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To the memory of my mother

For Audrey
The preponderance of Native American histories of the Old Northwest traditionally have examined macro-regional trends, particularly those related to warfare, trade, and the attrition of indigenous sovereignty in the face of European/American expansion. A number of recent studies have begun to dig deeper into the details of indigenous life in the region, but usually in the context of Indian Removal. This study attempts to shift the focus to a microhistorical examination of a single indigenous community, the Wyandot people in the Sandusky River region in modern northwest Ohio. I argue that training the analytical lens on the Wyandots reveals a much more complicated history than most existing studies have considered, especially after the War of 1812 (when most studies tend to end with the collapse of effective military resistance to American expansion). This study reveals a community in the midst of tremendous cultural changes, especially in regards to questions of religious adherence/identity, economic change, social structural changes, and perceptions of the importance of race and cultural identity. This dissertation considers these changes, especially the linkages (and non-linkages) between these
varieties of social and religious change. Most importantly, this study seeks to recover
both the complex lives of the Ohio Wyandots and the human agency they exercised in the
roughly fifty years between the signing of the Treaty of Greenville and the removal of the
bulk of the Wyandots in 1843. Framed within the legacies of both historical studies of
missions and studies of contemporary indigenous communities, this dissertation places
the Wyandot story into a broader context of Native American history, with important
lessons about the complex nature of religious and societal changes. Through the evidence
examined in the case of the Ohio Wyandots, it also asks historians to further question
dominant assumptions about indigenous cultural change, such as the perceived links
between religious conversion, economic adaptation, and racial identities.
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INTRODUCTION

“I inform you all brother Indians, that we do now, and will henceforth, acknowledge the fifteen United States, to be our father; you will all, for the future, look upon them as such: you must call them brothers no more. The Great Spirit has crowned them with success in all their undertakings.” –Tarhe (“the Crane”), 1795

Greenville, 1795

When Tarhe rose near the end of the Greenville Treaty council to symbolically genuflect before Anthony Wayne, he did so with the understanding that the lives of his people were unalterably changed. Tarhe had dealt with white people his entire life, both as an ally and an adversary. His historical memory reached to the French and Indian War in which he participated as a teenager. He had fought against the British colonists in the decades-long sporadic frontier warfare on “The Dark and Bloody Ground” between the Indians of the Ohio Country and frontiersman and squatters from Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Kentucky. It was a legacy of conflict strewn with atrocities on both fronts. His people, the Wyandot Indians, by and large supported the British during the American Revolution. Despite the British defeat at the hands of her own colonies, the Wyandots and most of their neighbors continued friendly relations with the British, who maintained a system of forts and a trading network in the Great Lakes region. By the late 1780s, the newly-minted United States had pressured unrepresentative groups of pliable Natives, including some Wyandots, into ceding the eastern and southeastern portions of Ohio, allowing the first legal (from an American point of view) settlers to cross the Ohio River and establish the first kernels of Americanization in the region.
The reaction of the vast majority of the Native residents of the Ohio Country and its surrounding environs to the developments of the 1780s was understandably forceful. When the United States authorized two large expeditions into the Ohio Country to quell the “rebellious” Indian inhabitants, the first led by Josiah Harmar in 1790 and the other by Arthur St. Clair, Governor of the Northwest Territory, in 1791; a confederacy of Indians including the Wyandots crushed both forces. For a few scant years the Indians had the military edge and the unity of the confederacy seemed resolute. The United States devised a two-fold strategy to deal with the Ohio Country. The first decision was to form and train a more professional military force headed by career military officers like General Anthony Wayne and a young William Henry Harrison, who cut his teeth in Indian affairs during the war. The other arm of American policy was to employ peace envoys, both white and indigenous, in hopes of coming to an amicable (read: pro land cessions) agreement or, at the very least, breaking the unity of the confederation. Both strategies had some affect, but the growing prowess of the American military force had the most profound impact on the war. The Indians logically turned to their British allies for support, but the British were reluctant to commit troops to engage their former colonies in another costly war. The British did provide some supplies and promises of shelter in case of dire need, but did little else to address the necessities of their old allies.4

As Wayne steadily advanced into the heart of Ohio Indian country, he left a string of manned forts in his wake, many of which he positioned at strategic points along rivers where thriving Indian villages had stood scant months before. The symbolic power of the forts and their locations certainly could not have been lost on the Ohio Indians. They
were not getting whipped in the field, but they nonetheless could not stop the advance of Wayne’s army. The most serious blow to the confederacy came at the Battle of Fallen Timbers in August 1794, where a combination of internal indigenous divisions and good planning and good timing by the Americans gave Wayne the advantage he needed to score a striking victory. When the Indians fled the field and sought refuge in a British fortification, the promises of aid and shelter proved unreliable as the British refused to open the fort and admit the warriors. The combination of Wayne’s growing power and no hope of British aid frayed the bonds of the confederacy. At the end of 1794, the Indians and Americans began a dialogue about forming a treaty council to end the war. After many months of debate and discussion about the composition of the council and the location, the majority of the Indian combatants met with Wayne and his aides at Greenville, Wayne’s main fort in western Ohio. Essentially on Wayne’s “home field” (which he had selected in lieu of less advantageous indigenous locations like Kekionga), he designed the treaty council to both end the conflict and demonstrate the superior position that the United States lay claim to in the region. For Wayne, the Greenville council was the ultimate display of his power, and Tarhe, more than any other speaker, told Wayne what he wanted to hear.\(^5\)

Tarhe had been shot in the elbow at Fallen Timbers and, by all accounts, was among the leading voices of the Confederacy who called for peace after the battle. In fact, he was reportedly the only Sandusky Wyandot chief to survive Fallen Timbers.\(^6\) Tarhe was in his early fifties in 1795, and he was both a seasoned warrior and a noted diplomat and orator.\(^7\) As the principal chief of the Wyandots, he also assumed an
The Wyandots were the largest Iroquoian group in Ohio, and most of the surrounding tribes referred to the Wyandots variously as “uncle,” “elder brother,” and, in a few instances, “grandfather.” Such familial terms should not be taken lightly, as the Indians of the Ohio Country attached great layers of meaning and obligation to these roles. The Wyandots, by virtue of their reputation and history, had earned titles indicating their sagacity and the level of respect other groups attached to them. Tarhe spoke on several separate occasions during the treaty negotiations, often assuming the role of speaker not only for his own people, but for other tribal groups and communities as well. Thus, when Tarhe declared that the assembled Indians should no longer call the United States “brother,” but instead declared them “father,” it signified a significant change in power relationships in the region. Many of the Ohio Country indigenous peoples had called the British and the French before them “father,” but this was their first significant reference to the United States as such. The historic enmity between the Ohio Indians and the American colonists has been well documented, and the change in relationship between the two parties would have been unthinkable before Wayne’s successes on the battlefield. However, Tarhe and many of the assembled Natives realized that they had few other options by 1795. The French were long-gone from the region and only accessible across the Mississippi River. The Spanish were far too distant to be of serious interest. Their most recent “fathers,” the British, were still close at hand, but their power was impotent, their assistance undependable. Ultimately, the Americans were the most viable game in town.
For his part, Anthony Wayne readily (and eagerly) adopted the new terminology, for to him it symbolized the rigors of paternal authority and the obedience of the proverbial Indian children. However, as Richard White has so elegantly demonstrated, the symbolism attached to the paternal relationship was quite different from a Native perspective. Indians viewed the relationship of fathers and children more in the vein of the responsibility and love that fathers had toward their offspring than in a patriarchal sense: “A father was not a stern patriarch; a father was a generous friend.” In the predominately matrilineal societies of the Ohio Country, fathers were providers for families, but females and maternal male relatives were the true authority figures for the children of each clan. This role of a father was one of love and obligation, not one modeled after the European patrilineal system that positioned the father as the dominant familial authority figure. In this light, the United States would now be obligated to deal justly with their indigenous children. The Indians also charged the Americans to act as a mediator between differing Indian communities and to become an unbiased force for peace in the region. Tarhe even called on the Americans to set tribal boundaries to alleviate disputes, a proposition most other indigenous people rejected on the spot.

