

**MASHANTUCKET PEQUOT MUSEUM AND
RESEARCH CENTER**
Archives & Special Collections

**Bibliography of
Native American Land Issues**

Introduction

Land possession has possibly been the most contentious issue throughout the entire history of Native American interaction with European settlers. Through fair means and foul, white settlers took control of tribal territories for their own socio-economic purposes, and enforced their claims through diplomacy and armed conflict, over a period of four centuries.

This bibliography contains items in the Archives & Special Collections that document these land acquisitions and the responses they provoked from Natives and concerned whites. (JA)

WHITE APPROPRIATIONS

Canada. Dept. of Indian Affairs. Deed, 11 February 1915. MSS 32.

Much as the state of Connecticut had done with the Pequot reservation in 1856, Canada's Department of Indian Affairs sold parcels of Ojibwa and Ottawa reservation land, and used the proceeds for the tribes' benefit, in the early twentieth century. This deed granted a farmer named Adam Arnold one hundred acres of Ojibwa and Ottawa land on Manitoulin Island in Ontario. (JA)

Charlestown (R.I.). Petition, 15 October 1765. MSS 181.

A Narragansett sachem had been selling parcels of land to whites without tribal authorization, at forty percent of the price that the tribe and the whites had officially agreed upon (one Colonel Christopher Champlin was about to purchase a tract of land at four pounds an acre, and this real estate was "worth ten pounds per acre"). The Narragansetts that signed this document stated that the sachem was selling land parcels "as fast as he can find opportunities," and expressed their fear that they soon would be "brought into servitude to the English for want of bread" as a result. The signatories also mentioned two white allies in their plight (Mathew Robinson and Edward Deake), who have incurred the hostility of the other whites in the area for siding with the Natives. (JA)

Charlestown (R.I.). Deed, 28 September 1769. MSS 173.

By this deed, Thomas Ninigrett, Sachem of the Narragansett, sold a parcel of land in Charlestown "containing by estimation seventeen acres and thirty-eight rods" to one Joseph Kenyon for the sum of forty-three dollars. (JA)

Connecticut. General Assembly. Petition of Martha Tantaquidgeon, 5 May and 4 June 1835. MSS 36.

This document (dated 5 May) requests permission for Martha Tantaquidgeon (1761-1859), a Mohegan, to sell several tracts of land in Montville, Connecticut belonging to her. The response to her request (dated 4 June) is included here, which put one Ralph Hurlbut of Groton in charge of selling the land and remitting money from the transaction to Tantaquidgeon. (EC)

Connecticut. Superior Court (New London County). Depositions, 1732; 1747; 1760. MSS 9.

Consists of records on the use and ownership of land disputed by the Town of Groton, Connecticut

and the Mashantucket Pequot tribe. Pequots cited in the documents are Joseph Wuyeck and Paunuck Cocheats, as well as the Tribe's overseers John Richards and Daniel Coit. Deponents are Parke Avery, Nathaniel Bellows, John Morgan, and Solomon Morgan, all residents of Groton. Public officials witnessing the depositions are John Chester, Jesse Dean, Jabez Hamilton, William Williams, William Witter, and George Wyllys. (EC/TS)

Little Compton (Rhode Island). Deed, 9 February 1693. MSS 163.

By this deed, Mamanuah of the Wampanoag ceded a "certaine small tract or roll of land, lying and being in the township of Little Compton, lying near Coxet" to William Southworth. This parcel was "bounded on the east side by the lands sometime belonging to Phillop, an Indian," and was sold for the sum of thirty shillings. One Edward Gray and one Jonathan Tripp countersigned the document as witnesses. On 26 July 1694, Nathaniel Thomas, "one of Their Majesties' Justices," confirmed this transaction. (JA)

Little Compton, (Rhode Island). Deed, 29 April 1710. MSS 164.

This is a deed for approximately 7.5 acres of land in the Coxet section of Little Compton in Bristol County, Rhode Island. Thomas Brownell and John Mamanuet sold it to Benjamin Southworth on that date. It lay adjacent to a parcel of land which Mamanuet had previously sold to Joseph Southworth. (JA)

Massasoit (ca. 1590-1661). Deed, 29 November 1652. MSS 19.

The Wampanoag Tribe's traditional lands are located in eastern Rhode Island and Massachusetts. The Puritans established portions of the Plymouth Colony on these lands. Massasoit was the sachem of Pokanoket, a group of Wampanoag villages around Narragansett Bay. He was also known as Ousamequin, Woosamequin and Wasamequen. Wamsutta, a signator of this deed, was the son of Massasoit. Massasoit met with the Puritan colonists soon after their arrival in Massachusetts and negotiated treaties with them in 1621. This deed documents Massasoit and Wamsutta selling a tract of land to William Bradford, Miles Standish, Thomas Southworth, John Winslow, John Cooke, and "their associates." Samuel Pedy and Jonathan Shaw are identified as witnesses to the transaction. The deed provides specifics on the location of the land and goods the colonists used to purchase the land. (TS)

New Plymouth Colony. Deed, 2 April 1659. MSS 166.

In this deed, Woosamsquin, Wamsutta, and Tofapanum sold land to Captain James Endworth, Josiah Winslow, Constant Southworth, John Burns, John T. Dall, Humphrey Turner, and several others. The area in question was "all the tract of upland and meadow lying on ye easterly side of Taunton River," and it was bartered for "ye consideration of twenty coats, two ruggs, two Iron Pots, two kettles and one kettle, eight pair of shoes, six pair of stockings, one dozen of Hoes, one Douzin (dozen) of Hatchets, two pounds of broadcloth, and a belt (?) satisfied to John Burns, which was received from Wamsutta unto John Burns before ye twenty-fourth of December 1657." (JA)

New Plymouth Colony. Deed, 11 July 1664. MSS 165.

In this deed, Wosniksik and Wattauntouson sold to Haumpmuit, "alias Charles of Ashimuit," a "neck of land with the meadow adioyning, called Mehtukquaaumt, lying betwixt two rivers." (JA)

New Plymouth Colony. Deed, 6 March 1679. MSS 172.

By this deed, Haumpmuit sold the property he had bought in 1664 (see MSS 165) to one Lieutenant Joseph Lothrop of Barnstable, Massachusetts for the sum of six pounds. (JA)

New Plymouth Colony. Deed, 19 (March?) 1679. MSS 168.

