University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books and Chapters
University of Nebraska Press

2015

The Civil War and Reconstruction in Indian Territory

Bradley R. Clampitt

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/unpresssamples

Clampitt, Bradley R., "The Civil War and Reconstruction in Indian Territory" (2015). *University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books and Chapters*. 311.
http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/unpresssamples/311

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Nebraska Press at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books and Chapters by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

THE CIVIL WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION IN INDIAN TERRITORY

Buy the Book

Buy the Book

The Civil War and Reconstruction in Indian Territory

Edited and with an
introduction by

BRADLEY R. CLAMPITT

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA PRESS
Lincoln and London

Buy the Book

© 2015 by the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska

A portion of the introduction originally appeared as "'For Our Own Safety and Welfare': What the Civil War Meant in Indian Territory," by Bradley R. Clampitt, in *Main Street Oklahoma: Stories of Twentieth-Century America* edited by Linda W. Reese and Patricia Loughlin (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2013), © 2013 by the University of Oklahoma Press. Reproduced with permission.

All rights reserved
Manufactured in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
The Civil War and Reconstruction in Indian Territory / Edited and with an introduction by Bradley R. Clampitt.
pages cm
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-8032-7727-4 (pbk.: alk. paper)
ISBN 978-0-8032-7887-5 (epub)
ISBN 978-0-8032-7888-2 (mobi)
ISBN 978-0-8032-7889-9 (pdf)
1. Indians of North America—Indian Territory—History—19th century. 2. Indians of North America—History—Civil War, 1861–1865. 3. United States—History—Civil War, 1861–1865—Participation, Indian. 4. Indian Territory—History—19th century. I. Clampitt, Bradley R., 1975–, editor.
E78.I5C53 2015
973.7089'97—dc23
2015002790

Set in Minion by Westchester Publishing Services

Buy the Book

CONTENTS

Map of the Civil War in Indian Territory vii

Introduction: The Civil War and Reconstruction in Indian Territory 1
Bradley R. Clampitt

1. Bitter Legacy: The Battle Front 19
Richard B. McCaslin

2. Hardship at Home: The Civilian Experience 38
Clarissa Confer

3. Our Doom as a Nation Is Sealed: The Five Nations in the Civil War 64
Brad Agnew

4. “The Most Destitute” People in Indian Territory: The Wichita Agency Tribes and the Civil War 88
F. Todd Smith

5. Who Defines a Nation?: Reconstruction in Indian Territory 110
Christopher B. Bean

6. “We Had a Lot of Trouble Getting Things Settled after the War”: The Freedpeople’s Civil Wars 132
Linda W. Reese

Buy the Book

7. Hearth and Home: Cherokee and Creek Women's Memories of the Civil War in Indian Territory 153
Amanda Cobb-Greetham

8. To Reach a Wider Audience: Public Commemoration of the Civil War in Indian Territory 172
Whit Edwards

Contributors 183

Index 185

Buy the Book

Civil War battle sites

Copyright 2013 University of Oklahoma Press

The denizens of Indian Territory found themselves caught between two powerful belligerents during the American Civil War. In the eastern half of the territory, numerous battles raged among Indian, black, and white troops. The conflict ravaged the home front for members of the Five Nations there and for the Plains tribes who resided in the western portion of the territory. From *The Story of Oklahoma: Revised Second Edition*, by W. David Baird and Danney Goble. Reproduced with permission. All rights reserved.

Buy the Book

Buy the Book

Introduction

The Civil War and Reconstruction in Indian Territory

Bradley R. Clampitt

From 1861 to 1865 the American Civil War raged after decades of sectional animosity between North and South, and the fratricidal bloodbath lives on in the imaginations of countless Americans. The endless public fascination with the Civil War has prompted one prominent historian to describe it as "The War That Never Goes Away."[1] One need not be a native of a former Confederate state to fall spellbound to the tragic "War for Southern Independence," and one need not hail from a Northern state to appreciate the Union's heroic effort to preserve the nation and eventually dismantle the abomination of chattel slavery. But where does that leave individuals who seek to understand the violent conflict in Indian Territory, a region populated predominantly by people who were neither Northern nor Southern and indeed were not U.S. citizens?

In recent years scholars have brought a degree of geographical balance to the study of the war by looking beyond the famed battles and leaders of the eastern theater and dedicating increased attention to the endless war in the western and Trans-Mississippi regions.[2] This volume continues that admirable trend and contributes to the relatively sparse scholarly literature of the Civil War and Reconstruction in Indian Territory.[3] The contributors approach the subject from multiple perspectives in eight essays that incorporate modern scholarship and interpretations into a readable narrative designed for students and scholars alike.