The Americans had a responsibility to care for their indigenous children, not a right to control them or to create dissension among them. As Tarhe famously put it, “an impartial father equally regards all his children.” Most importantly, the American father had the duty to take pity on his Indian children and “relieve their wants.” It is unclear whether Wayne fully understood these new layers of responsibility, though he certainly did not view the relationship from an indigenous perspective. For the Indians, they saw
this admission of American fatherhood as an acknowledgement that the United States was the new imperial power in the region, just as the French and British had been before. At Greenville, the confederated tribes sought to negotiate a power structure in the Ohio Country founded upon the principles they had long held. Many expected the United States to act in a similar fashion to their colonial forebears, though the burgeoning American frontier population was an ominous sign that land cessions would not end with the Greenville treaty. However, none could with certainty foretell the future for the Ohio Indians as the eighteenth century ended.

**Regional Contexts**

One of the fundamental deficiencies in the development of the “New Indian History” of the past thirty-five years is the noticeable lack of examination of the nineteenth century, specifically in what was once the Northwest Territory. Many of the leading works of “New Indian History,” such as James Merrell’s *The Indians New World*, Neil Salisbury’s *Manitou and Providence*, Daniel Richter’s *Ordeal of the Longhouse*, and James Axtell’s *The European and the Indian*, focus almost exclusively on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The “American period,” particularly the period before the Plains Indian Wars of the 1860s and 1870s, continues to be the most understudied epoch of American Indian history, with some exceptions discussed below. Coverage of the colonial period, while far from complete, has tended to be more pronounced. Among the more prominent examples are Michael McConnell’s study of the pre-Revolutionary Ohio Valley, Daniel Usner’s examination of the exchange economy
along the Mississippi River, and Jane Merritt’s study of the mid-Atlantic frontier.\textsuperscript{14} While the aforementioned studies examine issues in the North American interior, much of the literature focuses on one of two regions. The largest body of material pertains to New England, such as the extensive work of the aforementioned James Axtell, Jean O’Brien’s study of the dispossession of the Indians in Natick, and Ann Plane’s examination of Indian marriage in New England.\textsuperscript{15} The other major focus of study is the colonial-early national southeast, including the works of Thomas Hatley and Theda Perdue on the Cherokee, Claudio Saunt and Joshua Piker on the Creek, and Patricia Galloway on the Choctaw.\textsuperscript{16} Piker’s micro-historical work on the Creek town of Okfuskee, in particular, provided inspiration for the type of community-focused approach taken in this dissertation.\textsuperscript{17} The colonial era presents an array of themes and topics that provide historians with easier avenues to argue that indigenous Americans had power and exercised agency. These include narratives of first contacts, such as James Axtell’s work, the competition between European empires, as discussed by Francis Jennings, among others, and the considerable strength of Native Americans as warriors and diplomats, as Daniel Richter examines among the Iroquois.\textsuperscript{18} In recent years, several published anthologies have assembled scholarship throughout Indian country in the colonial-early national period as well, building a rich scholarship on a variety of topics and peoples in the process.\textsuperscript{19} The history of the Ohio country is still largely devoid of any major recent studies that deal with the post-Treaty of Greenville era. A few broader studies, the two best being Richard White’s \textit{The Middle Ground} and Gregory Evans Dowd’s \textit{A Spirited Resistance},
include some material from the post-Revolutionary War period until the end of the War of 1812.\textsuperscript{20} However, such studies tend to discuss the post-Greenville era as one small piece of a much broader puzzle and their analyses focus far more on the colonial and Revolutionary periods than the nineteenth century. It is also notable that neither of these works deals with the “accommodationist” factions in the Ohio country in more than a cursory way. White’s focus in this period centers on political and economic machinations, and he spends very little time on “ground-level” types of analysis, mainly because the scope of his work does not allow such micro-historical examinations. Dowd, while focusing more on the village-level details, spends much of his time discussing the nativist (anti-Christian largely) factions who were dedicated to resisting white expansion. Clearly, both works are highly regarded and quite thorough analyses in their own rights, but this project departs significantly from the work of these two major figures in the study of the Early Republican Ohio Country. Instead, I examine the activities of a community comprised of a significant body of accommodationist individuals who sought to remain in their Ohio homelands despite the massive influx of Euro-American settlers in the early nineteenth century, in part by adapting Christianity to their own needs.

There is a considerable body of analytical works that examine the interactions between accommodationists and Christians in this time period, ranging from the colonial period to the twentieth century, and dotting the landscape of Native America (and, indeed, contact scenarios around the globe). The literature is, to put it simply, immense. Several recent influential studies have examined the complex interactions between religious change, cultural adaptation, and the utility of Christianity to help Native
Americans weather such cultural change. Much of the now-classic literature focused initially on southeastern peoples. Outstanding examples include William McLoughlin’s detailed, nuanced studies of Cherokee-missionary interaction, as well as Clara Sue Kidwell’s work on the Choctaws of Mississippi. Both McLoughlin and Kidwell provide focused discussion of the changes wrought in Indian communities as a result of Christian missionary activity, as both the Cherokees and Choctaws changed significantly in the early nineteenth century as a result of these mission-associated adaptations. Following in the wake of these earlier studies, examinations of missions around the continent continued to consider the utility of Christian conversion, both in terms of possible spiritual satisfaction and in making the cultural/intellectual adaptations necessary to face the onslaught of European/American expansion and cultural dominance. From the northeast, studies like David J. Silverman’s work on Wampanoag religion and culture, Rachel Wheeler’s examination of Mohican-missionary interaction, and Linford Fisher’s detailed consideration of the Great Awakening’s impact on indigenous religious lives have both broadened and deepened the possibilities of focused examination of the Native adaptations of new Christian faiths. An additional important intellectual achievement is Sergei Kan’s work with Tlingit-Russian Orthodox interactions in Alaska, particularly his discussions of the possibility of preserving indigenous cultural values and mores through the adoption of Christianity, effectively countering the colonizing trends missions are typically believed to have wrought in these relationships. Casting a wider net, recent works on Catholic missions, such as Tracy Neal Levelle’s study of French-Indian conversion in what is now Illinois and the upper Great Lakes, demonstrate the
possibilities of close examination of the meanings of words, language, and cultural context in Indian Christianity. Steven W. Hackel’s work on the missions of Alta California examines the interactions between Spanish Catholic mission culture and the peoples of California, yielding important lessons about both the mission system and the uses California Indians made of Spanish Catholic liturgy and culture.²⁴

