had for so long governed Creek notions of identity was lost, or at least under-shadowed, during the nineteenth century. It may be argued that it was mainly full-blooded Creeks who now based their notion of what constituted Creek identity by blood alone. However, this argument, for the sake of this discussion, is of no true importance. Even if that argument is made, it still does not alter the idea that the concepts of identity had changed for these Creeks, whether they could claim full Creek lineage or not.

The enrollment of the Five Civilized Tribes ceased on March 4, 1907. After more than eleven years of work in the Muscogee Nation, the Dawes Commission enrolled 18,702 Creeks including 6,807 freedmen. Each decision had to be sent to the commissioner of Indian Affairs and then on to the Secretary of the Interior for approval; however, changing legal opinions by the U.S. Attorney General forced the commission to reconsider many citizenship applications. Eventually everyone enrolled received either an allotment of land or a cash payment equal in value to the land because there was not enough land to go around. Kent Carter suggests that each case, particularly those for rejected applicants, presented a

mystery that almost defied solution. According to Carter, witnesses often gave vague or even conflicting versions of basic information such as names, ages, locations, relationships, and sequences of events. Carter also points out that the enrollment of Creeks presented a particularly difficult challenge because of frequent name changes, the inability of some Creeks to speak and read English, and the fact that many official Creek records were in shambles.³⁴

The 1906 Dawes Rolls became the official register of Creek citizens according to the federal government. If it listed an applicant's name, then the federal government issued that person a certificate of citizenship which entitled him or her to an allotment of one hundred sixty acres.³⁵ According to Claudio Saunt, "Each allotment was separated on paper into a 40 acre homestead and 120 acres of surplus land. All homesteads were held in trust by the U.S. government for a period of twenty-one years from the date of allotment; surplus land remained in trust only until June 30, 1907. Creeks neither paid taxes on nor had the right to sell their surplus lands during those periods."³⁶

Determining who was entitled to citizenship was a complicated process for the Dawes Commission. It is undeniable that mistakes were made in some instances. The enrollment process was also marred by outright fraud in other instances. As an article from the *Indian Journal* in 1902 recounted, "This is no ordinary fable. The writer [Charles Gibson] has been referred to several instances where dead Indians have received certificates of allotment. If the matter was investigated, many similar cases might be found."³⁷ In theory, the criteria for citizenship prescribed by the Dawes Commission included full-blood Creeks, mixed-blood Creeks with and without African ancestry and non-Creek freedmen. Many individuals left off of the 1895 tribal roll were Creeks either by blood or by cultural adoption,

and, in some instances, the Dawes Commission simply refused to add their names to the citizenship roll. The Dawes Commission also had difficulty determining who was a freedman and who was a mixed-blood Creek with African heritage. The Commission often based their decisions on physical characteristics. As Claudio Saunt lamented, “The problem of determining who was a freed person and who was Creek by blood was compounded by outright fraudulent applications, submitted by ex-slaves from states and white people who desired a share of Creek lands.”³⁸

Evidence suggests that many blacks and mixed-blood Creeks with African heritage received allotments, whether they identified themselves as Creek or not. George McIntosh, a self-described “half-breed Creek,” whose ancestors were former slaves, filed for enrollment in 1896. The Dawes Commission granted McIntosh Creek citizenship, and he received an allotment of one hundred sixty acres near the town of Beland in the Muscogee Nation.³⁹ Chitto Harjo and the Snakes expressed dissatisfaction not only over freedmen receiving allotments, but also their frequent tendency to sell them to white and black non-citizens. Many African Americans advanced questionable claims of citizenship to secure allotments – some of whom promptly sold their allotments to land or oil speculators. In some instances, speculators hired “state Negroes” to marry unsuspecting freedwomen to obtain their land. In other instances, whites and “state Negroes” helped freedmen forge allotment papers while “state Negroes” passed themselves off as “citizens” in order to fraudulently secure additional allotments.⁴⁰

Katja May has suggested that the only possible collective symbol, the Dawes Rolls, did not unify but divided the communities by race and favored outsiders who were inter-married European-Americans. May also argues that among Indians, the Dawes Rolls was

an acceptable way of deriving one's identity. He observes that Indian identity had thus become determined by European-Americans who attributed "Indian" characteristics to anyone even with a little Native American ancestry, unless he or she also had African-American "blood." He indicates that after 1907 the racial hierarchy – white-Indian-black – promoted by whites was superimposed on the indigenous societies' way of integrating "strangers."⁴¹

The enrollment of the Creeks onto an "official" tribal roll at the beginning of the twentieth century was the final step in a shifting identity paradigm. After 1907, one could not express Creek identity, but rather one had to be seen in the annals of the Dawes Roll. Creek identity was now rigid. According to Pauline Turner Strong and Barrick Van Winkle, one of the many effects of allotment was that "Names of ancestors and their descendants were fixed permanently in the allotment records; similarly, names and relationships were recorded in school dossiers, probate court records, and the like."⁴²

Chapter 5

Conclusion

The issue of Native American identity has been debated more in the past few decades than ever before. In the 1980 decennial census, just over 1,364,000 people identified themselves as Indian. That number constitutes a seventy-two percent increase in the number of people who identified themselves as Indian in the 1970 census.¹ While there are many explanations for such a rapid increase in the number of Americans who wished to identify themselves as Native American, the concerns over self-identification are not within the scope of this study. What is important is how these people claim Indian identity which has left the door open for much discussion on the issue of what constitutes Native American identity. C. Matthew Snipp suggests that, conceding the impossibility of developing an acceptable all-purpose definition of who is an Indian, many agencies of the federal government, including the Census Bureau, rely on self-identification to define the Indian population. He argues the concept of race probably varies greatly from one person to another since individuals are given the discretion to develop their own personal ideas about race and to decide which information will be relevant for classifying themselves into one or another racial category.²

Recent scholarship concerning Native American identity has centered on the issue of “Indian blood.” This issue is not only a concern among scholars, but it is also of great importance to Native American groups. Pauline Turner Strong and Barrik Van Winkle indicate that “Although recent scholarship has considered the objectification of Indian

identity primarily as it played out in tribal recognition cases and museum collections, the need to objectify identity in the idiom of blood courses through Native American life.”³

Within the American scope of identity discourse, blood quanta affects no other group more than Native Americans. One of the reasons for the blood quanta debate most certainly revolves around resources – namely the federal aid that is due to “federally recognized” Indian groups. For most of the twentieth century, blood quanta were used by many federal agencies as the basis for the distribution of federal funds. However, in the latter part of the twentieth century, there was a movement to displace blood quanta as the main determinants of Indian identity. In engaging the contemporary problem of defining Native American, Margo S. Brownell traces, through federal policies and court cases, the evolution of the federal government’s role in determining Native American identity for the purposes of funding and services. Brownell chronicles how the federal government used various race-based criteria in the nineteenth century to define Native American identity and argued that because of the unconstitutional nature of a race-based agenda along with an interest for tribal sovereignty in the latter part of the twentieth century “Congress has moved away from the blood quantum and descent requirements and moved to a “political” definition of Indian identity.”⁴

The Creeks were just one of many Native groups who began to use blood quanta criteria as the basis for membership. Blood quantum became a rigid indicator of identity and, thus, citizenship for the Muscogee Nation in the twentieth century. According to article 3, section 2 of the Constitution of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation “Persons eligible for citizenship in the Muscogee (Creek) Nation shall consist of Muscogee (Creek) Indians by blood whose names appear on the final rolls as provided by the Act of April 26, 1906 (34

Stat. 137), and persons who are lineal descendants of those Muscogee (Creek) Indians by blood whose names appear on the final rolls as provided the Act of April 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 137); (except that an enrolled member of another Indian tribe, nation, band, or pueblo shall not be eligible for citizenship in the Muscogee (Creek) Nation.” Article 3, section 4 of the Muscogee (Creek) Constitution states “Full citizenship in the Muscogee (Creek) Nation shall be those persons and their lineal descendants whose blood quantum is one-quarter ($\frac{1}{4}$) or more Muscogee (Creek) Indian, hereinafter referred to as those of full citizenship. All Muscogee (Creek) Indians by blood who are less than one-quarter ($\frac{1}{4}$) Muscogee (Creek) Indian by blood shall be considered citizens and shall have all rights and entitlement as members of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation except the right to hold office.”