Buy the Book

The Civil War began forty-six years before Oklahoma statehood, but the ravages of war transcended political distinctions such as statehood. The residents of what was then known as Indian Territory experienced the horrors of civil war as vividly as almost any other population. So, when historians and students consider the region's role in the Civil War, do they think first of individuals who remained loyal to the United States or those who struggled for Southern independence? Perhaps the answer should be "Neither." Instead, the conflict in Indian Territory presents a unique interpretive framework, what one might call a series of "wars within a war." The American Indian population waged its own wars for independence, and indeed survival, within what began as someone else's fight. That quest for sovereignty most accurately frames the story of the Civil War in Indian Territory. The war witnessed brutal conflicts within and between Indian nations and tribes, numerous battles that involved Union and Confederate military forces, and debilitating struggles for civilians on the home front. It left a legacy in the region as bitter as that experienced almost anywhere in the country. The story of the Indians' Civil War also serves as a reminder that history is rarely about heroes and villains and that people in history frequently defy simple categorization.

Relative to the war's primary theaters of operations and the economic and political centers of the Union and the Confederacy, wartime Indian Territory must be considered remote and sparsely populated. Approximately seventy thousand individuals resided primarily in the territory's eastern half on lands claimed by Native American groups now known as the Five Nations—Chickasaws, Choctaws, Creeks (Muscogees), Seminoles, and Cherokees—who had been forcibly relocated from the southeastern United States decades earlier. The Chickasaw Nation occupied the south-central portion of the territory immediately west of the Choctaw Nation, which covered the southeastern corner of the region. Creeks and Seminoles claimed tracts of land near the center of the territory, while the Cherokee Nation possessed the northeastern portion. Smaller reserve groups and members of Plains tribes occupied

Buy the Book

the western portions of the territory, and a few other tribes lived on small tracts adjacent to the Cherokee Nation.[4]

Each of the Five Nations' governments had evolved during the decades between removal and the Civil War. Although some variation existed between the nations, by the time of the war, the Cherokees, Chickasaws, Choctaws, and Creeks had instituted republican governments similar to that of the United States with elected executives and assemblies. The Cherokees, Choctaws, and Creeks designated their executives principal chiefs, while the Chickasaws referred to their leader as governor. The Seminole Nation operated a more localized government, in part because of a lack of funding from their federal treaties that might have financed more significant government restructuring. Among the Seminoles a chief led each town, and a general council governed the nation overall. Each nation in the eastern half of the territory and the tribes who resided near the Wichita Agency in the western portion received annual payments from the federal government. Indian agents employed by the United States supervised payments, enforced treaty provisions, and served as liaisons between the federal government and Indian nations and tribes.[5]

The territory attracted the attention of Union and Confederate officials who hoped that the region might provide resources that they could ship to more important locations east of the Mississippi River, but claims that the two belligerents desperately sought to control an Indian Territory rich in resources exaggerate reality. In that regard what Indian Territory offered paled in comparison with the resources found in other contested border grounds such as Kentucky. Two other factors—geography and the question of the Indian population's allegiance—contributed far more to the territory's significance. Its location made Indian Territory potentially important and placed its residents in a precarious situation. Union-controlled Kansas bordered the territory to the north, while the Confederate states of Texas and Arkansas loomed to the south and east, respectively. To the northeast, Missouri included residents with divided loyalties. A Confederate-controlled Indian Territory might serve as a

Buy the Book

military buffer zone to protect the more important Texas and could potentially provide a base of operations for Confederate invasions of Kansas or even the rich gold fields of Colorado. Conversely, Union officials viewed the territory as a buffer to protect those regions and as a potential highway of invasion to Texas. Therefore, simple geography increased the likelihood of competition for control of Indian Territory and virtually guaranteed the involvement of the region's Native American population in the conflict.[6]

Neither belligerent could realistically assume that the Indian nations and tribes sympathized with its cause. Union officials could hardly be surprised if Indian leaders exhibited no great affection for the U.S. Army. Confederate officials certainly recognized that the southeastern states bore great responsibility for the removal of the Five Nations to Indian Territory decades earlier and that several tribes in the western portions of Indian Territory understandably harbored resentment toward the residents of Texas, who had forcibly removed them to the territory in more recent years. Still, because Union and Confederate officials displayed interest in Indian Territory, Indian leaders needed to be concerned about the looming war.