Northwestern groups of Woodlands Indians, many of whom were similarly “civilized”, have merited less attention from scholars. A few notable exceptions do exist. Susan Sleeper-Smith’s analysis of Indian women and French men, spanning the latter colonial and early national periods, provides some analysis of remnant peoples who managed to “civilize” and largely blend into the surrounding white community, especially those of blended indigenous-French heritage.²⁵ Rebecca Kugel’s work focuses on the employment of new definitions of political identity to redefine Ojibwe leadership in the nineteenth century, while Lucy Eldersveld Murphy’s work examines the shifting racial identities and economic lives of Indians and Metis peoples in the western Great Lakes in the late eighteenth-early nineteenth centuries.²⁶ Two recent studies of the Indians of the lower Great Lakes also merit attention here, particularly as they incorporate chapters on the Wyandot experience in the early 19th century. John Bowes’ excellent history of eastern Indians in the post-removal west, Exiles and Pioneers, includes extensive discussion of the relocation of the Wyandots and their neighbors to Kansas in the 1840s. Additionally, Bowes focuses a detailed eye on William Walker, Jr., a key figure in the Wyandot community in this period who appears many times in this dissertation. While Bowes focuses mostly on the post-removal period, his discussion of
Walker and his role in the community stretches back into the Ohio period, particularly Walker’s relationship/commonalities to Joseph Parks, a similarly important figure among the Shawnee.²⁷ The study most directly related to this dissertation in its consideration of the Wyandot people in this era is a chapter from James J. Buss’ examination of the conquest of the southern Great Lakes in the early 19th century. Buss focuses his work on the language used by Americans to shape the dispossession of Indians in the region. Buss devotes a chapter of his book to discussion of the Wyandots in the early 19th century, including a brief history of the Methodist mission (see Chapters 2 and 3 of this dissertation) and the role of William Walker, Jr. in the community, as well as the process of removal itself.²⁸ Both of these studies are excellent examinations of bits and pieces of the material discussed in this dissertation, but neither delves into the breadth and depth of Wyandot life in the region, nor do they consider the combination of factors (religion, economics, identity, etc.) discussed in this dissertation in relation to each other. This study will therefore fill a segment of that gap by examining the efforts of some Wyandots to acculturate their society to the growing dominance of Euro-American culture.

One of the fundamental theoretical problems I will deal with in this project is the delineation between “accommodation”, “acculturation”, and “assimilation.” When one uses a broad lens, as most studies of this region do, to examine the post-Greenville era, especially after Tecumseh’s defeat and death during the War of 1812, analysis seems to reveal a period of forced assimilation and removal. Such a view has also been perpetuated in the standard textbook narrative, even many of those books written by Native American specialists. A series of treaties after the War of 1812 served the purpose
of restricting the Ohio Indians, including the Wyandots, to progressively smaller reservations. By the mid-1830s, all of the communities aside from the Wyandots had removed to Kansas.

From this broad perspective, Gramsci’s views of hegemony seem relevant. The Euro-American assertion of a dominant, overarching system of power seems nearly complete east of the Mississippi. The Wyandots were one of a small group of people being acted upon on an intellectual and physical level by external forces (a superstructure, if you will). Any efforts to counter this hegemony were largely futile. However, Gramsci’s vision of hegemony (and, in related ways Foucault’s expositions on power and domination) does not fully apply in the case of the Wyandot. James C. Scott defines Gramsci thusly: “hegemony is simply the name Gramsci gave to this process of ideological domination. The central idea behind it is the claim that the ruling class dominates not only the means of physical production but the means of symbolic production as well.” Americans were not able at this stage in history to dominate the Wyandots in such a way. Instead, Scott’s paradigm of the “weapons of the weak” in which those who are under domination are able to exert forms of power through resistance, often embedded in the “hidden transcript”, seems more appropriate. The Wyandots were unquestionably weak compared to the United States, which wanted very much to dominate them. However, as the dissertation will demonstrate, the Wyandots did exert their own forms of power.

Certainly, the power structures when broadly construed reveal a vast disparity between the Wyandots and Americans. The Wyandots on the Sandusky River numbered,
at most, about 1000 people in this era (most counts are a few hundred shy of this maximum figure). The Euro-American population of Ohio had reached 60,000 by statehood in 1803, and continued to expand dramatically in the nineteenth century. Wyandot political, military, and economic clout was miniscule compared to the vast weight of American power. However, when one digs below the surface to look at how power operated on the Sandusky, the Wyandots exerted a significant amount of localized power to control their own lives. In fact, the whites most directly in contact with the Wyandots were Christian missionaries, and they had no official (meaning enforcement powers here) sanction from the U.S. government, which was at best an absentee power in the region. Instead, the missionaries, government agents, and surrounding white population often had to deal with the Wyandots on their own terms.

By no means am I arguing that the Wyandots were more powerful, or even as powerful, as the Euro-American presence in Ohio. This is not an extension of Richard White’s middle ground thesis, which relies upon a relative balance of power between Native and European political and military force, because the Wyandots were clearly unable to wield effective power, especially military power, against the United States. Instead, what they maintained was a relative degree of local autonomy, and this they held onto well into the nineteenth century. Theirs was not a case of forcible assimilation. Nor was it a situation of pure cultural accommodation, where both parties had to account for and adapt to the other based on relatively equal standing. The term and the reality of accommodation appear in my work before the War of 1812 because it best describes the reality at that time.
In the three decades following the war, the term acculturation seems more applicable to the Wyandot situation. I define acculturation to mean a largely (though perhaps not completely) selective absorption of some aspects of white culture that the Wyandots felt had the potential to allow them to remain in Ohio. In a sense, the Wyandots would become an island of Indianness- and a viable one- in the expanding United States. The definition of acculturation devised in the 1930s by Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits, while not precisely the same as my construction, captures the essence of how I use the term: “acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups.”

Certainly, by the nineteenth century, the Wyandots had to do most of the acculturating. I will examine the extent of this process in this dissertation.

Despite the degree of agency that the Wyandots possessed at Upper Sandusky, it is undeniable that most of the Wyandots viewed some degree of cultural accommodation as absolutely unavoidable. There was certainly an element of desire to change, particularly to secure goods and economic opportunities. Additionally, most of the Wyandot leadership, many of whom had traveled to Philadelphia and/or Washington D.C. and seen the massive urban areas of the United States, were quite aware that pursuing a “traditional” way of life in Ohio, based on female-driven agriculture, hunting, and fur trapping, would be impossible. The Wyandots had to change to survive in a sea of white expansion, though how they did it and what they chose to adopt remained largely under their control. The difference between the broad perception of Ohio Indians in the
extant secondary literature and the local realities of the situation makes a local-level analysis of the Sandusky region essential to understanding the complex processes of Wyandot (and Native American, in general) adaptation to American culture.