The Creeks, however, did not always use a blood quantum criterion as the basis for their identity. In the twentieth century, the utility of blood as a demarcation of identity arose from the Creeks’ need to be seen as different from other groups – which namely consisted of anyone of African descent including Creek freedmen and black immigrants to Indian Territory – by the dominant, ruling group. Since the American Revolution, the dominant class has been white, Anglo-Americans. However, the Creeks had not always based their identity on the perceptions of outsiders.

Much has been written on the how socio-cultural factors function to determine “real” Indianness. Steven Bryan Pratt has indicated that “real” Native American identity is acknowledged from relationships with other “real” Native Americans. Focusing his study on Native semiology, Pratt suggests that for “real” Native Americans, the question regarding identity is not answered by one’s assertion that he or she is a Native American, by tribal affiliation, by physical characteristics, or by blood quantum. Pratt argues a “real” Native

American is obligated to conduct himself in a manner that meets the expectations of other “real” Native Americans. The question, he argues, is answered by “the knowledge and comprehension a person possesses of the community’s life and a display of that knowledge and comprehension through adherence to those verbal and non-verbal practices which function to communicate one’s cultural identity.”⁵ He further suggests that “If he ceases to comport himself in the culturally appropriate manner, as perceived by other real Indians, his identity as a true member can become suspect and the cultural competency that had been previously conferred upon him can be weakened or even annulled.”⁶

There were certain factors in the nineteenth century which led to a shift in the way Creeks viewed identity. Prior to removal, Creek identity was demarcated by established socio-cultural norms. These socio-cultural norms included clan ties, matrilineal practices, and matrilocal practices. After their removal to Indian Territory in the 1830s, certain forces, such as Protestantism, institutionalized education, slavery, the Civil War and Reconstruction, widespread immigration and the enrollment of the Creeks dramatically affected the long-standing Muscogee paradigm of identity. It may be argued that some Creeks who converted to Christianity wanted to separate themselves from other Creeks who had not yet accepted the predominant religions of Anglo-America. Lucinda Tiger indicated that her father used to be “one of those Indians” who played stickball but that he was no longer “one of those Indians” after he converted to Christianity.⁷

Education, heavily promoted by Protestant missionaries, also had a considerable impact on the Creek socio-cultural model which, in turn, fueled a change in the way in which others viewed Creeks. As some nineteenth century Creeks adopted American economic and socio-cultural models as promoted by Protestant missionaries, many Creeks saw education as

a vehicle to embolden the socioeconomic status of their children – especially for their daughters. Anglo-American education also influenced matrilineal practices. It was customary for Creek women to permanently reside in the towns where they were born. However, later nineteenth century Creek women who became educators often changed residences in order to teach at various schools throughout the Muscogee Nation. Also, it was customary practice for Creek men to reside in their natal towns until marriage, wherein they relocated to the towns of their wives. As the nineteenth century wore on, education became more and more important as an ascriptive characteristic of Creek identity; it was easier to be seen as a Creek in the perceptions of outsiders because to be educated meant that one had embraced the socio-cultural values of the predominant, ruling white-American norm.

The Civil War, Reconstruction and post-war immigration had a considerable and long-lasting impact on the socio-cultural compositions of late nineteenth century Creek society. In turn, these socio-cultural changes significantly influenced the paradigm of Creek identity. One of the consequences of the Civil War was the cession of lands from each of the Five Civilized Tribes to the United States. In 1889, the federal government opened this territory, now called Oklahoma Territory, for settlement by non-Native Americans – including white and black homesteaders. The treaty the Five Civilized Tribes signed at the conclusion of the war also dictated that the nations of Indian Territory open up their lands for railroad construction which served to link eastern markets to the newly established Oklahoma Territory. Consequently, the Land Run of 1889 and the expansion of railroads rapidly brought large numbers of both whites and blacks to Oklahoma and Indian Territories.

Although slim in comparison to white immigration, black immigration into the Muscogee Nation was also substantial during the post-war decades. By 1890, the majority

of blacks, or those whom U.S. census officials classified as “black,” residing in Muscogee Nation had immigrated from bordering states. Many former slaves immigrated to the Muscogee Nation for the economic potential it provided; some came to work for railroad companies while others came to work on the large farms of wealthy, mixed-blood Creeks. A substantial number of both white and black immigrants entered the Muscogee Nation. This rapid influx of black immigrants created a rift, often expressed in terms of Muscogee identity, between black settlers and Creek freedmen. However, as the nineteenth century came to a close, many Creeks sought to distance themselves from their freedmen kin. Creeks began to fear that the substantial number of black immigrants would eventually threaten their sovereignty and potentially cause them to lose more of their lands. Creeks and especially Creek freedmen wanted to separate themselves from these “state Negroes” in order to show Anglo-America that they were different. Creek freedmen even briefly imposed social sanctions against marriage with blacks from neighboring states. However, after the Civil War, Creeks were defenseless not only against immigration, but also against a bigoted paradigm of racial hierarchy as promoted by the predominant, white, Anglo-American majority.

The identity of former slaves was a major point of disagreement throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century. The U.S. government sharply influenced Creek citizenship criteria, and thus their perception of identity, by way of the General Allotment Act. The General Allotment Act, enacted in 1887, empowered the President of the United States to dissolve all Native American nations, to divide the lands that Native groups held communally into small tracts, and to dispossess these tracts to individual members of those Native groups. Directly, the General Allotment Act institutionalized private land ownership among Native

American groups. Indirectly, the General Allotment Act and the subsequent enrollment of the Creeks onto an “official” register was the final factor in the reformation of Creek identity. The enrollment process required all Creeks, whether willing or not, to have their identity based on what some other group, in this instance the federal government, considered to be Creek. The Dawes Commission adopted a very narrow interpretation of its enrollment powers. This was one of the major flaws of the enrollment process. The Commission claimed that the Curtis Act limited tribal citizenship eligibility to those people who were on an authenticated roll or had been added by either the Commission or the U.S. court under an 1896 amendment. Thus, even if individuals could make a strong case that they should have been on existing tribal rolls, the commission refused to add their names to the rolls. The Dawes Commission also had difficulty determining who was a freedman and who was a mixed-blood Creek with African heritage. When in doubt, the Commission often based their decisions on physical characteristics.