By this deed, Sagaowitt, "alias Manumett Peter, Indyan," sold a piece of land near Agawam to Joseph Lothrop for five shillings. (JA)

New Plymouth Colony. Deposition of Jabish Hackit, 2 July 1669. MSS 180.

This is the testimony of Jabish Hackit, who had witnessed a land transaction around 1 October 1665. On that day, the "Sachem of Pakanockit, called Philip, alias Metacomet," signed a deed by which he ceded to James Leonard, Sr. of Taunton, Massachusetts "a neck of land lying by Mr. Brinton's land at Matapoyset, being bounded on each side by a brook." Leonard also secured the right to use the brook "to set up a mill or iron works." James Walker recorded Hackit's statement. (JA)

New Plymouth Colony. Land document, 25 July 1672. MSS 169.

By this deed, the sachem Sachimus ceded thirty-eight acres to Thomas Prence, who served as governor of Plymouth Colony from 1657 to his death in 1673. Thomas Hinckley verified the document's authenticity on 18 March 1674. The original document is accompanied by a typewritten transcript, which includes handwritten notes on the identities of the signatories. (JA)

New Plymouth Colony. Land grant, 8 March 1659. MSS 170.

The colony of New Plymouth granted a parcel of land to Captain Richard Morris "upon the condition that he shall submit himself unto this Government and be ready to do such duty as may be required of him as an inhabitant of the same, and also that neither he nor his heirs...shall engage in any controversies betwixt him or them and the Indians." (JA)

Northampton County (PA). Deed, 24 September 1787. MSS 13.

This deed granted one George Kuhns a plot of land in "Lehi (sic) Township" that lay adjacent to an area referred to as the "Indian Tract." A hand-drawn map at the top outlines Kuhn's property, and identifies neighboring landholders. (JA)

Providence (R.I.). Deed, 3 February 1668; Supplement (on reverse side), 7 May 1668. MSS 162.

By this deed, William Manunnian sold a parcel of land of 5 square miles near Providence to Roger Billings for the sum of 35 pounds. On 7 May 1668, King Philip, Sachem of the Wampanoags, joined Manunnian's brothers Joseph and Jaffery in confirming this transfer. (JA)

Quechatoset. Deed, 16 November 1671. MSS 20.

Quechatoset was the sachem of Manomet, a Wampanoag village near Plymouth, Massachusetts. He was also known as Quateashit, Qateatashit or Quechattasett. This deed documents Quechatoset, Quompanum and Ponfot selling a tract of land to Richard Bourne and John Cotton of the Plymouth Colony. Bourne and Cotton, along with John Eliot, were several of the notable Puritan missionaries who consolidated Christianized Indians into villages called Praying Towns. (TS/EC)

Queens County (N.Y.). Land grant, 1 January 1684. MSS 171.

By this grant, Mungoab, "chief Sachem of all ye lands comonly (sic) called and known by the name of Rokaway (sic) situate to the southwest of the town of Stamford within Queens County upon Long Island," gave as a gift "a neck of land" to one Thomas Townsend. (JA)

Rhode Island. Commissioner on the Narragansett Tribe of Indians. *Report of the Commissioner, Made to the General Assembly, at its January Session, 1858.* Providence: Knowles, Anthony, and Company, State Printers, 1858. LHRARE E99 .N16 R45 1858.

This report, written and submitted by Commissioner Joseph H. Griffin (1810-1879), briefly describes the Narragansett Tribe's business operations (primarily lumber and agriculture). In addition, Griffin addresses the Tribal Council's procedure of bequeathing land parcels to deceased tribal members' heirs. He asserts that tribal regulations codified between 1792 and 1839 required the Council to work in conjunction with the tribe's Treasurer in this practice. However, the Council had continued to allot parcels to tribal heirs despite the absence of a Treasurer since 1818. To rectify this problem, Griffin calls for new legislation. Aside from this issue, he asserts that "the general condition of the tribe at present, compared to what it was twenty or thirty years ago, has, no doubt, improved." (JA)

Rhode Island. Commission on the Affairs of the Narragansett Indians. *Annual Reports of the Commission, Made to the General Assembly, 1881-1884.* Providence: E.L. Freeman and Company, State Printers, 1882-1884. LHRARE E99 .N16 R45 1882-1884.

Between 1881 and 1884, this Commission issued annual reports concerning the Narragansett Tribe to the Rhode Island General Assembly. The 1882 and 1883 reports focus on the Commission's supervision of sales of Narragansett land to private whites. In the final report, the Commission discusses the construction of a memorial at Fort Ninigret in Charlestown, Rhode Island. (N.B.: The collection lacks the first report issued by this commission in 1881.) (JA)

Rhode Island. General Assembly. House of Representatives. Committee of Investigation on the Narragansett Tribe of Indians. *Narragansett Tribe of Indians: Report of the Committee of Investigation; a Historical Sketch, and Evidence Taken, made to the House of Representatives, at its January Session, A. D. 1880.* Providence, R.I.: E. L. Freeman & Co., Printers to the State, 1880-1884. MSS 75.

This is a bound set of four reports prepared for the Rhode Island House. The first report is of the Committee of Investigation and is an historical "sketch" of the Narragansett Tribe. The other three are the first, second and fourth annual reports of the "Commission on the Affairs of the Narragansett Indians." The latter three reports include extensive biographical information on the tribal members of the period, as well as documentation of the tribe's land sale transactions with the State of Rhode Island. (EC)

The Right of the Governor and Company of the Colony of Connecticut to Claim and Hold the Lands within the Limits of their Charter, Lying West of the Province of New-York. Hartford: Printed by Ebenezer Watson, 1773. VAULT F157 .W9 R5 1773.