Neutrality therefore appeared virtually impossible and was perhaps ill advised anyway because the war threatened to envelop the Indians' homelands. Perhaps the Indians' best course of action was to enter the war on their own terms. The vast majority of the residents of Indian Territory chose a side, but they did so for myriad reasons unique to their own experience, not necessarily out of affection for the Union or the Confederacy. Old grievances made a united front unlikely, and each group acted individually, with most leaders motivated by what they considered the best course of action for their people.

Of course the Native American occupants of the region as a whole proved neither ardent Confederates nor staunch Unionists. Most supported the Confederacy, some chose the Union, a relative few changed allegiance during the war, and others at least attempted to remain neutral. Beyond the fundamental desire to take the course of action deemed best

Buy the Book

for their respective people, numerous concerns factored into the groups' decisions. Existing treaties with the United States and dependence upon the federal government for a degree of financial support and reliance upon its military for physical security motivated some to remain loyal to the Union, while resentment of the United States, a genuine belief in the propriety of slavery, and a stronger cultural connection with the American South motivated others to support the Confederacy.[7]

Members of the Chickasaw, Choctaw, Cherokee, and Creek Nations collectively owned approximately seventy-seven hundred slaves. The plantation culture among those four nations strongly resembled that of white Southerners to the south and east of the territory. Similar to legislation in slaveholding states in the American South, laws in the Indian nations restricted the education of slaves and severely punished those who attempted to escape. However, one distinct characteristic emerged in the Indian Territory version of the Southern plantation complex. Native planters followed the traditional custom of communal use of land beyond individual plantations. Indian planters valued and protected their private property as much as any white landowner, but as one historian described it, "An Indian citizen could clear, improve, fence, and cultivate as much land as he wished, provided he did not interfere with his neighbor's holdings."[8] (In chapter 3 of this collection, Brad Agnew discusses the role of slavery in the conflict among members of the Five Nations and explains what prompted certain groups and individuals to support the Union.)

In addition to questions of security, money, legal obligations, and slavery, potential threats to continued possession of Indian lands concerned leaders of the Five Nations. An 1860 speech by Republican William H. Seward, who would become Abraham Lincoln's secretary of state, alarmed many Indian leaders. Seward pointed to American expansion into western lands as the key to suppressing the intense sectional conflict and called for yet another relocation of Native Americans to clear the way for white settlement. Therefore, while a Republican victory in the presidential election of 1860 likely promised an end to the

Buy the Book

expansion of slavery into the western territories, it guaranteed absolutely nothing to the inhabitants of Indian Territory. For all of these reasons, the Civil War would explode into more than simply a "white man's war."[9]

Indeed, events far and near in the spring of 1861 presented thousands with the reality of civil war. The famous events at Fort Sumter, South Carolina, in April and Lincoln's subsequent call for volunteers to suppress the rebellion forced the hand of the eight slave states that had not seceded in the aftermath of the presidential election of 1860. Four states—Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, and Delaware—remained officially loyal to the Union, while the other four—Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Arkansas—seceded and joined the Confederacy. Meanwhile, activities in and near Indian Territory in April 1861 more immediately affected the course of the war there. As war loomed that spring, Federal soldiers occupied three forts in the territory and Fort Smith, just across the Arkansas border. Fort Smith served as a supply depot to the three other posts, which helped to protect the Five Nations from raiding Plains tribes, who considered the Five Nations invaders. Fort Washita stood in the southeastern portion of the Chickasaw Nation, about sixty miles southeast of Fort Arbuckle. Farther west, Fort Cobb was located in present-day Caddo County, approximately forty miles north of present-day Lawton. Fort Cobb supplied the nearby Wichita Agency, which served a number of small bands that had been removed from Texas, including Wichitas, Caddos, Anadarkos, Penateka Comanches, and others and protected them against bands of Comanches, Kiowas, and Kickapoos.[10]

After a sequence of orders that initially called for the concentration of Federal forces at Fort Washita, Union officers ultimately ordered the evacuation of the military posts in the territory, thus leaving the Five Nations without the military protection guaranteed them by treaties with the United States. From the American perspective, this action did not represent a calculated decision to abandon Indians. Union officials ordered the evacuation of military posts elsewhere in areas threatened

Buy the Book

by Confederates and considered the soldiers' presence in the East more important.[11]

Not surprisingly, however, some Native Americans considered the evacuation tantamount to abandonment by the United States. The withdrawal of Union soldiers certainly cleared the way for Confederate diplomats who sought to form official alliances with the Five Nations and other groups within the territory. Considering conditions in Indian Territory in 1861, the cultural connections between many members of the Five Nations and the Southern states, and the perception that the federal government had abandoned them, it is hardly surprising that most members of the Five Nations cast their lot with the Confederacy.[12] An even simpler point should not be overlooked—in the minds of many Native Americans, the Confederacy offered at least the opportunity to fight for the lands supposedly reserved for Indians.