Among the Creeks, there were ambiguous feelings towards allotment. Their thoughts regarding the enrollment of Creeks and the allotment of their lands can be heard in WPA interviews and in the writings of prominent Creek authors such as Alice Callahan, Charles Gibson, and Alexander Posey. The reasons why Creeks either stood for or against allotment are varied and are, for the nature of this study, not important. What is important is that enrollment and allotment did happen. The 1906 Dawes Rolls became the official register of Creek citizens according to the federal government. If it listed an applicant's name, then the federal government issued that person a certificate of citizenship which entitled him or her to an allotment of one hundred sixty acres. In effect, the allotment of Creek lands brought an end to the practice of communal land ownership – a socio-cultural

feature that had been a significant demarcation of Creek identity. Allotment also dramatically affected customary matrilineal practices – another former socio-cultural demarcator of Creek identity. As Linda Collins reflected in a 1938 interview “in the old times, Indians lived close to their towns or stomp grounds, but most of the old folk have died and the others live on their allotments and are scattered about.”⁸ But more importantly, the enrollment of the Creeks changed the way Creeks perceived their identity – no longer could one not only define himself as Creek based on former socio-cultural norms, but rather one could only be defined as Creek by an outside force, in this instance whether he was defined as Creek by the Dawes Commission. One could claim he was Creek only if the 1906 Dawes Roll confirmed his identity.

Most Native American groups, including the Creeks, began to use blood quanta as the foundation for a new Indian identity paradigm in the twentieth century. The usage of blood quanta as the main standard for tribal-specific identification and membership continues to be prevalent today. Blood quantum guidelines are used by most Native governments as well as the United States government. As Pauline Turner Strong and Barrick Van Winkle have suggested, “But among federally recognized tribes in the United States, blood quantum (often 25 percent) is the most common criterion of membership. Used in specific cases since the Sauk and Fox treaty of 1830, blood quantum was given a more generalized application in the administration of Indian boarding schools and land allotments and in census reports, subsequently, blood quanta were codified in various forms in many of the tribal constitutions and by-laws written as a result of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, which defined tribal members and non-enrolled Indians through a mixture of descent, residence, and “blood.”⁹ Presently, blood quanta and its use remain a heated debate among scholars, indigenous

groups, and federal officials. As a symbol of identity, many opponents of its use suggest that blood quanta criteria fail to take into account the role and importance that socio-cultural factors play in both the ascriptive and self-labeling frameworks of identity. It may be claimed that its use, especially among Native groups, is yet another example that the colonization of America is not over.

Notes

Chapter 1

1. The terms Indian, Native and Native American are used interchangeably throughout this paper.
2. William Quinn, Jr., "The Southeast Syndrome: Notes on Indian Recruitment Organizations and Their Perceptions on Native American Culture," *American Indian Quarterly* 14.2 (Spring 1990): 152.
3. Pauline Turner Strong and Barrick Van Winkle, "'Indian Blood': Reflections on the Reckoning and Refiguring of Native North American Identity," *Cultural Anthropology* 11.4, *Resisting Identities* (November 1996): 556.
4. Talcott Parsons, "Some Theoretical Considerations on the Nature and Trends of Change of Ethnicity" in *Ethnicity, Theory and Experience*, eds. Nathan Glazier and Daniel P. Moynihan with the assistance of Corinne Saposs Schelling (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 53-83. See also David Schneider, *American Kinship: A Cultural Account* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968). Schneider states that a particular culture consists of a system of units (or parts) which are defined and differentiated according to certain criteria. These units, according to Schneider, define the world or the universe, the way the things in it relate to each other, and what these things should be or do. A unit in a particular culture is simply anything that is culturally defined and distinguished as an entity. But, Schneider argues, if language is, in one of its meanings, culture, culture is not wholly language. Culture includes more than language because language is not the only possible system of symbols and meaning. Schneider indicates that there can be and often are cultural units without simple, single words or names for them. Schneider further asserts that the cultural constructs, the cultural symbols, are different from any systematic, regular, verifiable pattern of actual, observed behavior. This pattern of observed behavior is different from culture.
5. Quinn, Jr., 147 -154.
6. Phillip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), 3, 5.
7. Strong and Van Winkle, 555.
8. Michael Yellow Bird, "What We Want to be Called: Indigenous Peoples' Perspectives on Racial and Ethnic Identity Labels," *American Indian Quarterly* 23.2 (Spring 1999): 16.
9. Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 8.
10. Karen I. Blu, *The Lumbee Problem: The Making of an American Indian People* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 134-135, 143.
11. Donald H. Unser, Jr., "Indian- Black Relations in Colonial and Antebellum Louisiana" in *Slave Culture and the Culture of Slavery*, ed. Stephan Palmié (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1995), 151, 157.

12. George Pierre Castille, "The Commodification of Indian Identity," *American Anthropologist* 98.4 (December 1996): 746. The notion of peoplehood is an interesting topic that has recently gained the attention of scholars across a broad spectrum of disciplines. One work that addresses a contemporary perspective on this topic is John Lie's *Modern Peoplehood* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 2006. Lie defines modern peoplehood as "an inclusionary and involuntary group identity with a putatively shared history and a distinct way of life." (1) Lie argues that although our collection of identities is not substantially impressionable, everyone experiences opportunities to choose, instinctively and strategically, affiliation, belonging and community and that people change, confer and present numerous identities. Lie further argues that "the paradox of modern identity is that in spite of the complexity of modern social life – and coexistent with the difficulty of discussing personal identity – we frequently find simplified articulations of belonging and identification." (9) In his study, Lie asks two questions: 1) Why do we abridge and reify people into essentialized groups of modern peoplehood? And 2) why do people identify chiefly with one or another type of modern peoplehood? One of Lie's conclusions is that "the socio-political face of modernity that spawned abstract and egalitarian individualism simultaneously pulverized received identities and sense of belonging." (267) Lie bases this argument and others within the essentialist framework of Emile Durkheim who argued in his 1893 *De la division du travail social* that in a modern, multifaceted society, the individual is the lowest common denominator and the source of solidarity. Lie further concludes that if preliterate, preindustrial society included overlapping memberships then postliterate, postindustrial society required a reified and singular identity. Lie sums up his conclusion by asserting that "any identity claim is an abstraction" and that "the paradox of identity is that there are no essences." (272) He argues that the creation of modern peoplehood forces the populace to continually contend with reified relations and categories and that specific individuality is evaded in the name of an abstract collectivity.