While there is significant evidence that the Wyandots adapted elements of Anglo-American culture in order to obtain material goods and a form of Western literacy-based education, a further important component of this study will be to consider the possibilities of “true” religious conversion. Rather than attempt to delineate between “authentic” converts and “inauthentic” converts, I am rather more interested in examining the possibilities of “true” conversion on a spectrum of reactions to Christian dogma. The evidence for the efficacy of conversion includes not only the oral accounts of converts (most, in this case, filtered through the pen and ink of the missionaries), but also the actions of those who converted. This “belief-as-action” approach allows one to analyze more tangible forms of evidence such as the willingness of some Wyandots to publicly profess their faith to Indian and non-Indian audiences, efforts to solicit funds for the mission from non-Indian donors, and ultimately to become Christian preachers and missionaries in their own right. It is quite likely that some converts saw the mission as a tool of cultural survival rather than a sacred space, but I think it useful to consider the implications for those Wyandots who did see the mission as a source of spiritual power as well. I think that Sergei Kan rightly states that:

It is difficult to ascertain the depth of the native commitment to Christian dogma and ritual. A scholar who writes in the currently popular ‘narrative-of-resistance’ mode is likely to interpret native conversion as ‘superficial’... Such an interpretation may also appeal to some of the more radical Native American activists and intellectuals. However, it likely carries the danger of reading contemporary attitudes and intellectual fads into the historical record...
Kan raises a vital point of analysis which many studies tend to downplay, that of the spiritual dimension of Indian-missionary interaction. This dimension is, I contend, a critical aspect of cultural contact that can yield fruitful and important interpretations of the full impact of acculturation at Upper Sandusky.

Finally, from a religious perspective, I will examine why some Wyandots were so receptive to Methodism in the 1820s after being less attracted by other Christian sects, particularly Presbyterians and Quakers, who both had an intermittent missionary presence from the 1790s to 1820s. One explanation is simply timing, as the Methodists arrived after the War of 1812, when effective Indian military power was diminished. There is certainly evidence that some degree of desperation informed the Wyandots’ interest in the Methodists. Another explanation may be the nature of Methodism. An Arminian faith that promoted a high degree of personal control and choice in regards to religion, Methodism may have been more acceptable to the Wyandots than the more authoritarian views of the Presbyterians and Congregationalists. For Wyandots, the practice of spirituality was very personally oriented, though there were certainly community mores that circumscribed the amount of freedom one had spiritually. The personal orientation of Methodism seems perhaps more palatable in light of previous Wyandot experiences with spirituality. Like the Methodists, the Quakers offered a similar kind of personal religion, but simply did not present consistent options to the Wyandots. Well into the 1820s, the Quakers were an intermittent presence at Upper Sandusky, but for various reasons the Quakers were unable to establish a consistent dialogue with the Wyandots, unlike the Methodists.
Of particular importance to the proposed study is the analysis of several social linkages, the most obvious, perhaps being between the adoption of Christianity and participation in economic activities both on and off the reservation. In addition, with the passage of decades, some Wyandots began to identify themselves (certainly outsiders did the same) based on conceptions of race and wealth in addition to (sometimes replacing) historic conceptions of Wyandot tribal membership based on kinship ties.\textsuperscript{36} The last two points indicate a growing acceptance of white constructions of class status and race. As Reginald Horsman has argued, the early nineteenth century saw the beginnings of scientific racism and the development of the idea of Manifest Destiny that took on a highly racist tone by the time of Wyandot removal in the 1840s.\textsuperscript{37} That Wyandots and other Native Americans were the objects of such racialization is apparent, but few studies have addressed how Native peoples thought about these new constructions of themselves based on race and class. This is particularly germane in a community like Upper Sandusky, where a considerable percentage of the population was either of mixed parentage or was racially white. The Wyandots, like most Iroquoian groups, had a long history of incorporating significant numbers of white captives, particularly children and teenagers, who had chosen to remain Wyandot into adulthood. That the Wyandots, especially those who were not “racially” Indian, would begin to adopt and incorporate some of the ideologies of the surrounding American society seems logical on the surface. But I am persuaded that the reality of the situation was more complex, as discussed in chapter five particularly.
In sum, this study seeks to fill a significant gap in the literature regarding Indian-white relations in the Early Republic. Though small in numbers, the case of the Sandusky Wyandot reveals a complex and, I think, widely applicable view of ground-level interactions between indigenous peoples and Euro-Americans. The complicated ways in which the Wyandots attempted to weather the storm of white encroachment points to broader issues of race, class, religion, and politics which affected all Native Americans in the eastern United States in the Early Republican era. And which have been little studied in the field. As such, this dissertation will provide a more nuanced and particular view of the processes of adaptation and acculturation in this era.

**Wyandot-Specific Literature**

While there is a notable ethnographic/anthropological record about the Huron, most of this body of materials is confined to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This makes a great deal of sense in light of the destruction of Huronia by the Iroquois Five Nations in 1649. As a result of this war, fought primarily over access to furs, the Huron Confederacy was shattered and dispersed from modern Ontario, fracturing into remnant communities that re-formed into new political affiliations. The Wyandot are descended from the Huron, as well as (likely) the Petun, Tobacco, and Erie Nations. Both Bruce Trigger and Elisabeth Tooker have tackled anthropological studies of the seventeenth century Huron, particularly in Trigger’s massive tome, *The Children of Aataentsic: A History of the Huron People to 1660*.\(^{38}\) Karen Anderson has dealt with issues of shifting gender status and the subjugation of women by the time of the dispersal
of the Huron confederacy in 1649. More recently, Roger Carpenter provided a comparative analysis of the thought worlds of the Huron and Iroquois in the seventeenth century. Finally, Erik R. Seeman’s recent study of the Huron-Wendat feast of the dead focuses on the ceremonial lives of seventeenth-century Wendat people.

While each of these works provides useful cultural and social background for the modern Wyandot, none of them has significant bearing on this dissertation project. In recent years, some scholars have begun to more deeply probe the history of the post-dispersal Wyandot people. Two outstanding examples are recent works by Kathryn Magee Labelle and John Steckley, one of the leading experts on Wyandot history, language, and culture. Labelle traces the survival of the Wendat people in the years after their dispersal, arguing for the maintenance of cultural, social, and political interconnections between those who survived the war with the Iroquois. Steckley’s most recent work focuses on the continuance of clan identities among the Wyandot people in the eighteenth century across the broad region of their dispersal, arguing for the maintenance of traditional kin systems despite the fracturing of their homeland.