What followed that historic spring brought years of tragedy and bloodshed to Indian Territory. In chapter 1 of this volume, Richard B. McCaslin chronicles the military narrative of the Civil War in Indian Territory and in the process establishes invaluable context for the other essays in the collection. McCaslin explicates the nuanced conflicts that blurred the lines of battle and created and destroyed fleeting alliances. He narrates the battles and campaigns of Indian Territory, explains their significance within the region, places the results within the larger context of the war, and situates the territory within the Trans-Mississippi theater specifically. The military events exacerbated existing conflicts within and between nations and tribes, struggles that often proved as severe as those between the Union and Confederacy. McCaslin illustrates how these conflicts played out on the field of battle and demonstrates that both Union and Confederate war efforts suffered from crippling command failures and personal rivalries among leaders.

Though the Union and the Confederacy competed for control of the territory and the allegiance of its residents, both ultimately abandoned serious interest in the region after the midpoint of the war. None of the

Buy the Book

military activity in the territory significantly affected the outcome of the war, and neither the military campaigns nor the civilian suffering proved especially urgent to officials in Richmond or Washington. In fact, with certain exceptions, both the Union and Confederate governments largely ignored the region and its inhabitants after the Union secured control of the Mississippi River in 1863. Still, as McCaslin and others in this volume demonstrate, the war raged on in the territory and transformed the lives of thousands there regardless of waning interest among officials to the east. Indians and whites on both sides and black Union soldiers fought battles and skirmishes, while Stand Watie gained a degree of recognition for his exploits in guerilla warfare on behalf of those Cherokees who supported the Confederacy. Civilians suffered intensely at the hands of forces on both sides and because neither government adequately provided for Indians.[13]

Indeed, the battles and campaigns described in McCaslin's essay brought terror and suffering to the territory's home front. Clarissa Confer examines the experience of civilians—Indian, white, and black—in Indian Territory and illustrates the uncertainty of life in a border region caught between two belligerent powers. Civilians found themselves in the direct path of military actions from the outset of the war, and many fled the territory in search of security, while others lacked the basic resources necessary to relocate. Left to fend for themselves against armies from both sides, as well as irregular forces and outlaws, men, women, and children suffered from a range of material deprivations, including shortages of food, clothing, and shelter. As with the military conflict, the struggles of the home front widened existing chasms among noncombatants within the Five Nations. As Confer explains, the chronic lack of stability and security plagued the residents of Indian Territory long after the war.

The brutality of civil war divided Native Americans just as it fissured North and South. That crisis of division began with the important decision of which side to support and continued through years of tragedy and devastation wrought by warfare. Brad Agnew closely examines the

Buy the Book

Five Nations' decision making, experiences, and perspectives during the Civil War era, beginning with his assessment that the decades between removal and the war do not represent a "golden age" in Five Nations history. Serious rifts remained within the nations after removal, and the divisions were only exacerbated by the rise of Christianity among the communities and the escalation of tensions related to slavery. The 1840s and 1850s brought immediate threat to the lands supposedly reserved to the nations in the form of cattle drives and railroads. Agnew delineates the complex disputes between the nations and within individual communities and adroitly explains the motivations for each group in their formation of alliances during the Civil War. Agnew's essay is particularly enlightening for its analysis of the multifaceted motives and actions of Cherokee leader John Ross. Ultimately, Agnew concludes that the war, Reconstruction, and the influx of outsiders into the territory further undermined Indian sovereignty and resulted in the greatest tragedy to befall the Five Nations since initial European contact.

Meanwhile, inhabitants of Indian Territory outside the Five Nations survived their own trials of the Civil War. F. Todd Smith focuses his essay on the experiences of the Plains tribes who resided at the Wichita Agency in the western portion of the territory. Smith chronicles the often-overlooked story of the western tribes' arrival in Indian Territory shortly before the Civil War and demonstrates that these individuals suffered as much as their counterparts in the eastern half of the territory and, like the Five Nations, responded to the crisis of civil war in myriad ways. Smith explains that before the war, agency tribes found themselves "between two fires," with hostile Texans on one side and Comanches and Kiowas on the other. The Civil War introduced a "third fire" in the form of the contest between the Union and the Confederacy and those belligerents' competition for the agency tribes' allegiance. Thus the residents of the Wichita Agency and those Comanches who signed the treaties clearly did so out of concern for their own well-being rather than as a display of affection for the new Confederacy. During the remainder of the conflict, some agency tribes fled to Union-controlled

Buy the Book

Kansas, others attempted to persevere in western Indian Territory, and still others searched for independence away from either belligerent. Smith scrutinizes the relationship between the agency tribes and the Confederacy, an association that proved short lived because the Confederacy could not adequately provide for the tribes and because the Indian leaders did not trust their new allies to protect them from Texans. The agency tribes' struggles continued after the war when the federal government forced them to share their lands with other tribes, including their traditional enemies.