13. In *American Indians: The First of This Land* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1989), C. Matthew Snipp suggests there are two dimensions of ethnicity: 1) there are the objective, observable social characteristics that distinguish an ethnic group from other segments of society 2) there is a subjective sense of belonging and personal identification which ethnic group members share in common with each other. (37) Snipp further asserts that cultural groups include one or more tribes with similar cultural practices and that cultural areas are geographical regions presently or formerly occupied by a cultural group. He also indicates that cultural areas typically overlap the geographical location of major Indian groups, predictably showing that the geographic distribution of cultural practices and linguistic patterns are closely related. (40-41)

14. The body of scholarly literature regarding WPA interviews is quite vast and covers a wide range of themes. One such theme that scholars such as Tiya Miles and Laura Lovett address is the role of genealogical performance in WPA interviews. In "Uncle Tom Was an Indian: Tracing the Red in Black Slavery" in *Confounding the Color Line: The Indian-Black Experience in North America*, ed. James F. Brooks (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 137-160, Tiya Miles argues that the gesture of naming Native American relatives, common in interviews with Black Indians, might be considered as a habit grounded in Native kinship customs. Alternately, or simultaneously, the gesture could be read as an attempt to authenticate the speaker's Indianness in the face of skepticism, a bicultural characteristic grounded in the particular experiences of Black Indians. Laura Lovett, in "Africans and Cherokees By Choice: Race and Resistance Under Legalized Segregation" in *Confounding the Color Line: The Indian-Black Experience in North America*, ed. James F. Brooks (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 192-222, indicates that WPA interviewees challenged fixed notions of biological blackness and black inferiority by highlighting Native American family legacies. Lovett asserts that in referencing Native kin, interviewees enacted "genealogical performances" that operated as ideological and political disruptions of the racial status quo. She further argues that WPA interviewees invoked often stereotyped Indian characteristics to demonstrate a legacy of resistance in their families.

15. Amelia Rector Bell offers a good discussion regarding the importance of gendered subjectivity of the modern Creek language. In "Separate People: Speaking of Creek Men and Women," *American Anthropologist*, New Series 92.3 (June 1990): 332-345, Bell argues that in contemporary Creek social relations, the notion persists that men and women are separated people and that this separation is vital to form a reproductive world that can remain Creek. Bell indicates that Creek language is categorized through mutually supporting assumptions of gendered subjectivity. Through this gendered subjectivity, men define and shape social reproduction while women provide life and growth which forces the separation of men and women. Bell demonstrates how male and female have continued to be differentiated through various socio-cultural customs and practices including language, participation in annual stomp dances, tribal politics and various aspects of marriage and childrearing. Bell's findings suggest that many traditional marriage practices and customs persist among contemporary Creeks; however, she does not address the issue of a cultural divide between "traditional" Creeks and "progressive" Creeks. Bell does mention a differentiation between "full-bloods" (those who speak Creek) and "mixed-bloods" (those who do not speak Creek) in her discussions on Creek tribal politics.

16. The words Creek and Muscogee/Muskogee are used interchangeably throughout this paper.

17. *The New Georgia Encyclopedia*, (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004), s.v. "Languages of Georgia Indians."

18. Frederick Web Hodge, ed., *Handbook of the American Indians North of Mexico*, Part I, Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 30 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1907), 302, 363. For more information regarding the history of the Creeks prior to their removal to Indian Territory see also William S. Willis, "Divide and Rule: Red, Black and White in the Southeast," *Journal of Negro History* 48 (1963): 157-176; Renate Bartl, "Native American Tribes and Their African Slaves" in *Slave Cultures and the Culture of Slavery*, ed. Stephan Palmie (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1995): 162-175; Theda Perdue, *Mixed Blood Indians: Racial Construction in the Early South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2003); J. Leitch Wright, Jr., *Creeks and Seminoles: The Destruction and Regeneration of the Muscogulge People* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986); George Stiggins, *Creek Indian History: A Historical Narrative of the Genealogy, Traditions and Downfall of the Ispocaga or Creek Indian Tribe of Indians*, ed. Virginia Pounds Brown, Introduction and Notes by William Stokes Wyman (Birmingham, AL: Birmingham Public Library Press, 1989); Michael D. Green, *The Politics of Indian Removal: Creek Government and Society in Crisis* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982).

19. H.S. Halbert and T.H. Ball, *The Creek War of 1813 and 1814* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1969), 25.

20. Frank Lawrence Owsley, Jr., *Struggle for the Gulf Borderlands: The Creek War and the Battle of New Orleans, 1812-1815* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1981), 8.

21. Ross Hassig, "Internal Conflict in the Creek War of 1813-1814," *Ethnohistory* 21.3 (Summer 1974): 251.

22. Hodge, 364.

23. Hassig, 253. For a closer look into 18th century Creek town life, see Joshua Piker, *Okfuskee: A Creek Indian Town in Colonial America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004). Piker indicates that "it is only when we turn to the daily life of the Creek people that we can truly understand the centrality of towns in the 18th century Creek world." (9) Piker further demonstrates that "despite ties to other towns, an individual's hometown was at the center of his or her social, economic, political and spiritual life." (15) Piker illustrates that, although the familial unit was important, clan, regional, moiety and national affiliations were more influential in shaping Creek identity.

24. Claudio Saunt, *A New Order of Things: Property, Power and the Transformation of an American Family* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 39.
25. Ibid, 45.
26. Theda Perdue, "Race and Culture: Writing the Ethnohistory of the Early South," *Ethnohistory* 51.4 (Fall 2001): 703-704.
27. Kathryn E. Holland Braund, "Guardians of Tradition and Handmaidens to Change: Women's Role in Creek Economic and Social Life During the 18th Century," *American Indian Quarterly* 14.3 (Summer 1990): 245. Brackets mine.
28. Kathryn E. Holland Braund, "The Creek Indians, Blacks and Slavery," *The Journal of Southern History* 57.4 (November 1991): 602, 604, 615.
29. Saunt, 47.
30. Braund, "The Creek Indians, Blacks and Slavery," 616.

Chapter 2

1. *Encyclopedia of Oklahoma History & Culture*, (Oklahoma Historical Society), s.v. "McIntosh, Chilly (c.1800-1875)," <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu> [accessed January 7, 2012].
2. L. Leitch Wright, Jr., *The Creeks and Seminoles: The Destruction and Regeneration of the Muscogulgee People* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), 282.
3. Timmie Fife, interview by Dawes Fife, 22 April 1937, vol. 30-0000, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>
4. George Looney, interview by Grace Kelley, 22 June 1937, vol. 55-6500a, transcript, Indian Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>
5. Annie Collin, interview by Margaret Maguire, 25 August 1937, vol. 19-7329, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>
6. Sarah Odom, interview by L.W. Wilson, 27 December 1937, vol. 68-1256, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>
7. Alex Blackston, interview by L.W. Wilson, 14 October 1937, vol. 8-7826, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>
8. George McIntosh, interview by L.W. Wilson, no date given, vol. 58-0000, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>
9. Celia E.Naylor-Ojurongbe, "Born and Raised Among These People, I Don't Want to Know Any Other: Slaves' Acculturation in 19th Century Indian Territory" in *Confounding the Color Line: The Indian-Black Experience in North America*, ed. James F. Brooks (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 161-191.
10. Angie Debo, *The Road to Disappearance* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1941), 116.