Perhaps the most interesting and useful theoretical work dealing with Wyandot culture is Georges Sioui’s Huron-Wendat: The Heritage of the Circle. Sioui, a Canadian Huron/Wendat, provides a very valuable overview of Wyandot culture and lifeways. Although much of his discussion also centers on the seventeenth century, he raises a number of contemporary concerns that tie the history of the early contact period to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, such as identity, the tensions between change and tradition, and other issues addressed in this dissertation.
Full histories of the Wyandot incorporating discussion of their lives in Ohio are both very old and limited in number. Arguably the first, which traces the history of the Wyandots after the Huron dispersal, is Peter Dooyentate Clarke’s *Origin and Traditional History of the Wyandotts*, published in 1870. Clarke, himself a Wyandot from the Michigan-Ontario borderlands, acquired traditional stories and history from a number of Wyandot sources scattered throughout the Midwest and Canada in the 1850s and 1860s. His book, while infinitely interesting, is problematic due to his scant documentation of sources and penchant to engage in speculation about historical events. He also devotes little attention to the Wyandots in the nineteenth century. In terms of the Sandusky Wyandots in the nineteenth century, missionary James B. Finley wrote the first history (focusing mostly on the Methodist mission, but with some consideration of previous history) in 1840. This book, discussed in several places in this dissertation, is principally a collection of primary sources (letters mostly) sent and received by Finley during his tenure as missionary at Upper Sandusky, with personal observations and recollections spliced between these sources. The book is far and away the most utilized source in many of the secondary works which consider the mission (see below), but has been criticized as both biased and, perhaps, partially embellished/fabricated (see chapter three of this dissertation). While I use Finley’s published works at times in this dissertation, more use is made of the original archival letters he left behind.

The only ethnographic materials that deal in a specific way with the Wyandots of Ohio in this era are a handful of publications resulting from the Indian Claims Commission research conducted by Erminie Wheeler-Voegelin and Helen Hornbeck
Tanner in the 1960s and 1970s. These works focus primarily on the geographic location of the Wyandots and their neighbors over time and tend to dwell on issues of land usage and treaty rights and obligations. All three of the referenced works essentially end at 1795, aside from a few references to later treaties. There are a few theses and dissertations with a Wyandot focus, the two most relevant being Randall Buchman’s 1958 Master’s thesis and Martha Bowman’s 1965 Master’s thesis, both of which focus largely on the removal question and rely almost exclusively on missionary accounts and published government documents such as the *Territorial Papers of the United States* and Kappler’s collection of Indian treaties. No focused book-length scholarly study of the Wyandots after 1795 exists, at least in published form.

I use the word “scholarly” in the above reference intentionally, because a retired schoolteacher named Thelma Marsh collected data and completed a handful of local histories about the Wyandots and Wyandot County, Ohio in the 1960s and 1970s. The two most notable titles are *Lest we forget: A brief sketch of Wyandot County's history* and *Moccasin Trails to the Cross: A History of the Mission to the Wyandott Indians on the Sandusky Plains*. Both of these titles were locally published, one by the county historical society and one by the local United Methodist Church. Marsh, a practicing Methodist, conducted a great deal of primary and secondary research during her writing, but her books reflect a very slanted pro-Christian view and tend to be quite dismissive of “traditionalists” who eventually found their way to the “true” faith.

While full monographic treatments of the Wyandots are few, there have been a few book chapters (the aforementioned works of James Buss and John Bowes) and some
articles examining the early nineteenth century Wyandots. One of the best of these is Martin Walsh’s article about the Methodist missionaries’ recorded observations of the non-Christian Wyandot in the 1810 and 1820s. Donald Huber has also provided a brief overview of the early years of the Wyandot mission for a more popular audience in the journal *Timeline*. A small but notable body of older scholarly articles detail specific incidents at Upper Sandusky, primarily centered on efforts to remove the Wyandot people and their final removal from Ohio in 1843. Robert E. Smith focused on the rivalry between the nascent Methodist mission and the Indian agent posted at Upper Sandusky in the early 1820s. Other scholars, such as Carl Klopfenstein, Dwight L. Smith, and Frederick A. Norwood, have contributed articles detailing the efforts to remove the Wyandots in the 1830s and 1840s.

More recently, the *Journal of Northwest Ohio History* devoted a 2004 issue to examination of the Ohio Wyandot. Articles by Christie Raber, Paul A. Westrick, Christopher S. Stowe, and Kevin Kern provide an overview of Wyandot history from the late eighteenth century through removal, focusing mainly on an overview of the Methodist mission and the removal negotiation/process. While these articles provide generally solid overviews of these themes, they rely heavily on the published writings of missionaries like James B. Finley, or the aforementioned secondary articles. Only one of these articles liberally uses unpublished primary source material or manuscript government documents. Most recently, Shannon Bontrager contributed an article discussing the Wyandot interest in the mission and the cultural change it provided through the lens of traditionalist resistance to Methodism (Finley specifically).
Bontrager’s article, which covers much of the same chronological ground as Chapter two of this dissertation, frames his article mainly as a story of the utility of the mission for a minority of converts who adapted Christianity for their own cultural uses, while Finley misread the situation and exaggerated the “truth” of Wyandot Methodism. In the main, my consideration in Chapter two agrees in several basic ways with Bontrager’s assessment, though I examine the early history of the mission in a different light, and a deeper manner. Like some of the articles in the *Journal of Northwest Ohio History*, Bontrager exclusively uses Finley’s published writings (mostly his history of the mission) and recent secondary literature to build his arguments within essentially a textual analysis framework. Bontrager does not exploit the vast unpublished source material available about the Wyandot in this era. Frankly, the vast majority of published articles, with a few exceptions aside, fail to use materials beyond some government documents, published missionary accounts, and the fleeting references to the Wyandots in the secondary literature. This study seeks to contribute to the inadequate literature that deals with the Wyandots beyond basic summaries of the missionary record and the story of Indian removal as a political process.

**Overview of the Dissertation**

This study is designed to serve several purposes. The first goal is to fill a significant gap in the literature, in terms of the study of the Wyandot Indians, Ohio Indians in the nineteenth century, and the study of small Midwestern tribal communities on the fringes (and in the midst) of American expansion. Most studies of this time period
end in 1815, for the War of 1812 in some ways marks the antebellum watershed event in the region. As mentioned above, even those studies that examine the first two decades following the Treaty of Greenville typically focus on the efforts of Tecumseh, Tenskwatawa, and their followers to halt the westward expansion of the United States. But what of those who did not join the cause? In most cases, their actions are relegated to the realm of opposition to the brothers, and they are often written off as the self-interested profiteering of “treaty chiefs” who lined their pockets by cooperating with the United States. This study of the Wyandots seeks to complicate the story by examining the actions of large numbers of Wyandot people living along the Sandusky River in modern northwest Ohio. Issues such as accommodation and cultural adaptation, the liberal use of white cultural accoutrements, and the efforts by some Wyandots to tap into the intellectual and spiritual world of the Euroamericans are among the dominant foci of this dissertation. Woven within and between these themes were the efforts of the Wyandots to carve out a viable niche in the Ohio Country which would ensure their continued survival within the bounds of Ohio while maintaining a separate political and societal identity. Though it is easy to reflect on these efforts as ultimately futile, the endgame should not diminish the significance of these activities within their own timeframe. Indeed, the Wyandots as an identifiable “tribal” entity remained in Ohio for nearly five decades following the Greenville treaty, and numerous Wyandot individuals and families have quietly existed in the region into the twenty-first century.