Beginning in the 1750s, a growing population within Connecticut, combined with a loose interpretation of the colony's 1662 Charter, led to an attempt to annex the Wyoming Valley in Pennsylvania. In 1753, land speculators in Windham founded the Susquehanna Company to serve this purpose. The following year, it obtained a questionable deed for a large tract of land along the Susquehanna River from Natives living in the area (estimated to encompass fully one-third of William Penn's colony). This territorial expansion divided Connecticut leaders. Radicals discerned great economic opportunities in the expansion, and conservatives feared it would jeopardize the Charter (and add to the radicals' political strength). Actual settlement of the Wyoming Valley by Connecticut emigrants did not begin until royal approval was obtained in 1773. Pennsylvanian resistance to this incursion began with denials that the Natives who had sold the land had owned it in the first place, and culminated in armed confrontations during the Revolutionary War. In the mid-1780s, after independence was won, a commission ruled in favor of Pennsylvania's claim to the land in question; Connecticut acceded in 1786. Subsequently, Pennsylvania confirmed the individual land titles held by the erstwhile Connecticut residents. (This information was obtained from the "FAQs" Web site maintained by the Connecticut State Library's History and Genealogy Department.)

This document defends Connecticut's claim to the disputed territory, and provides a detailed account of the Susquehanna Company's purchase of land from the area's Natives. (JA)

Stockbridge (Massachusetts). Deed, 26 July 1768. MSS 178.

By this deed, Jacob Unkaumug (alias Umpencheny) sold "one certain tract or parcel of meadow land lying and being scituate in the township of Stockbridge" to John Naunauphtaunk for twenty pounds. Accompanying this document is a photocopy excerpted from Electa F. Jones' 1854 book, *Stockbridge, Past and Present: or, Records of an Old Mission Station*, in which she briefly discussed Umpencheny and his wife. (JA)

Stockbridge (Massachusetts). Papers, 1737-1772. MSS 205.

Among the papers in this collection are the following two deeds:

A deed dated 2 June 1737, by which Housatonic tribal members John Pophnehonawah (alias Kunkapot) and Joniste Pelawuhkout (alias Shaunaup Wequagun) sold a tract of land to Nahum Ward of Shrewsbury and Ephraim Williams of Newton for the sum of three hundred pounds. This land is described as "wilderness land, scituate or lying in the County of Hampshire," bounded on the east by the Farmington River. (This is Document #3 in the collection.)

A deed dated 11 September 1738, by which Housatonic tribal member Masinamake, alias Solomon, sold a parcel of land to Jacob Wendell for the sum of one hundred twenty pounds. Wendell had previously bought one of six lots that had been put on public auction in Boston in June 1737. Masinamake's land lay adjacent to his lot, straddling the Housatonic River. It is described as being rich in timber and "mineralls." (This is Document #5 in the collection.) (JA)

United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs. *Public Auction Sale of Indian Lands*, November 1917. MSS 100.

This booklet lists, by county, parcels of land held by individual Natives that were up for sale in the then-new state of Oklahoma (which had acquired statehood ten years earlier). Each entry provides the name of the Native landholder, the corresponding parcel's acreage and physical features, and the price being asked. (JA)

United States. Congress. House of Representatives. Committee on Indian Affairs. (41st Congress, 2nd Session). *Cherokee Neutral Lands of Kansas: Argument of James F. Joy, Esq.*, 1 April 1870. Washington, DC: GPO, 1870. MSS 85.

In 1825, the federal government had purchased from the Osage Tribe 800,000 acres of land in the southeastern portion of what later became the state of Kansas. This region was originally intended to serve as an uninhabited, "neutral" zone between white settlers and the Osage. Following the forced removal of the Cherokees from Georgia in the late 1830s, however, this land became earmarked for occupation by displaced Cherokees. (Hence the name "Cherokee Neutral Lands.") White encroachment ensued in subsequent years. Individual settlers arrived starting in the late 1850s. In 1861, the Cherokee Tribe signed a treaty with the Confederate States of America by which they would sell the land to that government. One year after the Civil War ended, the tribe then concluded a treaty with the federal government ceding the same tract of land. Under the terms of the 1866 treaty, a Hartford-based organization named the American Emigrant Company quietly purchased a large section of this area. Unaware of this transaction, railroad magnate James F. Joy later attempted to buy the same piece of land, intending to construct a connecting rail line there.

This document and MSS 86 below pertain to what became a three-way dispute over these lands, between Joy, the American Emigrant Company, and the white settlers. At issue (among other things) was the legality of the deeds that had been granted to the Cherokees (and, therefore, whether they, rather than the government, were entitled to sell the land to the white settlers and companies).

United States. Congress. House of Representatives. Committee on Indian Affairs. (41st Congress, 3rd Session). *Cherokee Neutral Lands of Kansas: Minority Report of the Committee*, 13 January 1871. Washington, DC: GPO, 1871. MSS 86.

The findings regarding this disputed tract of land note that the Cherokee Tribe had it to the Confederate States of America in 1861, and argue that the tribe had therefore forfeited its claim to it. As a result, the tribe's 1866 treaty with the federal government, and, in turn, the sales to the American Emigrant Company and James Joy, were declared null and void. The disputed land was thus made available for further settlement by individual whites. (JA)

Weesoem. Will, 30 July 1670. MSS 167.

In this will, Weesoem (who estimated his age to be about eighty at the time) willed to his son Waxehtamun and his kinsman Haumpmuit ("or Charles") "all of (his) lands and meadows that lyeth at a place called Monquaquok." He made a provision that, if his son were to die before him, then Haumpmuit would inherit the entire estate. Richard Bourne (a Deputy of the General Court who served as a tribal advocate) and Mokomosk countersigned as witnesses. On 20 April 1680, Governor Thomas Hinckley of the New Plymouth Colony affirmed that Weesoem indeed owned the land in question. (JA)

Winsor, Justin (1831-1897). *The Rival Claimants for North America, 1497-1755*. Worcester, MA: Press of Charles Hamilton, 1895. MSS 155.

Though noted historian and librarian Justin Winsor largely addresses the Anglo-French contest for hegemony over North America during this time period, he also focuses on English land claims *vis à vis* the Iroquois and Cherokee tribes. (JA)

NATIVE REACTIONS

Connecticut. Department of Environmental Protection. Property appraisal reports, February and May 1985. MSS 30.

These five reports provide analyses of the market value of a total of 177.48 acres of vacant, unimproved land adjacent to the Mashantucket Pequot reservation then privately owned by residents of Ledyard. The Tribe had an interest in purchasing this land. (JA)

Sekatau, Ella Wilcox and Ruth Wallis Herndon. *Narragansett Communities in Nineteenth-Century Rhode Island*. (Presented as part of *The American Seminar*, held at Brown University's John Nicholas Brown Center for the Study of American Civilization, 14 March 2001.) MSS 215.