11. Larkin B. Ryal, interview by Grace Kelley, 10 March 1937, vol. 79, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>
12. John Tiger, interview by Lucinda Tiger, 19 February 1970, vol. 30-T-552, transcript, Doris Duke Collection, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>.
13. Alex Haynes, interview by Billie Byrd, 21 May 1937, vol. 40-5884, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>.
14. Lucy Washington, interview by Margaret McGuire, 25 August 1937, vol. 95-7330, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK.. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>.
15. Claudio Saunt, *Black, White and Indian: Race and the Unmaking of an American Family* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 74.
16. Littlefield, Jr., 255.
17. Sarah Odom.
18. Saunt, *Black, White and Indian*, 74-75.
19. Ibid, 89.
20. Tiya Miles, "Uncle Tom Was an Indian: Tracing the Red in Black Slavery," in *Confounding the Color Line: The Indian-Black Experience in North America*, ed. James F. Brooks (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 145-146, 152.
21. Katja May, *African Americans and Native Americans in the Creek and Cherokee Nations, 1830s to 1920s: Collision and Collusion*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1996.
22. Regarding ethnicity and intermarriage, see David M. Heer, "Intermarriage" in *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, eds. Stephan Thernstrom, Ann Orlov, and Oscar Handlin (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 513-521. Heer argues that the reluctance to intermarry, as a general rule, is proportional to the number and degree of differences, whether physical or socio-cultural, between the given outside group and one's own group. Heer also suggests that the incidence of intermarriage is also inversely proportional to the degree to which ethnic boundaries coincide with class boundaries and that the barriers of intermarriage that each group enforces its own members or on outsiders may be classified as formal legal, formal religious or informal.

Chapter 3

1. Saunt, *Black, White and Indian*, 97.
2. Donald A. Grinde, Jr. and Quintard Taylor, "Red vs. Black: Conflict and Accommodation in the Post Civil War Indian Territory, 1865-1907," *American Indian Quarterly* 8.3 (Summer 1984): 211-212.
3. M. Thomas Bailey, *Reconstruction in Indian Territory: A Story of Avarice, Discrimination and Opportunism* (Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1972), 24-25.
4. Saunt, *Black, White and Indian*, 96.

5. Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 212.
6. Ibid.
7. *Encyclopedia of Oklahoma History and Culture*, (Oklahoma Historical Society), s.v. "Statehood Movement," <http://digital.libraries.okstate.edu> [accessed January 7, 2012].
8. Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 217.
9. Renate Bartl, "Native American Tribes and their African Slaves," in *Slave Cultures and the Culture of Slavery*, ed. Stephan Palmié (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1995), 170-171.
10. Saunt, *Black, White and Indian*, 119.
11. Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 215.
12. Sigmund E. Sameth, "Creek Negroes: A Study of Race Relations," (Master's Thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1940), 38, 220; Cited in Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 215.
13. Littlefield, Jr., 259.
14. "The Creek Nation. A Settlement of their Troubles Effected – Samuel Checote Declared Chief," *The New York Times*, October 23, 1871.
15. Sameth, 34. Cited in Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 215.
16. Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 218.
17. Naylor-Ojurongbe, 161, 182-183.
18. Alex Blackston.
19. Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 214.
20. Jackson Lears, *Rebirth of a Nation: The Making of Modern America, 1877-1920* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009), 4. In his work, Lears argues "Americans longings for renewal continued to be shaped by persistent evangelical traditions, and overshadowed by the shattering experience of the Civil War. American seekers merged Protestant dreams of spiritual rebirth with secular projects of purification – cleansing the body politic of secessionist treason during the war and political corruption afterward, reasserting elite power against restive farmers and workers, taming capital in the name of the public good, reviving individual and national vitality by banning the use of alcohol, granting women the right to vote, disenfranchising African-Americans, restricting the flow of immigrants and acquiring an overseas empire." (9) Moreover, many scholars have argued that the use of force has always been used since European arrival to re/construct an Anglo-American identity suited for expansion. See also Richard Slotkin, *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1973).

21. Margaret Connell Szasz, "Introduction" In *Between Indian and White Worlds: The Cultural Broker*. ed. Margaret Connell Szasz (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994), 6. Szasz expounds on Robert Paine's "patron-broker-client" theory to illustrate that "everyone engaged in cross-cultural negotiation can be classified as one of four types" – 1) the "go-between" who is exclusively a purveyor between parties without expecting any remuneration or alteration; 2) the "broker," who also purveys values but deliberately changes emphasis or content; 3) the "patron," who dispenses assets to gain access or control over resources by promoting the dependence of the 4th type of intermediary – 4) the "client," who accepts the values chosen by the patron and is rewarded and protected for his loyalty and dependence." (11-12)

22. Mary Jane Warde, *George Washington Grayson and the Creek Nation, 1843-1920* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999).

23. Linda Collins, interview by Grace Kelley, 13 January 1938, vol. 19-1265, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>.

24. Alexander Spoehr, *Changing Kinship Systems: A Study in the Acculturation of the Creeks, Cherokee and Choctaw*, Anthropological Series Field Museum of National History vol. 33.4 (January 17, 1947) Publication 583, Field Museum Press, reprinted by UMI Books on Demand (Ann Arbor, MI: Bell & Howell Co., 1998). See also Donald L. Horowitz, "Ethnic Identity" in *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*, eds. Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan with the Assistance of Corinne Saposs Schelling (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 111-140. Horowitz suggests that collective identity is often a motive for merger, in the hope that a larger unit will stand a better chance of attaining higher ritual and social status. Horowitz asserts that a person who identifies himself as a member of a small kin-group or clan for some purposes may also consider himself a member of a larger aggregation or nationality or race for other reasons. Cultural change, according to Horowitz, may follow or accompany, rather than precede, identity change. He further indicates that group identity tends to expand or contract to fill the political space available for its expression. He indicates that a group may become more or less acculturated to the norms of some other group, more or less internally cohesive and more or less ethnocentric or hostile to other groups.

25. Edward P. Dozier, George E. Simpson, and J. Milton Yinger, "The Integration of Americans of Indian Descent," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 311, American Indians and American Life (May 1957): 163.

26. Appendix VI, List of Schools (Entry 600 & 601), Preliminary Inventory of the Office of the Five Civilized Tribes Agency, Muskogee Area of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Record Group 75), compiled by Kent Carter, Sept. 1994.

27. For more information regarding these pre-Civil War Boarding Schools, a good place to begin is the *Encyclopedia of Oklahoma History and Culture*. Reverend Robert Laughridge left *Koweta* mission in 1850 to supervise the newly-constructed Tullahassee Manual Labor School. After the war, Rev. Laughridge opened yet another mission school in 1882, the *Wealaka* mission school. The Eufaula Indian Boarding School is still in operation today. At first co-educational, it was turned into an all-girls school in 1907. Creek males were transferred to nearby Nuyaka Boarding School.

28. John L. Williams, *Encyclopedia of Oklahoma History and Culture*, (Oklahoma Historical Society), s.v. "Bacone College."

29. F.H.A. Aherns, interview by Ella Robinson, 9 August 1937, vol. 1-7074, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>.