Thus when the war ended in 1865, it proved a mixed blessing to the residents of Indian Territory. Peace and stability eventually returned, but the war's end also meant surrender negotiations and yet another round of treaties with the federal government. As the war's closing scenes played out, Confederate-allied Indians, Plains Indians, and Confederate officials held an important conference May 25–27 at Camp Napoleon, near the Washita River and present-day Verden, Oklahoma. Confederate officials sought peaceful relations with all Native groups and vowed to honor Indian demands for the right to surrender their own forces. Confederate Indians also turned their attention to their postwar fate. Before the meeting, Choctaw principal chief Peter P. Pitchlynn revealed those concerns and expressed the Confederate Indians' position when he insisted upon separate surrenders for Indian forces, "that we may be enabled to take steps for our own safety and welfare."[14]

Thus events at Camp Napoleon, perhaps more than any other event, illustrate the Indians' ongoing search for sovereignty and their attempt to protect their interests during what began as someone else's war. The delegates pledged peace between the Plains tribes and the Confederate-allied Indians. Indeed, the authors of the remarkable document known as the Camp Napoleon Compact chose for their motto "An Indian shall not spill an Indian's blood" and promised, "The tomahawk shall be forever buried. The scalping knife shall be forever broken." The compact features dramatic and emblematic language that lamented the decline

Buy the Book

of the Indian populations and placed some of the blame squarely on Indian shoulders. Delegates called for a united front among all Indians in an attempt to protect themselves against their common enemies.[15]

During the next several weeks, all Confederate Indian forces surrendered. If Indian leaders still pondered their postwar fate, U.S. emissaries cleared up those uncertainties at a meeting with representatives of the Five Nations and other groups at Fort Smith, Arkansas, in September. Because the Indians had made war against the United States, proclaimed the American envoys, they forfeited all rights and expectations from previous treaties. Nations and tribes would be expected to make peace with each other and with the United States, abolish slavery, surrender portions of their lands for the relocation of other Natives into Indian Territory, and submit to a policy that united all Indian groups in the territory under one government. Federal officials made no distinction between Natives who had supported the rebellion and those who had not. Indian delegates understandably rejected the terms and refused to conclude an official settlement at Fort Smith, though all eventually negotiated Reconstruction treaties with the federal government. Though some tribes fared better than others in negotiations, those Reconstruction treaties essentially made official most of the American demands announced at Fort Smith and enumerated exactly how much land each Indian nation or tribe would cede.[16]

Those bitter postwar years are the focus of Christopher B. Bean's essay on Reconstruction in Indian Territory. Bean chronicles the negotiations between Native American representatives and federal officials and assesses the motives, actions, and successes and failures of each. Federal officials sought to open the region to white settlement, while consolidating Indian governments under congressional rule and taking a significant early step toward the policy of assimilation. Interestingly, Bean demonstrates in detail that resultant treaties varied based on Indian negotiation strategies. Rather than provide a well-ordered postscript to the war, the Reconstruction years witnessed the continuation of

Buy the Book

antebellum and wartime conflicts with railroad companies and other territorial outsiders and ever-widening rifts between Indian progressives and traditionalists.

The most controversial battle to emerge during the Reconstruction years in Indian Territory remains contentious today—what would be the fate of the Indian nations' former slaves? Linda W. Reese expertly examines the intense and sometimes violent struggle between Indian nation members and freedpeople and demonstrates that, like most issues with the war era in Indian Territory, no simple conclusion applies to every community. Federal officials expected the Indian nations to grant full rights of citizenship to their former slaves, a proposal many leaders and members vehemently opposed. While Native officials verbally sparred with federal representatives in Washington, Indians and freedpeople waged a brutal conflict in Indian Territory. Both Union- and Confederate-affiliated Indian nations endeavored to limit the rights of freedpeople, in some cases even calling for, ironically, the removal of former slaves to segregated areas within the territory. Freedpeople encountered the greatest difficulty and daily uncertainty in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations.