In 1880, Rhode Island's General Assembly legislated the Narragansett Tribe out of existence, claiming that no Narragansett "of pure Indian blood" lived within the state's borders any longer. This fiat paved the way for the state to take all but two of the acres that had been allotted to the Tribe almost two centuries earlier. In this paper, Narragansett Tribal member Ella Wilcox Sekatau and History Professor Ruth Wallis Herndon of the University of Toledo refute this claim. Supported by documentary evidence, they argue that the Narragansetts maintained vibrant, cohesive communities in Rhode Island throughout the nineteenth century. (JA)

Six Nations. *Petition and Appeal of the Six Nations, Oneida, Stockbridge, &c. to the Government of the United States*. Sangerfield [NY]: Printed by Joseph Tenny, 1829. MSS 214.

Continuing white settlement in the state of New York in the early nineteenth century compelled the tribes comprising the Six Iroquois Nations to seek territory elsewhere. On 18 August 1821, these tribes signed a treaty with the Menominee and Winnebago tribes of the Green Bay region of the Territory of Michigan by which the Michigan tribes ceded a tract along the Fox River to the Six

Nations tribes for the price of \$1,500. President James Monroe approved this treaty on 9 February of the following year. Soon, however, this allotment proved insufficient for tribal members migrating westward. Accordingly, on 23 September 1822, the leaders of the Six Nations purchased additional territory from the Menominee and Winnebago Tribes, for a price of \$1,000. President Monroe approved this treaty on 13 March of the following year. Unfortunately for the Six Nations, the federal government signed another territorial agreement with the Chippewa, Menominee, and Winnebago Tribes four years later. By the Treaty of Butte des Morts, signed on 11 August 1827, the signatory tribes agreed to cede lands to the federal government; part of this cession included a significant portion of the parcels that the Six Nations had earlier purchased.

This document is the Six Nations' formal protestation of the 1827 treaty to the federal government. It includes reprints of the treaties of 1821 and 1822 and additional documentation to prove the legitimacy of the plaintiffs' claim to the land in question. It hints that the process by which Lewis Cass (then Governor of the Michigan Territory) and Colonel Thomas McKenney obtained Menominee cooperation in 1827 may have been questionable. When these representatives of the federal government first arrived, the Menominee Tribe had no sachem. Lewis and McKenney thereupon appointed a young man (named Ois Coss) to act as the tribe's head and negotiator. The leaders of the Six Nations warn in their opening statement, "If this Treaty...should be confirmed, it will serve wholly to discourage the emigration of our people from the East." Although the United States Senate ratified the treaty on 23 February 1829, it added a proviso that it "shall not impair or affect any right or claim which the New York Indians...have to any of the lands mentioned in the said treaty." (JA)

Sonnit, Dority, (Dorothy). Will, 14 December 1713. MSS 6.

In this will, Dority Sonnit refers to herself as "Indian of the town of Plimouth, in the county of Plimouth, in the province of Maccicutsit in New England." She bequeathed 200 acres of land, in parcels of varying size, to her sons Cornelius, George, Jacob, and Daniel; her grandson, Samuel; her daughters, Mary and Marcy; and her husband, Samuel. All of the land was in Plymouth with one parcel at Sampson's Pond. (Bibliographer's note: While it is true that Dority Sonnit is not specifically identified as a Wampanoag Indian in her will, the fact that she is identified as "Indian of the town of Plimoth" points to her being of Wampanoag blood. She may have been a "Christian Indian," since many Indians of that region were Christianized by the first part of the eighteenth century.) (TS/EC)

Stockbridge (Massachusetts). Papers, 1737-1772. MSS 205.

Among the papers in this collection is the following petition:

A petition from the Stockbridge Tribe to Spencer Phips (1685-1757), the Lieutenant-Governor of the Colony of Massachusetts, on 27 May 1752. The delegation charged the neighboring towns of Blandford and Framingham with encroaching on tribal lands without adequate compensation for Tribal members. The General Assembly resolved on 4 June to appoint a commission to investigate the matter. (This is Document #7 in the collection.) (JA)

Strong, Nathaniel T. *Appeal to the Christian Community on the Conditions and Prospects of the New-York Indians, in Answer to a Book, Entitled The Case of the New-York Indians, and Other Publications by the Society of Friends.* Buffalo, NY: Press of Thomas & Co., 1841. RARE E99 .S3 S77 1841.

This is the pamphlet which Seneca leader Nathaniel T. Strong wrote in defense of his decision to sign the controversial 1838 treaty with the Ogden Land Company and the federal government (see below). He accuses the treaty's opponents of having selfish motives; among them were merchants whose businesses depended upon the Seneca presence on the contested New York lands. Further, Strong asserts that the Society of Friends unjustly impugned the motives of the Ogden Land Company. According to him, leading tribal members, along with the federal government, carefully scrutinized the company's agenda and were satisfied as to its legality. (JA)

United States. Congress. Senate. Committee on Indian Affairs. (34th Congress, 1st Session). *Memorial of the Delegates and Representatives of Choctaw Nation of Indians*, 18 March 1856. Washington, DC: [s.n.], 1856. MSS 83.

Soon after the Indian Removal Act of 1830 laid the foundation for moving tribes living in the southeastern United States west of the Mississippi River, the Choctaw was the first tribe to sign a removal treaty with the federal government, on 27 September 1830. Under its terms, the Choctaws would receive monetary compensation for the lands that they ceded in the state of Mississippi. Twenty-six years later, the tribe still had yet to receive this payment.

This item contains the tribe's formal appeal for this compensation, along with various related documents. (JA)

United States. Congress. Senate. Committee on Indian Affairs. (41st Congress, 2nd Session). *Memorial of Members of Black Bob's Band of Shawnee Indians*, 11 February 1870. Washington, DC: GPO, 1870. MSS 87.