30. Belle Gray Conner, interview by Lucinda Tiger, 10 October 1969, vol. 29-T-526-1, transcript, Doris Duke Collection, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>.
31. Kate Shaw Ahrens, interview by Ella M. Robinson, 1 September 1937, vol. 1-7374, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>.
32. U.S. Congress, *Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, 1874, 43rd Congress, 2nd Sess., *House Executive Document* 18.1 (Washington: Government Printing Office), 349. Cited in Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 216.
33. U.S. Congress, *Report of the Department of the Interior*, 1908; *Indian Affairs, Territories*, Vol. II (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1908), 241. Cited in Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 224.
34. Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 217-218.
35. Rev. Samuel Checote, interview by Jefferson Berryhill, 28 May 1937, vol. 17-6054-6058, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>.
36. Lee Clinton, interview by Mary Dorward, 26 August 1937, vol. 18-7387, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>; History of Patterson Mercantile Company, interview by Ella Robinson, 15 April 1937, vol. 108-0004, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>.
37. *Encyclopedia of Oklahoma History and Culture*, (Oklahoma Historical Society), s.v. "Callahan, Sophia Alice (1868-1894)," <http://digital.library.okstate.edu/encyclopedia> [accessed July 7, 2011].
38. Annette Van Dyke. "An Introduction to *Wynema, A Child of the Forest*," *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, Series 2.4 (Summer/Fall), 123, 125. For a good account regarding views on miscegenation in American history, see Peter Wallenstein, *Tell The Court I Love My Wife: Race, Marriage and Law – An American History*. In his work on miscegenation throughout United States history, Peter Wallenstein examines the ways in which individuals or groups used – or at least attempted to use – the expense of others. Wallenstein argues that where the state defined race and regulated marriage, the public sphere sought to govern the most private dimensions of people's lives. He suggests that, even when there was no law to deny a marriage license, or to convict a couple of a felony for entering into an interracial marriage, people's identities were often still an issue in their own mind and in the minds of others.
39. Susan Bernardin. "On the Meeting Grounds of Sentiment: S. Alice Callahan's *Wynema: A Child of the Forest*," *The American Transcendental Quarterly* 15.3 (Summer 2001): 216.
40. Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 217. Brackets mine.
41. Tiya Miles and Sharon P. Holland, "Introduction," in *Crossing Waters, Crossing Worlds: The African Diaspora in Indian Country*, eds. Tiya Miles and Sharon P. Holland (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 5.
42. Saunt, *Black, White and Indian*, 127.
43. Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 218, 220.
44. *Ibid*, 218.

45. David A.Y.O Chang, "Where Will the Nation Be at Home? Race, Nationalisms, and Emigration Movements in the Creek Nation" in *Crossing Waters, Crossing Worlds: The African Diaspora in Indian Country*, eds. Tiya Miles and Sharon P. Holland (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 83.

46. Ibid, 87.

Chapter 4

1. OHS microfilm CRN, roll 1. Cited in Kent Carter, "The Dawes Commission and the Enrollment of the Creeks." The U.S. National Archives & Records Administration 29.1 (Spring 1997), <http://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/1997/spring/dawes-commission> [accessed November 21, 2007].

2. Ibid. Cited in Carter, 1.

3. Saunt, *Black, White and Indian*, 152-153.

4. Carter, 1.

5. Ibid. The term "Five Civilized Tribes" was first used sometime shortly after the creation of the Union Indian Agency at Muskogee, Creek Nation, Indian Territory in 1874. The Union Indian Agency was the place for the office and residence of the Indian Agency Superintendent. Prior to 1874, each of the Five Civilized Tribes had their own Agency and Superintendent, except for the Chickasaws and Choctaws who shared one. As it resided in the Creek Nation, the Union Indian Agency also was a home and school for the orphans of Creek freedmen. In 1914, the Union Indian Agency was consolidated with the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes (also known as the Dawes Commission) to create the Five Civilized Tribes Agency. Today, the former Union Indian Agency building is the site of the Five Civilized Tribes Museum in Muskogee, Oklahoma. See also Grant Foreman, *Muskogee: The Biography of an Oklahoma Town* (St. Louis: Blackwell Wielandy Company, 1943) and Angie Debo, *And Still the Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968).

6. Carter, 2.

7. 29 Stat. L. 321. Cited in Carter, 2-3.

8. OHS microfilm CRN, roll 1. Cited in Carter, 7.

9. Carter, 8.

10. Ibid, 3.

11. Alex Harjo, interview by Billie Byrd, 27 April 1937, vol. 38-5581, transcript, Indian-Pioneer Papers, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK. <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>.

12. Ibid.

13. Rev. Samuel Checote.

14. Charles Gibson, "The Indian – The Future," *Indian Journal*. June 6, 1902. Cited in Thomas Murray, "Selected Works of Charles Gibson," (American Native Press and Sequoyah Research Center) http://anpa.ualr.edu/digital_library/Selected%20Works%of%20Charles%20Gibson.htm [accessed July 7, 2011].

15. Siobhan Senier, "Allotment Protest and Tribal Discourse: Reading *Wynema's* Successes and Shortcomings," *American Indian Quarterly* 24.3 (Summer 2000), 421.

16. Ibid, 420.
17. Ibid, 423-424, 428, 431.
18. Daniel F. Littlefield, Jr. and James W. Parins. "Short Fiction Writers of Indian Territory." *American Studies* 23.1 (Spring 1982), 28.
19. Ibid, 30.
20. Littlefield, Jr. "Evolution of Alex Posey's Fus Fixico Persona," 139.
21. Littlefield, Jr. and Parins, 31.
22. Doris Challacombe, "Alexander Lawrence Posey," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 11.4 (December 1933): 1015; Appendix I, Preliminary Inventory of the Office of the Five Civilized Tribes Agency, Muskogee Area of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Record Group 75), Compiled by Kent Carter, September 1994; *Encyclopedia of Oklahoma History & Culture*, (Oklahoma Historical Society), s.v. "Soper", "Hitchcock", "Owen, Robert Lathan (1856-1947)", "Haskell, Charles Nathaniel (1860-1933)" <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu> [accessed May 25, 2012].
23. Craig K. Womack, "Alexander Posey's Nature Journals: A Further Argument for Tribally Specific Aesthetics," *Studies in American Indian Literatures, Series 2* (Summer/Fall 2001), 50. Author's italics.
24. Littlefield, Jr. "Evolution of Alex Posey's Fus Fixico Persona," 139.
25. Senier, 422.
26. Challacombe, 1016.
27. Littlefield, Jr. "Evolution of Alex Posey's Fus Fixico Persona," 140.
28. *Encyclopedia of Oklahoma History & Culture*, (Oklahoma Historical Society) s.v. "Crazy Snake Uprising," <http://digital.libraries.ou.edu> [accessed January 7, 2012].
29. Carter, 8.
30. "Crazy Snake Uprising."
31. 30 Stat. 1. 495. Cited in Carter, 4-5.
32. Eufaula Harjo, SR 5013 p. 91. Author's brackets. Cited in Carter, 8.
33. Entry 37, FCTA, Annual report for 1898, p.4. Cited in Carter, 5.
34. Carter, 9.
35. Ibid, 5.
36. Saunt, *Black, White and Indian*, 161.
37. Charles Gibson. "Raising the Dead," *Indian Journal*. August 1, 1902. Cited in Murray.
38. Saunt, *Black, White and Indian*, 155-156.

39. George McIntosh.
40. Grinde, Jr. and Taylor, 221.
41. May, 262.
42. Strong and Van Winkle, 558.

Chapter 5

1. Quinn, Jr., 151.
2. Snipp, 36.
3. Strong and Van Winkle, 552.
4. Margo S. Brownell, "Who Is an Indian? Searching For an Answer to the Question at the Core of Federal Indian Law," *University of Michigan Law Reform* 34 (2000-2001): 285.
5. Steven Bryan Pratt, "Being an Indian Among Indians" (Ph.D diss., University of Oklahoma, 1985), 99.
6. Ibid, 100.
7. Church Services, transcribed by Lucinda Tiger, 21 September 1969, vol. 30-T-523, Doris Duke Collection, Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK.
<http://digital.libraries.ou.edu/whc>.
8. Linda Collins.
9. Strong and Van Winkle, 555.