The modern continuation of that controversy highlights the importance of public memory of the Civil War, a subject that has garnered much attention from scholars during recent years. Amanda Cobb-Greetham examines memories of Creek and Cherokee women of the war period as recorded in the Indian-Pioneer Papers and places that project in the context of the growing scholarly literature on historical memory. The accounts focus on the difficulties of daily life, material conditions, struggles for food and shelter, and the survivors' return to destroyed homes and devastated landscapes more so than on the war's political causes and consequences or its transformative effects on the country. The women's memories also lend individual voices and perspectives to the larger issues addressed in other essays within this collection.

In an insightful essay that approaches Civil War memory from a modern angle, Whit Edwards lends his expertise in the area of public

Buy the Book

or applied history and examines commemoration of the war in Indian Territory. Edwards explains where and how the general populace often learns about the conflict in light of its relative obscurity in textbooks and public school curricula. Public historians grapple with the challenge of making the war relevant and accessible to a general audience and to that end employ numerous methodologies. Edwards explains that historical reenactments have emerged as an effective forum through which to inform individuals about the war and to encourage them to pursue further research. Reenactments communicate human dimensions of the conflict in ways that statues and memorials cannot convey.

The diverse population and myriad dimensions of the war in Indian Territory present public historians with unique challenges in their quest to commemorate the war in the territory and to communicate with a large audience the important questions examined throughout this collection.

In the end, Native Americans' determined but problematic pursuit of sovereignty best illustrates the distinctive character of the Civil War and Reconstruction in Indian Territory. Although the territory was geographically similar to border regions such as Missouri and Kentucky, the residents of those states were U.S. citizens who shared their national and cultural identities with other citizens in the North or the South or both. While some Native Americans exhibited genuine loyalties to either the Union or the Confederacy, they were not U.S. citizens, and the protection of their own people understandably motivated them more than any other factor. They found themselves fighting to protect a precarious position as semi-independent nations with the unusual dual status of communities distinct from the American citizenry yet legally considered wards of the federal government.

Unfortunately for Native Americans in Indian Territory, the Civil War presented a threat to their sovereignty more than an opportunity to secure it. A Union victory delivered only a step backward from true independence, while a Confederate victory portended the unknown, though at the very least it would have further divided Indian peoples and

Buy the Book

prolonged slavery within the Indian nations. Ultimately that paradox demonstrates yet another in the long list of tragedies associated with the Civil War. The Indian nations almost certainly stood to gain nothing from their participation, yet neutrality proved unrealistic for groups of quasi-independent peoples caught between two powerful belligerents. Still, the Indian participants for the most part were not innocent bystanders. They played an active role in their theater of the war, and for that the Union victors punished them severely during Reconstruction. The disastrous dimension of Reconstruction in Indian Territory was not that the Confederate-allied Indians were punished. They had fought an armed rebellion against the United States, and for that they expected and received punishment. The great transgression was that the federal government treated all Natives in the same manner and punished even those who chose not to support the Confederacy. Moreover, as Bean's essay demonstrates, in the long term the U.S. government penalized the Confederate-allied Indians more severely than it punished the residents of the eleven former Confederate states.

The same U.S. government that waged a heroic war effort to preserve the nation and destroy slavery perpetrated the moral crimes of the Indian Reconstruction treaties. Some of the same Indian groups who fought courageously to protect the interests of their peoples switched sides when it proved convenient, Indians on both sides owned slaves, and certain Indian participants willfully endeavored to preserve chattel slavery. The story of the Civil War in Indian Territory is one of shades of gray rather than black and white or heroes and villains.

The eight essays that follow examine this nuanced story of layered conflicts within the larger war from multiple angles. These include the military front and the home front, the experiences of the Five Nations and those of the agency tribes in the western portion of the territory, the severe conflicts between Native Americans and the federal government and between Indian nations and their former slaves during and beyond the Reconstruction years, and the concept of memory through the lenses of Native American oral traditions and the modern craft of

Buy the Book

public history. The essays are carefully crafted to provide accessible summaries and analyses of the subject matter for students, general readers, and scholars. In an attempt to preserve the readability of the essays yet provide materials useful to scholars and those who wish to pursue further research, the authors have provided detailed sources and have restricted historiographical dialogue to the endnotes. It is our hope that this collection provides a crossroads of sorts for scholars and especially students interested in the Civil War, Native American history, and Oklahoma history.