In 1825, the federal government had granted to the Shawnee Tribe a tract of land in what later became the state of Kansas. In 1854, during white settlement of the region, the tribe returned this tract to the government, and received 200,000 acres in retrocession. Soon thereafter, the tribe divided into two sections. One favored holding its land parcel in severalty (i.e., dividing it into individual land holdings). The other, led by "Black Bob," advocated keeping the land as common property. Immediately after the Civil War, white settlers and land speculators were attracted to this fertile region of Kansas. They soon pressured the "Black Bob" branch of the tribe to divide its land holdings in severalty, to enable the whites to obtain it piecemeal (through fair means and foul) from individual tribal members. These tribal members resisted, arguing that this measure would disintegrate their tribal organization. Moreover, the quality of their allotted land varied widely, thus rendering a fair division of it impossible. Lastly, they justifiably feared being swindled by unscrupulous speculators pursuing a "divide and conquer" strategy.

This document is the petition to Congress written and signed by leading members of the "Black Bob" branch of the Shawnee Tribe. In it, they provide several supporting documents to underpin their case. (JA)

WHITE REACTIONS

Abel, Anna Heloise (b. 1873). *Indian Reservations in Kansas and the Extinguishment of their Title*. [Topeka]: Kansas State Historical Society, 1902. MSS 154.

Abel wrote this as her Master's Thesis in History during her studies at the University of Kansas, and presented it to the Kansas State Historical Society on 2 December 1902. In it, she detailed the compulsory migrations of eastern tribes to the Kansas Territory in the first four decades of the nineteenth century, and their subsequent, mid-century removal to the "Indian Territory" of Oklahoma as a result of the influx of white settlers. (JA)

Amt, Gerhard J. *Casino Impact Study: Southeastern Connecticut Planning Region*. Norwich, CT: Southeastern Connecticut Regional Planning Agency, 1991. MSS 130.

This study examines the projected local impact which the enterprises that the Mashantucket Pequot Tribe was then contemplating would have. Predicted effects on local traffic and adjacent residential areas receive attention. (JA)

A Brief Exposition of the Claims of the New-York Indians to Certain Lands at Green Bay, in the Michigan Territory, [1829]. MSS 199.

This booklet offers documentary proof of the Six Nations' ownership of the lands they had purchased in the Green Bay area of the Territory of Michigan. (However, this booklet was printed after the United States Senate ratified the controversial Treaty of Butte des Morts in 1829. (See MSS 214 above.)) Included here are the texts of the treaties which the leaders of the Six Nations had signed with the Menominee and Winnebago Tribes in 1822 and 1823. Last to appear is the Treaty of Butte des Morts, accompanied by letters of approval from President John Quincy Adams and Secretary of State Henry Clay. This investigation into the Six Nations' claims led to subsequent adjustments of the Treaty of Butte des Morts in their favor, such as the Treaty of Washington, signed between the federal government and the Menominee Tribe on 17 February 1831. (JA)

Bourassa, Joseph N. (d. 1878). Papers, 1858. MSS 201.

In February 1858, the Potawatomi Tribe assembled a delegation to secure a new treaty with the federal government (to supplement the treaty ratified on 22 July 1846). On 2 February 1858, William Murphy, the United States Agent for the tribe, sent a letter to General James William Denver (1817-1892), then the Governor of the Kansas Territory. In it, Murphy described the initial terms which the tribe sought to secure (listed on an accompanying document). Among these terms was a proposed division of the reservation into individual parcels of land which individual tribal members could then purchase. Although Murphy approved of these terms, he also noted that, the previous December, he had advised the tribe to sell a portion of their reservation so that "they would be less liable to encroachment from the white race." Murphy believed that "they had more land than they could possibly cultivate," and that the proceeds of such a land sale could help indigent tribal members.

In another letter to Denver, dated 3 March 1858, Murphy stated that the tribal delegation had received additional instructions to seek "a fair price" for selling land for the construction of the Missouri River and Rocky Mountain Railroad. (JA)

Connecticut. *Between Old John Uncas, Young John Uncas, and Several Other Mohegan Indians, on the Behalf of Themselves and the Rest of their Tribe, by John Mason and Samuel Mason, the Trustees for and Guardians of the Said Tribe and the Governor and Company of the English Colony of Connecticut in New England in America, and Others. The Summary of the Case of the Respondents, the Landholders*, [1770?]. MSS 233.

Territorial disputes had periodically divided English settlers in southeastern Connecticut and the Mohegan Tribe since the mid-seventeenth century. To assist them in navigating the convoluted straits of English law as it related to land, the Tribe had enlisted the services of Major John Mason (of Pequot War infamy). Mason and his descendants continued to represent (at least, officially) Tribal interests *vis à vis* neighboring English colonists through the mid-eighteenth century. Often, such Tribal land claims served as a pretext for challenges to Connecticut's colonial charter after it was issued in 1662; the Masons sometimes allied with Royal Governors in New York and Massachusetts who wished to annex Connecticut. An initial ruling by a Court of Commission in 1705 had upheld Mohegan land claims. However, Sir Henry Ashurst, Connecticut's agent in London at the time, successfully appealed the decision. The Colony of Connecticut prevailed in further hearings on the matter through subsequent decades, until it was decisively adjudicated in the colony's favor in 1773. (This information was obtained from David W. Conroy's *Defense of Indian Land Rights: William Bolland and the Mohegan Case in 1743*, published by the American Antiquarian Society in 1994. Call Number: LOCHIST E99 .M83 C66 1994.)

This document contains the colonists' evidence from a hearing that occurred around 1770. It provides a chronology of the land transactions between the colony, the Mohegan Tribe, and the Masons, starting with the deed by which Uncas had ceded his territory to the colony on 28 September 1640. In finding for the colonists, the judges William de Grey, Baron Walsingham (1719-1781) and John

Dunning, Baron Ashburton (1731-1783) wrote in their opinion,

Upon the Whole, this is the Case...of the 800 landholders, and not of them only, but of *all the Landholders in America*, who are all liable upon the Principle contended for by the Appellants (i.e., the Mohegans), to be brought to England to defend themselves against pretended Indian titles. (JA)

Eastman, H. W. *Have the Indians Suffered More from the Injustices of the Whites than the Negroes?* (Speech, 9 January 1849.) MSS 33.