Bibliography

- Abel, Annie Heliose. *The American Indian in the Civil War, 1862-1865*. Introduction by Theda Perdue and Michael D. Green. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992.
- Baird, W. David. "Are the Five Tribes of Oklahoma 'Real' Indians?" *The Western Historical Quarterly* 21.1 (Feb. 1990): 4-18.
- Bartl, Renate. "Native American Tribes and Their African Slaves." In *Slave Culture and the Culture of Slavery*. Edited by Stephan Palmié, 162-175. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1995.
- Bell, Amelia Rector. "Separate People: Speaking of Creek Men and Women." *American Anthropologist*, New Series 92.3 (June 1990): 332-345.
- Bernardin, Susan. "On the Meeting Grounds of Sentiment: S. Alice Callahan's *Wynema: A Child of the Forest*." *The American Transcendental Quarterly* 15.3 (September 2001): 209-224. <http://findarticles.com> [accessed May 23, 2011]
- Bernstein, Anita, ed. *Marriage Proposals: Questioning a Legal Status*. New York: New York University Press, 2006.
- Bird, Michael Yellow. "What We Want To Be Called: Indigenous Peoples' Perspectives on Racial and Ethnic Identity Labels." *American Indian Quarterly* 23.2 (Spring 1999): 1-21.
- Blu, Karen I. *The Lumbee Problem: The Making of an American Indian People*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Braund, Kathryn E. Holland. "Guardians of Tradition and Handmaidens to Change: Women's Role in Creek Economic and Social Life During the 18th Century," *American Indian Quarterly* 14.3 (Summer 1990): 239-258.
- "The Creek Indians, Blacks and Slavery." *The Journal of Southern History* 57 (1991): 601-636.
- Brooks, James. F. *Confounding the Color Line: The Indian-Black Experience in North America*. Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press, 2002.

- Brow, James. "Notes on Community, Hegemony and the Uses of the Past." *Anthropological Quarterly* 63.1 (January 1990): 1-6.
- Brownell, Margo S. "Who Is an Indian? Searching for an Answer to the Question at the Core of Federal Indian Law." *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 34 (2000-2001): 275-320.
- Carter, Kent. "The Dawes Commission and the Enrollment of the Creeks." *The U.S. National Archives & Records Administration* 29.1 (Spring 1997).
<http://www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/1997/spring/dawes-commission>
 [accessed November 21, 2007].
- Castille, George Pierre. "The Commodification of Indian Identity." *American Anthropologist* 98.4 (December 1996): 743-749.
- Challacombe, Doris. "Alexander Lawrence Posey." *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 11.4 (December 1933): 1011-1018.
- Chang, David A.Y.O. "Where Will the Nation Be at Home? Race, Nationalisms, and Emigration Movements in the Creek Nation" In *Crossing Waters, Crossing Worlds: The African Diaspora in Indian Country*. Edited by Tiya Miles and Sharon P. Holland, 80-99. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Clifton, James A. "Alternate Identities and Cultural Frontiers" In *Being and Becoming Indian: Biographical Study of North American Frontiers*. Edited by James A. Clifton, 1-37, Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1989.
- Davis, Karl. "Remembering Fort Mims: Reinterpreting the Origins of the Creek War." *Ethnohistory* 21.3 (2002): 611-623.
- Debo, Angie. *And Still The Waters Run: The Betrayal of the Five Civilized Tribes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- . *The Road to Disappearance*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1941.
- Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Dozier, Edward P., George F. Simpson and J. Milton Yinger. "The Integration of Americans of Indian Descent." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 311, American Indians and American Life (May 1957): 158-165.
- Fitzgerald, Thomas K., ed. *Social and Cultural Identity: Problems of Persistence and Change*, Southern Anthropological Proceedings, No. 8, Southern Anthropological Society. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1974.

- Foreman, Carolyn Thomas. "S. Alice Callahan: Author of *Wynema, A Child of the Forest*." *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 33.3 (1955): 306-315.
- Foreman, Grant. *Muskogee: The Biography of an Oklahoma Town*. St. Louis: Blackwell Wielandy Company, 1943.
- Fritz, Henry E. "The Making of Grant's 'Peace Policy'." *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 37.4 (1959): 411-432.
- Green, Michael D. *The Politics of Indian Removal: Creek Government and Society in Crisis*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982.
- Grinde, Jr., Donald A. and Quintard Taylor. "Red vs. Black: Conflict and Accommodation in the Post Civil War Indian Territory, 1865-1907." *American Indian Quarterly* 8.3 (Summer 1984): 211-229.
- Halbert, H.S. And T.H. Ball. *The Creek War of 1813 and 1814*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1969.
- Hallowell, A. Irving. "American Indians, White and Black: The Phenomenon of Transculturation," Papers in Honor of Melville J. Herskovits, *Current Anthropology* 4.5 (December 1963): 519-531.
- Hames- Garcia, Michael R. "Who Are Our Own People?: Challenges for a Theory of Social Identity" In *Reclaiming Identities: Realist Theory and the Predicament of Postmodernism*. Edited by Paula M. L. Moya and Michael R. Hames-Garcia, 102-132. Berkely: University of California Press, 2000.
- Hanson, Allan. "The Making of the Maori: Culture Invention and Its Logic." *American Anthropologist*, New Series 91.4 (December 1989): 890-902.
- Hanson, Jeffrey R. "Ethnicity and the Looking Glass: The Dialectics of National Indian Identity." *American Indian Quarterly* 21.2 (Spring 1997): 195-208.
- Hassig, Ross. "Internal Conflict in the Creek War of 1813-1814." *Ethnohistory* 21.3 (Summer 1974): 251-273.
- Hochtritt, Jr., James Gribble. "Rural Cherokees, Chickasaws, Choctaws, Creeks, and Seminoles in Oklahoma During the Great Depression." Ph.D diss., University of Oklahoma, 2001.
- Hodge, Frederic Webb, ed. *Handbook of the American Indians North of Mexico, Part I*. Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 30. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1907.

- Horowitz, Donald L. "Ethnic Identity." In *Ethnicity, Theory and Experience*, edited by Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan with the assistance of Corrinne Saposs Schelling, 111-140, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Johnson, Troy R. "The State of the American Indian: Who Gets the Indian Child?" *Wicazo Sa Review* 14.1, Indigenous Resistance and Persistence (Spring 1999): 197-214.
- Lears, Jackson. *Rebirth of a Nation: The Making of Modern America, 1877-1920*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009.
- Lichter, Daniel T. and Zhenchao Quian. *The American People: Marriage and Family in a Multi-cultural Society*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2004.
- Lie, John. *Modern Peoplehood*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Littlefield, Jr., Daniel F. *Africans and Creeks: From the Colonial Period to the Civil War*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1979.
- . "Evolution of Alex Posey's Fus Fixico Persona." *Studies in American Indian Literature* 4 (Summer/Fall 1992): 136-144.
- Littlefield, Jr., Daniel F. and James W. Parins. "Short Fiction Writers of Indian Territory." *American Studies* 23.1 (Spring 1982): 23-38.
- Lovett, Laura. "Africans and Cherokee By Choice: Race and Resistance Under Legalized Segregation." In *Confounding the Color Line: The Indian-Black Experience in North America*. Edited by James F. Brooks, 192-222, Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press, 2002.
- May, Katja. *African Americans and Native Americans in the Creek and Cherokee Nations, 1830s to 1920s: Collision and Collusion*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1996.
- Mihesuah, Devon A. "Commonality of Difference: American Indian Women and History." *American Indian Quarterly* 20.1, Special Issue: Writing About American Indians (Winter 1996): 15-27.
- Miles, Tiya. "Uncle Tom Was an Indian: Tracing the Red in Black Slavery." In Brooks, 137-160.
- Murray, Thomas. "Selected Works of Charles Gibson [a machine-readable transcription]." American Native Press and Sequoyah Research Center.
http://anpa.uar.edu/digital_library/Selected%20Works%20Charles%20Gibson.htm.
 [accessed July 7, 2011]