NOTES

1. James M. McPherson, "The War that Never Goes Away," in McPherson, *Drawn with the Sword: Reflections on the American Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 55–65.
2. Earl J. Hess, *The Civil War in the West: Victory and Defeat from the Appalachians to the Mississippi* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012); Bradley R. Clampitt, *The Confederate Heartland: Military and Civilian Morale in the Western Confederacy* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011); Charles D. Grear, ed., *The Fate of Texas: The Civil War and the Lone Star State* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2008); Kenneth W. Howell, *The Seventh Star of the Confederacy: Texas during the Civil War* (Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2009); Richard Lowe, *Walker's Texas Division, C. S. A.: Greyhounds of the Trans-Mississippi* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004); Gary D. Joiner, *Through the Howling Wilderness: The 1864 Red River Campaign and Union Failure in the West* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006); Stephen A. Townsend, *The Yankee Invasion of Texas* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2005); Jeffrey S. Prushankin, *A Crisis in Confederate Command: Edmund Kirby Smith, Richard Taylor, and the Army of the Trans-Mississippi* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005); Stephen A. Dupree, *Planting the Union Flag in Texas: The Campaigns of Major General Nathaniel P. Banks in the West* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2008).
3. Mary Jane Warde, *When the Wolf Came: The Civil War and the Indian Territory* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2013); Lary C. Rampp and Donald L. Rampp, *The Civil War in the Indian Territory* (Austin TX: Presidial, 1975); LeRoy H. Fischer, ed., *The Civil War Era in Indian Territory* (Los Angeles: Lorrin L. Morrison, 1974); Laurence M. Hauptman, *Between Two Fires: American Indians in the Civil War* (New York: Free Press, 1995); John C. Waugh, *Sam Bell Maxey and the Confederate Indians* (Abilene TX: McWhiney Foundation,

Buy the Book

1998); Clarissa W. Confer, *The Cherokee Nation in the Civil War* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007); Annie Heloise Abel, *The American Indian in the Civil War* (3 vols.) (Cleveland OH: Arthur H. Clark, 1915–1925). Abel's three volumes have been reprinted by the University of Nebraska Press as *The American Indian as Slaveholder and Secessionist* (Lincoln, 1992); *The American Indian in the Civil War, 1862–1865* (Lincoln, 1992); and *The American Indian and the End of the Confederacy, 1863–1865* (Lincoln, 1993).

4. Douglas Hale, "Rehearsal for Civil War: The Texas Cavalry in the Indian Territory, 1861," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 68 (Fall 1990): 233–34; Robert L. Kerby, *Kirby Smith's Confederacy: The Trans-Mississippi South, 1863–1865* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972), 4; Rampp and Rampp, *Civil War in the Indian Territory*, 1; Confer, *Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*, 4–7; Fischer, *Civil War Era in Indian Territory*, 1. In this collection the term "Five Nations" is used instead of "Five Tribes" or "Five Civilized Tribes." For some historians, "Five Tribes" has generally replaced the traditional "Five Civilized Tribes" in scholarly usage in large part because of the elusive definition of "civilization" and because of judgments of other cultures implicit in the term. The traditional "Five Civilized Tribes" reference, used by whites and the tribes themselves, referred to the parallels between Five Nations' cultures and mainstream American cultures. The nations also used the terms in part to distinguish between themselves and Plains tribes, whom they considered more "wild" or "savage." The Five Nations individually and collectively fit the definition of nation in that they pursued and preserved political sovereignty and controlled specific regions through a commitment to written, codified governments. For the evolution of the use of "tribe," see David La Vere, *Contrary Neighbors: Southern Plains and Removed Indians in Indian Territory* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000), 21–22.
5. Fischer, *Civil War Era in Indian Territory*, 11–14; F. Todd Smith, *The Caddos, the Wichitas, and the United States, 1846–1901* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1996), chaps. 3 and 4.
6. Hale, "Rehearsal for Civil War," 233–34; Kerby, *Kirby Smith's Confederacy*, 4; Rampp and Rampp, *Civil War in the Indian Territory*, 1; Confer, *Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*, 4–7.
7. Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, ix–xii, 1–13; Rampp and Rampp, *Civil War in the Indian Territory*, 3.
8. Fischer, *Civil War Era in Indian Territory*, 15, 16 (quotation); Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, ix–xii, 1–13; Rampp and Rampp, *Civil War in the Indian Territory*, 3; Waugh, *Sam Bell Maxey and the Confederate Indians*, 29–30.
9. George E. Baker, ed., *The Works of William H. Seward* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1853–1884), 4:346–67.
10. E. D. Townsend to Secretary of War, March 27, 1861, in United States War Department, *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records*

Buy the Book

of the Union and Confederate Armies, 128 vols. (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1880–1901) (hereafter cited as *Official Records*) ser. 1, vol. 1, 659–60; Smith, *Caddos, Wichitas, and the United States*, 78–84; La Vere, *Contrary Neighbors*, 62–90; A. M. Gibson, "Confederates on the Plains: The Pike Mission to Wichita Agency," *Great Plains Journal* 4 (Fall 1964): 8. Fort Gibson, in the Cherokee Nation, had been abandoned in 1857 but would witness extensive wartime activity. Fort Towson, in the Choctaw Nation, had been turned over to the Choctaw Indian Agency in 1854 and ceased operation as an active military post. It was occupied temporarily by Confederates during the war.