Although he was sympathetic to the plight of African-American slaves in the United States, Eastman had little empathy for Natives that were dispossessed of their lands by European encroachment. In this speech, he argues that civilization depended upon European land appropriations in North and South America. Burgeoning populations in Europe and the United States necessitated putting as much land as possible under agricultural cultivation, and, "if unsettled and sparsely scattered tribes of hunters and fishermen show no disposition or capacity to emerge from the savage to the agricultural or civilized state of man, their right to keep some of the fairest portions of the earth a mere wilderness...becomes utterly inconsistent with the civilization and moral improvement of mankind." Furthermore, Eastman argues, European methods of land acquisition were wholly justified: English colonists purchased their plots of land at fair prices mutually agreed upon, and the *Conquistadores* won the territory for the Iberian empires through military superiority. (Anticipating objections to the latter, "might makes right" argument, Eastman reminds his audience of the outcome of "the late war between the United States and Mexico.") (JA)

Gookin, Daniel (1612-1687). *Petition of the poor distressed Pequits now living at Poquatuck*, 21 May 1664. MSS 197.

According to an accompanying letter from 1930, Gookin is the probable author of this petition to "the Honored Generall Court now assembled in Boston." He wrote it on behalf of the "Pequits" at "Poquatuck." They had been given a five-year lease on land in Squomacut and Poquatuck, in order to improve it by planting. At the expiration of this lease, they had been promised "a convenient Track of land elsewhere in the woods" consisting of eight thousand acres. Unfortunately, the Pequots met resistance from white settlers in the area; Gookin states that "...we cannot get the land layed out according to these orders, nor can quickly possess and improve the same." (JA)

Hallett, Benjamin F. (1797-1862). *Rights of the Marshpee Indians: Argument of Benjamin F. Hallett, Counsel for the memorialists of the Marshpee tribe, before a joint committee of the legislature of Massachusetts.* Boston: J. Howe, Printer, 1834. MSS 195.

Hallett ardently defended the rights of individuals against the government. Here, he argued that the state of Massachusetts had illegally exercised control over the Mashpee tribe and had wrongly taken tribal lands in Barnstable County. (JA)

Humphrey, Heman (1779-1861). *Indian rights and our duties: an address delivered at Amherst, Hartford, etc., December, 1829.* Amherst: Published by J. S. & C. Adams and Co., 1830. MSS 190.

Humphrey, the President of Amherst College, here discussed the history of white interaction with Natives in New England and New York up to that point. Decrying the near extinction of the Pequots, the Mohegans, and the Mohawks, Humphrey urged his audience to proceed with care in future dealings with Native peoples (specifically, he mentioned the Cherokees and Choctaws). (JA)

Josephy, Alvin M. (b. 1915) (compiler). *Indian Resistance: The Patriot Chiefs.* (Jackdaw, No. A2). New York: Grossman Publishers, 1972. Accession Number 1999-0110.

Historian Alvin M. Josephy compiled this packet of reprinted documents, illustrations, and maps as part of the Jackdaw series, for the use of secondary-level history teachers. The enclosed items address

white seizure of cultural and geographic hegemony over North America, and the "unhappy story of the resistance of the Indian to the conquest of his lands." Among the documents are: an excerpt from a letter written by a Nez Percé chief protesting white encroachments on reservation land and an essay titled "Manifest Destiny and its Opponents." (JA)

Monroe, Samuel. Petition, 9 March 1765. MSS 182.

Monroe wrote this petition to Sir William Johnson (1715-1774), the British Superintendent of Indian Affairs, on behalf of the Wappinger tribe and its influential leader, Daniel Nimham (1724-1778). Nimham had asserted that white settlers had unjustly encroached upon Wappinger lands in Dutchess County, New York. (Many tribal members had moved to Stockbridge, Massachusetts, during the French and Indian War, and subsequently returned to New York. During their absence, whites had appropriated this territory.) Monroe, to whom the tribe had given power of attorney, had assisted Nimham in bringing suit to the colony's Governor and Provincial Council, armed with "several papers and vouchers to attest the truth of such their Complaints and Right to the said lands." Unfortunately for Nimham and Monroe, the Assembly, dominated by prominent white families with land interests in the contested region (such as the heirs of local merchant Adolph Philipse), denied the Native claims. To make matters worse, the Assembly issued a warrant for Monroe's arrest. In this petition, Monroe appealed his case to Johnson. Unfortunately, this overture availed Monroe and his clients little. He spent two months in prison. Meanwhile, the white settlers bombarded Johnson with documentation supporting their claims. In the end, Johnson decided on 26 August 1765 that "wherever a Title is set up by any Tribe of Indians of little consequence or importance to His Majesty's interest, & who may be considered as long domesticated, that such Claim unless apparently clear, had better remain unsupported than that Several old Titles of His Majesty's Subjects should thereby become disturbed." (Information obtained from Volumes IV, V, and XI of *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*. (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1921-1965). Call Number: E195 .J62 1921 vols. 1-14.) (JA)

Mystic Pioneer, (Mystic, Connecticut), 14 May 1859. MSS 103.

This edition of the newspaper contains an article about the Pequot Tribe on page thirty-nine, second column. The article details the number of people living on the Pequot reservation in 1859, the number of acres comprising the reservation lands and their value. (TS/EC)

New York (State). Legislature. Assembly. Special Committee to Investigate the Indian Problem.

Report of the Special Committee. Albany: Troy Press Company, Printers, 1889.

RARE E78 .N7 N77 1889.

This book contains the findings of a special committee that the New York State Legislature had appointed in a resolution dated 21 March 1888. The committee's mandate charged it with the duty of investigating (among other things) "the amount of land cultivated and uncultivated" on reservations within New York State, "the manner in which the (Natives residing in New York) assume to allot their lands among the several members of their tribes," and the "title to the lands on their several reservations." In addition, the commission probed into the claims on these lands asserted by the Ogden Land Company, which had been purchasing large tracts of Native lands in western New York State and selling them at enormous profits since the 1790s (see above). (JA)

North American Review. Review of an Article in the North American Review for January 1830, on the Present Relations of the Indians, 1830. MSS 98.