- Naylor-Ojuronbe, Celia E. "Born and Raised Among These People, I Don't Want to Know Any Other: Slaves' Acculturation in 19th Century Indian Territory." In Brooks, 161-191.
- Osburn, Katherine M.B. "The 'Identified Full-Bloods' in Mississippi: Race and Choctaw Identity, 1898- 1918." *Ethnohistory* 56.3 (Summer 2009): 423-447.
- Owsley, Jr., Frank Lawrence. *Struggle for the Gulf Borderlands: The Creek War and the Battle of New Orleans, 1812-1815*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1981.
- Palmié, Stephan, ed. *Slave Culture and the Culture of Slavery*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1995.
- Parsons, Talcott. "Some Theoretical Considerations On the Nature and Trends of Change of Ethnicity." In Glazer and Moynihan, 53-83.
- Perdue, Theda. *Mixed Blood Indians: Racial Construction in the Early South*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2003.
- . *Nation's Remembered: An Oral History of the Five Civilized Tribes, 1865-1907*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993.
- . "Race and Culture: Writing the Ethnohistory of the Early South." *Ethnohistory* 51.4 (Fall 2004): 701-723.
- Phillips, Valerie J. "Seeing Each Other Through the White Man's Eyes: Reflections and Commentary on the 'Eating Out of the Same Pot' Black-Indian Conference at Dartmouth College." In Brooks, 371-386.
- Piker, Joshua. *Okfuskee: A Creek Indian Town in Colonial America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Pratt, Steven Bryant. "Being an Indian Among Indians." PhD diss., University of Oklahoma, 1985.
- Quinn, Jr., William W. "The Southeast Syndrome: Notes on Indian Recruitment Organizations and Their Perceptions on Native American Culture." *American Indian Quarterly* 14.2 (Spring 1990): 147-154.
- Robbins, Sharla. "Relationship Aggression, Marital Satisfaction, and Gender Differences: The Effects of Historic Trauma, Traditionality, Alcohol and Drug Use, and the Influence of Parent Relationship Aggression with Oklahoma American Indian and Euro-American Samples." PhD diss., University of Oklahoma, 2002.

- Ruoff, A. Lavonne Brown. "Justice for Indians and Women: The Protest Fiction of Alice Callahan and Pauline Johnson." *World Literature Today* 66.2 (Spring 1992): 249-255.
- Russell, Steve. "Apples Are the Color of Blood." *Critical Sociology* 28 (2002): 65-76.
- Ryan, Melissa. "The Indian Problem as a Women's Question: S. Alice Callahan's *Wynema: A Child of the Forest*." *American Transcendental Quarterly* 21.1 (2007): 23-45.
- Saunt, Claudio. *A New Order of Things: Property, Power and the Transformation of the Creek Indians, 1733-1816*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- , *Black, White and Indian: Race and the Unmaking of an American Family*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- "The English Has Now a Mind to Make Slaves of Them All: Creeks, Seminoles, and the Problem of Slavery." In Brooks, 47-75.
- Schneider, David M. *American Kinship: A Cultural Account*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Senier, Siobhan. "Allotment Protest and Tribal Discourse: Reading *Wynema's* Successes and Shortcomings." *American Indian Quarterly* 24.2 (Summer 2000): 420-440.
- Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1973.
- Snipp, C. Matthew. *American Indians: The First of This Land*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1989.
- Spoehr, Alexander. *Changing Kinship Systems: A Study in the Acculturation of the Creeks, Cherokee and Choctaw*, Anthropological Series Field Museum of National History 33.4 (January 17, 1947). Publication 583, Field Museum Press, reprinted by UMI Books on Demand (Ann Arbor, MI: Bell & Howell Co., 1998).
- Stiggins, George. *Creek Indian History: A Historical Narrative of the Genealogy, Traditions and Downfall of the Ispocoga or Creek Indian Tribe of Indians*, edited by Virginia Pounds Brown with Introduction and Notes by William Stokes Wyman. Birmingham, AL: Birmingham Public Library Press, 1989.
- St. Jean, Wendy. *Remaining Chickasaw in Indian Territory, 1830s-1907*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2011.
- Strong, Pauline Turner and Barrik Van Winkle. "'Indian Blood': Reflections on the Reckoning and Refiguring of Native North American Identity." *Cultural Anthropology* 11.4 (November 1996): 547-576.

- Szasz, Margaret Connell, ed. *Between Indian and White Worlds: The Cultural Broker*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.
- “The Creek Nation. A Settlement of their Troubles Effected – Samuel Checote Declared Chief.” *The New York Times*, October 23, 1871.
- Unser, Jr., Daniel H. “Indian-Black Relations in Colonial and Antebellum Louisiana.” In Palmié, 145-161.
- Van Dyke, Annette. “An Introduction to *Wynema, A Child of the Forest*.” *Studies in American Indian Literature* 4, Series 2 (Summer/Fall): 123-128.
- Van Kirk, Sylvia. “‘What If Mama Is an Indian?’: The Cultural Ambivalence of the Alexander Ross Family.” In *The New Peoples: Being and Becoming Métis in North America*. Edited by Jacqueline Peterson and Jennifer S. H. Brown, 207-219. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985.
- Wallace, Anthony F.C. *Culture and Personality*. New York: Random House, 1961.
- Wallenstein, Peter. “Native Americans Are White, African Americans Are Not: Racial Identity, Marriage, Inheritance, and the Law in Oklahoma, 1907-1967.” *Journal of the West* 39 (2000): 55-63.
- . *Tell The Court I Love My Wife: Race, Marriage and Law – An American History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Warde, Mary Jane. *George Washington Grayson and the Creek Nation, 1843-1920*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.
- White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Williamson, Joel. *New People: Miscegenation and Mulattoes in the U.S.* New York: New York University Press, 1984.
- Willis, William S. “Divide and Rule: Red, Black, and White in the Southeast.” *Journal of Negro History* 48 (1963): 157-176.
- Womack, Craig K. “Alexander Posey's Nature Journals: A Further Argument for Tribally-Specific Aesthetics.” *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 13.2 (Summer/Fall 2001): 49-66.
- Wright, Jr., J. Leitch. *Creeks and Seminoles: The Destruction and Regeneration of the Muscogulge People*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.

Vita

Daniel Anthony Patterson was born in Gastonia, N.C. He graduated from Ashbrook High School in 1996. He earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in History from Appalachian State University in 2004, and, in December 2013, he was awarded a Master of Arts degree in the same field from Appalachian State University.

Mr. Patterson currently works and resides in Changsha, Hunan Province, People's Republic of China.