A second focus of this study is an examination of the interplay between the issues of cultural adaptation, religious conversion, economic participation, and racial
identification among the Wyandots. The process of choosing how and what to adopt from white American examples such as education, agricultural techniques, and social structure marks a key point of dissention among the Wyandots in the nineteenth century. Perhaps the most contentious divisions occurred between those who chose to convert to Christianity in some form or fashion and those who opted to reject it. These choices consequently led to varying degrees of economic participation and social interactions between Wyandots and with the surrounding white community. Another phenomenon that appears to have coexisted with adaptation, conversion, and economic participation was a growing identification of racial differences within the Wyandot community. Of course, Europeans and white Americans made common practice of differentiating “racially” Native people from adopted whites and those who had mixed ancestry. The blood-quantum phenomenon of the nineteenth-century was indeed largely the product of white invention and interpretation of what race and identity represented. However, there are some strong indicators that the Wyandots themselves began to adopt, or at the very least acknowledge, some facets of white racial identification. Not surprisingly in light of studies of southeastern Natives by William McLoughlin, Clara Sue Kidwell, Theda Perdue, and others, mixed-blood and racially white Wyandots tended to be slightly more acquisitive of things and ideas associated with white culture and more prone to involvement with white people and institutions. But the adoption of some facets of white racial identity, which grew more overt and racist as the century wore on, added additional layers of division and differentiation within the Wyandot community on the Sandusky.
A third major focus of the study is to place the community-level study of the Wyandot Indians of Ohio into a broader context, particularly the religious and missionary aspects of their story. Throughout the post-Greenville period, the Wyandots hosted numerous itinerant missionaries and two on-site missions. The Methodists made the most significant inroads on the Sandusky, founding a mission in 1816 that lasted until removal to Kansas in 1843, when the Methodist mission relocated along with the Wyandots. The ways in which some Wyandots interfaced with Christianity allow for a broader comparison to the global phenomenon of Christian missionization, conversion, and the social and cultural significance of choosing whether or not to accept the Euroamerican version (and vision) of God. Examining this phenomenon in a broader theoretical framework allows this study to make more far-reaching and broadly applicable observations about the process of mission for indigenous persons.

Finally, this dissertation is a story of persistence. Indians largely disappear from the literature, especially mainstream Midwestern state and regional histories, with the death of Tecumseh and the failure of the Indians and their British allies to expel the Americans from the Upper Ohio Valley in the 1810s. Stories of yeoman farmers, burgeoning industry and trade, and the growth of highly developed transportation systems dominate the story of Ohio and the eastern environs of the Midwest in the early nineteenth century. However, in all parts of the Midwest, groups of indigenous people, officially and unofficially recognized, continued to survive and, in some cases, found a modicum of success living in a white-dominated world. Larger, more visible groups such as the various communities of Ojibwe, Lakota, and others in the Western Great Lakes and
upper Great Plains, have gained a significant degree of scholarly attention in recent years. Some smaller groups, especially the Miami of Indiana, have also been the focus of significant tribal, community, and biographical studies.\textsuperscript{57} Many other smaller groups in the eastern Midwest have attracted less attention, but their stories provide a vital glimpse into what it meant to be Indian in America long before the zenith of American empire after the Civil War. Indeed, their stories tell us what post-frontier life entailed for those that fought to weather the storm.

Chapter one covers the period from the aftermath of the Treaty of Greenville to the growing tensions between the Indians and Euroamericans in Ohio on the eve of the War of 1812. The particular focus in this chapter is the burgeoning missionary enterprise among the Wyandots and the subsequent interactions between the Wyandot people and the missionaries, most of whom were Quakers and Presbyterians. The handful of converts reaped from nearly a decade of missionary work point to the overall lack of interest in Christianity, but the numerous interactions between the mission and non-Christians indicate that the Wyandots sought more materialistic ends from the presence of the missionaries.

Chapters two picks up the story of Wyandots and Christianity after the War of 1812 with the beginnings of the Methodist mission to the Wyandots. This mission began in 1816 as the personal spiritual quest of a mulatto exhorter named John Stewart. By 1819, the Ohio Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church took notice of Stewart’s mission and adopted it as their own, creating the first mission in that denomination’s history. Dominant issues in this chapter are the rationale for conversion,
the efforts that the Wyandots made to ensure the success of the mission, the coupling of
spiritual and practical education for Wyandot children, and the uses that the Wyandots
made of the mission in its early years, culminating in the building of a permanent mission
curch in 1824.

Chapter three continues the history of Wyandot Christianity into the maturation of
the mission in the late 1820s-1830s. The focus shifts from establishing a missionary
enterprise to the incorporation of the mission as a significant institution in the lives of
numerous Wyandot people. Analysis of the efficacy of the mission focuses on the
growing number of converts, the maturation of the mission school system, and the
growing leadership roles Wyandot people played in the institution, including formation of
a missionary society and Wyandot council of directors to maintain the mission church
and contribute to the mission school system.

Chapter four abandons the chronological bent of previous chapters to consider the
interconnections between the Sandusky Wyandots and the Euroamerican world. Issues
such as trade, the establishment of a general store and inn, off-reservation business and
land transactions, and participation (both willing and unwilling) in legal proceedings
indicate a growing interplay between the Wyandots and their American neighbors. This
chapter also considers the linkages between religious identity and economic activities in a
variety of contexts.

Chapter five provides a focused examination of issues of identity, especially
indications of growing identification among the Wyandots based partially on
Euroamerican definitions of race. While not fully abandoning the markedly more
egalitarian older system of clan, kin, and adoption, some mixed-race Wyandots used their connections to the white Euroamerican world to secure advantages in trade, government employment, and property ownership. In one very notable instance an individual maintained his rights as a Wyandot while also self-identifying as “white” and exercising voting rights in state and local elections. These connections between economics, religious identity, and racial identification played a major role in the political and social position of the Wyandots within the state of Ohio. However, the findings on the connections between these cultural markers, as demonstrated in this chapter, provide a more complex story than one might assume.

The Conclusion focuses briefly on the removal of the Wyandots in 1842-3. Issues of particular consideration are the continuation of the social and religious trends noted in this dissertation after removal, demonstrating both the continued evolution of Wyandot identity and the continued importance of Methodism to some Wyandots after the removal process landed them in Kansas.
Introduction

Despite the foreign origins of Christianity, the colonial circumstances of its introduction, and all of the multifaceted arguments about the introduction of Christianity as a tool of assimilation, the fact remains that many of the peoples of the Eastern Woodlands have lived with Protestant Christianity for two centuries or more. They have engaged with Protestantism on a variety of levels. Indeed, many, including many Wyandot, have come to embrace it as their religion, shaping Protestant faiths to meet their needs. When considering this spiritual legacy, one must consider the long-term influence of Christianity on traditional practices, traditional practices on indigenous Christianity, and the coexistence and commingling of beliefs and traditions. Such changes and alterations are the natural products of historical religious change. Clyde Holler made this observation thirty years ago. He noted, “all living religions change in response to new circumstances and challenges. This has been especially true of Native American religions, which have changed rapidly and drastically in response to forced cultural change and contact with Christianity…a religion that ceases to change is a religion that is already dead or in danger of extinction.” The locus for the possibility of such changes was in the contact of spiritual traditions, one example of which was the

“[Barnet] was under great temptations to conceal his sentiments on religion from his father’s family and the other Indians, because they laughed at him.” –Reverend George Scott, 1803

ONE: PROTESTANT ORIGINS AMONG THE SANDUSKY WYANDOTS
early 19th century Wyandot-Presbyterian experience. In the two centuries since, Protestantism has become “traditional” for many Wyandot and other indigenous peoples.