This is an impassioned condemnation of white encroachment on Native territory in general, and on Cherokee lands in Georgia in particular. The author notes that, although the federal government has purported to compensate displaced Natives adequately, "our extensive purchases of their lands have had a most disastrous influence upon their character and condition." Tribal members have been forced into regions in which they could no longer practice their lifestyle. Often, they have been forced to live adjacent to territory occupied by hostile tribes. Even if they have received sufficient monetary compensation from the federal government, they then have fallen victim to unscrupulous white

traders, "more rapacious than the locusts of Egypt." Cherokee possession of lands in Georgia, unless and until voluntarily relinquished, "is *unlimited* -- it is FOREVER." The author notes with outrage that the designated land west of the Mississippi River to which the Cherokees would be exiled is unsuitable, especially for Natives "inured to a Southern climate" and dependent upon agriculture for their livelihood. Even if it were well-suited, the mass migration of the tribe over such a long distance would exact a frightful toll. After reminding the reader that the Cherokees and the white settlers in Georgia had thus far coexisted peacefully, and opining that they would continue to do so, "unless (the Cherokees) are wantonly molested," the author asserts that "the (white) Georgians settled around them, not they in the midst of the Georgians. Hence, the Indians are the last that should suffer." Ultimately, "if the Georgians wish for more land, let them find it beyond the Mississippi." (JA)

Society of Friends. Joint Committee on Indian Affairs (Hicksite). *The Case of the Seneca Indians in the State of New York.* Philadelphia: Merrihew and Thompson, Printers, 1840. RARE E99 .S3 C29 1840.

On 15 January 1838, members of various New York tribes who had not relocated to the Green Bay area (see MSS 214 and MSS 199 above) concluded a treaty with the Ogden Land Company and the federal government by which they agreed to cede their claims on Green Bay lands to the federal government. In addition, they would then move to the region then designated as "Indian Territory" in what later became the state of Kansas. This booklet, published by the Society of Friends, is a passionate condemnation of the treaty. Its authors point out that, during the United States Senate's consideration of the treaty, several Seneca leaders charged that tribal signatures to it were obtained through bribery, threats, and other fraudulent means. A revised version of the treaty drafted by the Senate's Committee on Indian Affairs in 1839 was hardly any better. Once again, too, agents of the Ogden Land Company obtained tribal members' signatures through foul methods. (JA)

----- *A Further Illustration of the Case of the Seneca Indians in the State of New York, in a Review of a Pamphlet Entitled "An Appeal to the Christian Community, &c., by Nathaniel T. Strong, a Chief of the Seneca Tribe."* Philadelphia: Merrihew and Thompson, Printers, 1841. LHRARE E99 .S3 F812 1841.

Nathaniel T. Strong, a leader of the Seneca Tribe, was one of the 1838 treaty's signatories (see previous entry). Subsequently, in 1841, he wrote a pamphlet in which he justified it (see above). In this booklet, the Society of Friends again decries the treaty, and stridently critiques Strong's defense of it. Ultimately, however, the United States Senate ratified the treaty (albeit with further revisions) on 20 May 1842. (JA)

Stockbridge (Massachusetts). Papers, 1737-1772. MSS 205.

Among the papers in this collection is this report of the investigative committee formed in response to complaints made by the Stockbridge Tribe in May 1752 (see Document #7 of MSS 205 above). This committee brought representatives of the Tribe and of the neighboring towns together in November 1752. The Tribal representatives presented their grievances individually, and their white adversaries responded in turn. This report summarizes the exchange. (This is Document #6 in the collection.) (JA)

United States. Congress. House of Representatives. (24th Congress, 2nd Session). *A Bill for the Relief of Elisha Moreland, William M. Kennedy, Robert J. Kennedy, and Mason E. Lewis,* 23 January 1837. Washington, DC: [s.n.], 1837. MSS 126.

Proposed by Representative Reuben Chapman (1799-1882), an Alabama Democrat serving on the House Committee on Public Lands, this bill called for compensation for the four named white squatters in Madison County, Alabama, who lost land when an adjacent reservation was created for an individual Cherokee named Challenge. Chapman recommended that the squatters be given an opportunity to purchase, at "the minimum price per acre," any "unappropriated public land" in the nearby Huntsville district, and divide it among themselves. (JA)

United States. Congress. House of Representatives. (25th Congress, 3rd Session). *Indians Removed to West Mississippi from 1789: Report from the Secretary of War*, 5 February 1839. Washington, DC: [s.n.], 1839. MSS 78.

Possibly as a result of the controversial forced removal of the Cherokee Tribe from Georgia which had begun the previous year, the House of Representatives passed a resolution on 14 January 1839 that called for a report quantifying removals of eastern tribes to lands west of the Mississippi River in the years since the federal Constitution was ratified. On 5 February, Secretary of War Joel R. Poinsett submitted this response, including reports from Treasury Secretary Levi Woodbury and Commissioner of Indian Affairs T. Hartley Crawford. Woodbury's report indicates how the acres of land which the federal government had thus obtained were allocated (internal improvements, estates granted to veterans of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, etc.). Crawford provides yearly listings of the numbers of Natives removed from these regions, the numbers of acres taken from them, and the total amounts of money used to purchase these acres. (JA)

United States. Congress. House of Representatives. Committee of Ways and Means. (26th Congress, 2nd Session). *Estimates -- Indian Department -- for 1841*, 23 December 1840. Washington, DC: [s.n.], 1840. MSS 90.

This document itemizes the projected budget for the Department of Indian Affairs (under the aegis of the War Department) for 1841. Listed by tribe, many of these anticipated disbursements were intended to compensate tribal members for ceded lands. (JA)

United States. Congress. House of Representatives. Committee on Indian Affairs. (31st Congress, 1st Session). *Removal of the Winnebagoes*, 17 September 1850. Washington, DC: [s.n.], 1850. RARE E93 .A4 1850.

In the spring of 1850, the federal government secured a contract with a private individual, Henry M. Rice (1816-1894), in which he pledged to oversee the relocation of Winnebago tribal members from the new states of Iowa and Wisconsin to the Minnesota Territory. Contracts of this nature reflected the belief that civilian, rather than military, control of tribal removals conducted better to future peaceful relations with the dislocated tribes. The Governor of the Minnesota Territory, Henry Hastings Sibley (1811-1891), protested this contract in a report to the House dated 18 April 1850. In it, he charged that Rice had grossly underestimated the number of Winnebago Tribal members to be moved, that Rice had charged too high a fee for his services, and that it was "derogatory to the dignity of the government" for it to delegate one of its duties to a private citizen.