11. See various orders, reports, and correspondence in *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 1, 648–53, 656–57, 659–67; see also Dean Trickett, "The Civil War in Indian Territory, 1861," *The Chronicles of Oklahoma* 17 (September 1939): 318–22 and n30.
12. Hauptman, *Between Two Fires*, 25–26; Confer, *Cherokee Nation in the Civil War*, 45–46.
13. Steven E. Woodworth and Kenneth J. Winkle, eds., *Atlas of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 310; Arrell Morgan Gibson, "Native Americans and the Civil War," *American Indian Quarterly* 9 (Fall 1985): 390–93; Rampp and Rampp, *Civil War in Indian Territory*, 11–146.
14. Brad R. Clampitt, "'An Indian Shall Not Spill an Indian's Blood': The Confederate-Indian Conference at Camp Napoleon, 1865," *Chronicles of Oklahoma* 83 (Spring 2005): 34–53; J. J. Reynolds to James Harlan, June 28, 1865, *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 48, pt. 2, 1018; Camp Napoleon Compact, May 26, 1865, *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 48, pt. 2, 1102–3; Edmund Kirby Smith to Albert Pike, April 8, 1865, *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 48, pt. 2, 1266–69; C. S. West to W. D. Reagan, *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 48, pt. 2, 1279–80; Kirby Smith to D. H. Cooper, *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 48, pt. 2, 1270; Cooper to James W. Throckmorton, May 16, 1865, *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 48, pt. 2, 1307; Cooper to W. P. Adair, May 16, 1865, *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 48, pt. 2, 1307–8; Cooper to Throckmorton, May 22, 1865, *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 48, pt. 2, 1317; James C. Veatch to J. Schuyler Crosby, July 20, 1865, *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 48, pt. 2, 1095–97; Interview with Charles Stewart Lewis, March 11, 1938, in Indian-Pioneer History, ed. Grant Foreman, 112 vols., unpublished manuscript, 109:157, Research Division, Oklahoma Historical Society, Oklahoma City; Testimony of James Webb Throckmorton, *Congressional Record*, 49th Cong., 1st sess., March 9, 1886, ser. 2236, pt. 3, 17; Maurice Boyd, *Kiowa Voices: Myths, Legends, and Folktales* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1981), 163; Council Minutes, May 13, 16, 20, 1865, Peter P. Pitchlynn Papers, Gilcrease Institute, Tulsa OK; William P. Adair to Stand Watie, May 13, 1865, in *Cherokee Cavaliers: Forty Years of Cherokee History as Told in the Correspondence of the Ridge-Watie-Boudinot Family*, ed. Edward E. Dale and

Buy the Book

Gaston Litton (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939), 224–25; Pitchlynn to Smith, May 17, 1865, Peter P. Pitchlynn Papers, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma, Norman.

15. Clampitt, "Camp Napoleon," 43–47; Camp Napoleon Compact and Camp Napoleon Minutes, May 25–27, 1865, Pitchlynn Papers, Gilcrease Institute; Reynolds to Harlan, June 28, 1865, *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 48, pt. 2, 1018; Cooper to S. S. Anderson, May 15, 1865, *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 48, pt. 2, 1306; Camp Napoleon Compact, May 26, 1865, *Official Records*, ser. 1, vol. 48, pt. 2, 1102–3; U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs, *Annual Reports*, 39th Cong., 1st sess., 1865, H. Ex. Doc., vol. 2, pt. 1, serial 1248, 202.
16. Gibson, "Native Americans and the Civil War," 405; M. Thomas Bailey, *Reconstruction in Indian Territory: A Story of Avarice, Discrimination, and Opportunism* (Port Washington NY: Kennikat, 1972). Several Plains tribes, including Comanches, Kiowas, Cheyennes, Arapahos, and Kiowa-Apaches, played a relatively minor role in the war. At a meeting in Kansas in October 1865, American officials assigned those tribes to various reservations in Indian Territory, Kansas, and the Texas Panhandle.

Buy the Book