Framing Protestantism as “traditional” does not imply that non-Christian traditional spirituality and cultural practices were unimportant or ceased to function, neither does it ignore the very real damage that the introduction of Protestantism wrought on indigenous cultures and territory. There is little doubt that Christianity – both Catholic and Protestant – introduced Euro-American cultural practices and the subsequent loss of homelands during this period. What emerges from the story in this essay is that for most Wyandot, the interplay between Christianity and indigenous spirituality was not an either/or choice. Many Wyandots and others felt (and feel) connections to both traditions in very real, very fluid ways. Holler’s argument about Lakota spiritual leader Black Elk’s conversion to Christianity is particularly relevant: “commitment to Christianity does not necessarily imply any lessening of his commitment to traditional Lakota religion. This is clearly the understanding of conversion assumed by the missionaries, but it was not necessarily that of the Indians themselves.” While it is difficult to pinpoint the stance many Wyandots took on this issue, particularly in light of the reliance on (mostly) missionary-produced records, it is not an unreasonable leap to think of Wyandot engagement with Protestantism in a similar light. By conceptualizing the first decade of Protestant Christianity among the Wyandots along the Sandusky River as the introduction of a new religious tradition, a new thread in the Wyandot cultural tapestry, this chapter calls on us as historical observers to note the multiple levels upon which Wyandot people chose to engage with Protestantism. It also forces us to lend more
credence to the notion that early converts were not simply “outcasts,” “corrupted,” or “inauthentic.” Instead, they can be envisioned as individuals and small groups forming the cornerstones of what became a new religious tradition, for good and ill.

**Early Contacts with the Quakers**

Following the Treaty of Greenville in 1795, the Native Americans of Ohio faced the realities of a constricted land base and the encroachment of white settlers into what would soon become the State of Ohio, depleting the available hunting resources. One possibility for forging a tenable way of life in light of these new realities was to selectively adapt to white culture. Many of the Sandusky Wyandots, like a number of other Native groups east of the Mississippi, had begun to consider adaptation critical to their own future survival. Euro-American expansion was rapidly transforming the Ohio frontier (a middle ground) into a white-dominated contact zone. The greatest potential source for gaining critical skills, primarily education in English language and white agricultural techniques, proved to be the growing missionary movement among American Protestants. In the post-Greenville era, the first substantial contacts with Protestant missionaries were with Quaker missionaries. From 1797-1799, the Wyandots conducted an ongoing dialogue with the Society of Friends about the feasibility and desirability of establishing a mission along the Sandusky River. After contacting some Wyandot and Delaware hunters and chiefs in the spring of 1797, where the Quakers proposed the establishment of “agriculture, and some of the most useful mechanical arts,” the indigenous listeners agreed to take the proposal to their “grand council” and to send word...
of their decision. In either late 1798 or early 1799, the Wyandots sent a message on behalf of themselves and the Delaware in the form of a speech delivered by Tarhe, the principal Sandusky Wyandot chief, along with “a large belt and ten strings of white wampum”, to the Friends of Baltimore. They called on the Quakers to remember the long history of contact and friendship between their peoples, likely referencing the early relations between William Penn and the Delaware and others in the 17th century. They also made very specific references to the “chain of friendship” forged between them, one made “not…of iron, but that it was a chain of precious metal—a chain of silver, which would never get rusty.”

By invoking Iroquoian diplomatic and familial terminology and obligations, the speech indicates the indigenous perception of the relationship between the two parties as one of long standing, mutual respect, and kinship. The speech also flatteringly references the reputation of the Quakers as “a good and faithful people, ever ready to do justice, and to do good to all men, whether they be white or black.” The Wyandot and Delaware invited the Quakers to visit them again, when they would “show you a belt of wampum which was given to us by your forefathers, with a piece of written parchment affixed thereto.” Along with more allusions to the chain of friendship between their peoples, Tarhe urged the Quakers to wait until June to visit the Wyandot and Delaware villages, as it “would be a difficult task for our brethren to find our places of abode, as during the winter we will all be scattered abroad for the purposes of hunting in the wilderness.” Tarhe promised the Quakers that if the missionaries came to his residence on the Sandusky, he would “conduct you safe to the grand council fire of our great Sasteretsy,
where all good things are transacted, and where nothing bad is permitted to appear." At the council fire, both parties would remind each other of their history and mutual obligations toward each other. The communication was signed by leaders of both the Sandusky and Michigan Wyandots, with Tarhe, Ska-hon-wat, Adam Brown, and Mai-i-rai (Walk-in-the-Water) all affixing their signs to the letter, which was delivered on behalf of the Wyandot and Delaware Nations.

In response to the speech and wampum, the Baltimore Friends opted to send a large contingent (seven) of Friends in the early summer of 1799 to visit the Indians in the Lake Erie watershed. After a fairly arduous trek from Baltimore, Maryland to the Sandusky, the Quakers entered the village of Upper Sandusky, described as “a large Indian village, extending nine or ten miles on both sides of the river, and containing about one thousand inhabitants.” Three Wyandots confronted the men upon entering the village to discover who they were, and what business they had there: “two of them appeared much intoxicated, and seemed disposed to be insolent, but the other, who spoke good English, was very civil to us.” The Quakers, eager to cut to the chase, wished to see Tarhe immediately, though they were told “the chief was not then in a condition to attend to business.” The Quaker’s persistence caused the English-speaking man to conduct them to Tarhe’s residence, which was about five miles from the village. On the journey, the Quakers were faced with “a considerable number of Indians riding at full speed towards us, and hallooing most vehemently,” inspiring consternation among the missionaries, who attributed the actions to intoxication. One of the pursuers questioned the missionaries and with “much ferocity” informed the journal writer that his name was
“Kill white man.” When they arrived at Tarhe’s house, they indeed found him indisposed and decided to camp nearby to wait for a meeting the following day. The journalist observed a number of intoxicated Wyandots gathered near Tarhe’s home, engaged in “excess or violence,” and riding their horses very dangerously.24 By the next morning, the now sober Wyandots were very friendly with the Friends, with even “Kill white man” declaring the Quakers his brothers. Complaining of the unavailability of meat from the “more than two hundred families” in the village, the Quakers had to rely on a French trader to acquire sufficient flour to feed themselves. The Frenchman informed the Quakers that rum had been brought to the village recently, accounting for the outbreak of consumption.