This report of the House Indian Affairs Committee, submitted by Committee member John Crowell (1801-1883), a Whig from Ohio, overruled Sibley's objections. In the preface, the Committee noted that

One object -- and it is a very important object -- of making the contract with Mr. Rice to remove the Indians was, by kind treatment, to inspire their minds with friendly feelings towards the government of the United States, which has too often treated them unkindly, and presented to them the bayonet when it ought to have extended the calumet of peace.

(As a postscript, Rice later became a Representative from the Minnesota Territory (1853-1857), and then one of Minnesota's first United States Senators after it gained statehood in 1858.) (JA)

United States. Congress. Senate. (26th Congress, 1st Session). *Report from the Secretary of War Transmitting Estimates of the Appropriations Necessary for the Service of the Indian Department for the Year 1840*, 13 January 1840. Washington, DC: Blair & Rives, Printers, 1840. MSS 92.

Similarly to MSS 90 (see above), this document provides the same projected data for the previous year. (JA)

United States. Congress. Senate. Committee on Indian Affairs. (29th Congress, 1st Session). Report, 9 February 1846. Washington, DC: Ritchie & Heiss, Printers, 1846. MSS 79.

In 1833, Cherokee tribal member John Rogers, living in Grand Saline, Texas (which was still a Mexican state at the time), leased a plot of land to one Hugh Keener, a citizen of the United States. Keener, who sought to operate a salt works there, agreed to pay Rogers a monthly rent in the form of 250 bushels of salt. The following year, Keener acquired a client named Lewis Evans, to whom he agreed to sell all produced salt not earmarked for rental payment. In the summer of 1834, Keener pledged to give Rogers an additional 1,660 bushels for payment on his lease. Soon afterward, Rogers seized a salt shipment that Evans had purchased. Through the next few years, Evans unsuccessfully sought retribution through appeals to several federal agencies in the United States. Admission of Texas into the union in 1845 did not improve Evans' prospects. This report, submitted in February 1846 by Senator Spencer Jarnagin (1792-1853), a Whig from Tennessee, upheld the previous rulings against Evans. (JA)

United States. Congress. Senate. Committee on Indian Affairs. (41st Congress, 2nd Session). Report, 12 April 1870. Washington, DC: GPO, 1870. MSS 76.

Submitted to the Senate on behalf of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs by Senator Garrett Davis (1801-1872), a Democrat from Kentucky, this report was a response to the petition which the "Black Bob" branch of the Shawnee Tribe had brought before Congress the previous February (see MSS 87 above). Although the 1854 treaty had putatively given individual members of the "Black Bob" Shawnees the option of purchasing 200-acre lots of land (should they decide to withdraw from the communal land arrangement), Davis questioned the legality of issuing deeds to such tribal members. He reiterated the arguments posed by the tribal delegation. (At this point, the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs was considering resolving this dilemma by simply having the federal government buy the tract of land claimed by the "Black Bob" Shawnees, and then use the proceeds to finance moving them southward into Oklahoma and providing for their welfare. In the end, Congress passed a joint resolution that validated the individual deeds in February 1871, thus paving the way for white appropriation of the territory.) (JA)

United States. Congress. Senate. Committee on Indian Affairs. (41st Congress, 2nd Session). Report, 3 May 1870. Washington, DC: GPO, 1870. MSS 89.

On 4 December 1868, several tribes residing in New York signed a treaty with the federal government by which they agreed to relinquish their claims to lands west of Missouri in return for monetary compensation. Several months later, in February of 1870, lawyers representing the signatory tribes proposed several amendments to the treaty, in order to ensure adequate payment to individual tribal members.

In this report to the Committee, Senator William A. Buckingham (1804-1875), a Connecticut Republican, recommended against ratification of the treaty. To support his argument, he noted that, in accordance with a treaty signed on 15 January 1838, these New York tribes had ceded much of the land in question to the federal government. The portion which the tribes kept was earmarked for members who had no permanent place of residence, on the understanding that they would move to and occupy that region within five years. Three decades later, many of these tribal members had not yet relocated. Therefore, Buckingham contended, they had "forfeited all interest in the lands." (JA)

United States. Congress. Senate. Committee on Indian Affairs. (49th Congress, 2nd Session). *Letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Transmitting Report and Papers Relative to Sale of Lands Allotted to Certain Shawnee Indians*, 28 February 1887. Washington, DC: GPO, 1887. MSS 88.

This document contains the federal courts' affirmations of the legality of the individual land deeds held by members of the "Black Bob" branch of the Shawnee Tribe (see MSS 76 above). Included here are transcripts of court hearings, maps of the individual land parcels, and the opinion of the federal Circuit Court for the District of Kansas. (JA)

Weekly Republican (Supplement) (Springfield, MA), 25 February 1854. MSS 139.

This supplement to this newspaper reprints the speech which William H. Seward (1801-1872) (then a Whig Senator from New York) gave in response to the Kansas -Nebraska Act on 17 February 1854. Although the main theme of Seward's speech was a condemnation of the proposed act's abrogation of the Missouri Compromise's ban on the extension of slavery west of the Mississippi River, he also noted that the territory in question was already populated by displaced Natives. Should the territory be opened to white settlement,

Where shall they go? Will you bring them back again across the Mississippi?
There is no room for Indians here. Will you send them northward beyond your territory of Nebraska, toward the British border? That is already occupied by Indians; there is no room there. Will you turn them loose upon Texas and New Mexico?
There is no room there. Will you drive them over the Rocky Mountains? They will meet a tide of immigration there flowing from Europe and from Asia. Whither, then, shall they, the dispossessed, unpitied heirs of this vast continent go? The answer is -- nowhere.

Unfortunately for these "unpitied heirs of this vast continent" (and for the rest of the United States), the controversial act became law on 30 May 1854. (JA)

Introduction, annotations, and overview of map collection by Elliott Caldwell (EC), Timothy Spindler (TS), and Jonathan Ault (JA), Assistant Archivist, Reference.

This bibliography was first compiled in February 2002, and will be updated quarterly. Any omissions or errors are deeply regretted by the bibliographers who have made every effort to ensure the accuracy of this document.

Amy Langlois, Assistant Archivist
Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center
Archives & Special Collections
110 Pequot Trail
Mashantucket, CT 06338
Telephone: (860) 396-6872
Fax: (860) 396-7004
E-mail: archive@mptn-nsn.gov

Rev. 7/2007