Tarhe and a council of chiefs from Upper Sandusky met with the Friends to discuss their business. The Friends explained that in light of the speech and wampum they received, they wished to discuss how the Quakers might be of service to them. Tarhe “listened with great joy to the proposals we had now made of furnishing them with implements of agriculture, &c.; but as the grand council did not meet until the middle of the month, he could not enter into any definitive arrangements before that time.”25 He promised to discuss the matter in council and to inform the Friends by a speech what the decision was, delivering his address on four strings of white wampum. After hearing the speech, the Friends quickly took their leave of the Wyandots, since they could make no headway on establishing a mission and had few provisions. The visit proved very brief and ultimately inconsequential, as there seems to have been little follow-up to this visitation. No regular Quaker mission was established at Sandusky, nor does there
appear to have been much significant contact between the Quakers and Wyandots for several years following these initial interactions.\textsuperscript{26}

The Quakers diverted their attention to other tribes in the Northwest, particularly the Shawnees and Miamis.\textsuperscript{27} Periodic, isolated contacts with Quakers continued in the first decade of the century. Daniel Richter, for example, chronicles a pair of letters to Ohio Quakers in the early months of 1804, when Tarhe and about a hundred of his people appealed to the Quakers for assistance during a blizzard.\textsuperscript{28} Later in 1804, after an extended visit with the Miamis and Pottowatomies, a Quaker deputation visited Brownstown, one of the two principal villages in Michigan, where they noted that the local Wyandots “had, since the visit made by the Friends, to their nation, in the year 1799, advanced considerably in agriculture; many of them having built comfortable houses, and acquired a considerable number of cattle, hogs, and other domestic animals.”\textsuperscript{29} While in Brownstown, they were also informed that both the Sandusky Wyandots and the Shawnee on the Auglaize River had “turned their attention very much towards the cultivation of their lands.”\textsuperscript{30} While immodesty might be unbecoming, the Quaker deputation seemed well pleased to observe: “the committee to these nations, and the exertions which had been made, to turn their minds to agriculture, although we had not been in a situation to extend much assistance to them, have not been altogether unavailing.”\textsuperscript{31} Unbelievably, a few days visitation had proved the inspiration for significant lifestyle changes along the Sandusky! With little tangible benefit from their flirtation with the Quakers, the Wyandots, for their part, turned their attention to other potential suitors, most significantly Presbyterian missionaries.
Early contacts with Presbyterians

The first contact between the Wyandots and what would become the Presbyterian mission likely took place in 1800. Reverend Joseph Badger of the Connecticut Missionary Society preached to the Wyandots at Lower Sandusky in October of that year. Badger immediately broached the subject of establishing a permanent linkage between his faith group and the Wyandots. On this initial visit he claimed to have:

had a talk with the Chiefs on the Subject of having a minister live with them, and teach their children to read, & c. was fully persuaded that this was the only way in which they could be led to any valuable improvement. At the close of our talk they expressed a wish to hear from us again.

Badger’s initial visit was the beginning of a long dialog between the Sandusky Wyandot and Christian missionaries about a more permanent missionary arrangement. Between 1801 and 1805, Presbyterian missionaries repeatedly visited the Wyandot people along the Sandusky, with a few venturing into Michigan to visit Wyandot people at Brownstown and Monguagon. In addition to preaching to Wyandot people, they also preached regularly to other Native Americans, local white settlers, and at a small African-American community located near Upper Sandusky.

What clearly emerges from the extant records of these initial years of contact is a pattern of “feeling out” by both the Wyandot and missionaries, both of whom considered the other only one of several potential partners for cooperation. For their part, many missionaries argued that the Wyandot were more primed for a mission than other indigenous groups. For example, in September 1801, Reverend Thomas Hughes noted that the Sandusky Wyandot “are more civilized, and have more information than any we met with. The Roman Priests have been among them, and have baptized some of them.”
Hughes met with assembled chiefs at Upper Sandusky, where an unnamed headman asserted, “they [the Wyandots] had been talking among themselves about our preaching, and were all pleased, and wishing that a minister would come and live with them.”

After gaining an audience with the assembled chiefs, and speaking through a chain of interpretation (George Bluejacket translated English to Shawnee, and a Wyandot man who understood Shawnee translated to Wyandot), the chiefs promised to go to Lower Sandusky and give a formal response regarding the presence of a minister and/or schoolmaster among them. Most of the council never made it to Lower Sandusky, however, complaining of sickness as the culprit for their absence. Without their presence or participation, consensus could not be reached, prompting the same “old chief” to state:

...we think it not best to give our answer yet: if we did, the chiefs from the upper town, who are the Head-Chiefs, might come upon us and say, Why did you give your answer so soon? We think best to wait a little longer…You, brothers, come and want to preach to us: this is good; we thank you for it. You want to send a schoolmaster to teach our children, and a minister to teach us how to serve God: this is all good, brothers; we thank you for it.

Beyond the notable perpetuation of traditional community decision-making procedures into the nineteenth century, it is also clear that the Wyandot leadership dictated the proper setting for discussion of the issue of a mission, and the missionaries were powerless to speed the process. All told, it required nearly four years of give and take discussions before the Wyandot accepted the development of a mission among them.
Establishing the Mission

In the summer of 1805, Joseph Badger returned to the Sandusky. He “talked with the Indians on the subject of civil improvements, both in learning to read, write, and number by figures, and cultivating their lands more extensively, raising cattle, and making of cloth.” As all missionaries had attempted before, Badger too met with a Wyandot council to propose a missionary establishment. This time, however, the Wyandot gave a definite answer:

They have given their full consent to have a Minister reside with them and have a school to teach their children. Their reasons for not accepting the offer before are in these words ‘we were So bad, we were afraid to have a Minister live with us, we were all drunkards So that he would not preach to us but a few times we were afraid Some of our young men when intoxicated would Stagger to his house hooping & Yaling So as to put him in fear, and make him uncomfortable, but now we are determined to quit drinking altogether.’ ---There is no difficulty now in the Way, on the part of the Wyandots of having the Gospel Staiedly amongst them, and also a school for their children, if a grant of a piece of the reserved land can be made by Congress to the Missionary who would Settle here.

Though Badger’s statement simplifies the numerous reasons why the Wyandots had yet to select a missionary on the Sandusky, his comment reveals that the Wyandots (at least enough of them to effectively sway the community) were finally committed to allowing both religious and practical instruction from the Western Missionary Society, marking the first solid determination on the part of the Wyandot to receive full-time Protestant missionaries. Badger received tribal approval to build his mission anywhere on the western side of the Sandusky River at Lower Sandusky, providing that he “should not go off the Reserve to improve any land, or bring any other white people but such as I needed to assist in the mission.” The Wyandot were willing to host the mission, but only with a small mission family in a narrowly defined space. The Wyandots, at least their tribal leaders, attempted to control cultural adaptation by choosing and sanctioning the
Presbyterians on their own terms. As became clear during the life of the mission, allowance of the mission meant neither acceptance of Christianity nor rejection of other possibilities.

**Challenges to the Mission**

While the missionary establishment would certainly make an impact among the Sandusky Wyandot, a number of other possibilities existed alongside the mission. Some of these alternative pathways had little to do with the mission, while others presented direct challenges to Wyandot engagement with Christianity. At times, these challenges came from within the mission itself, or more broadly from Euro-Americans. In other cases, these alternatives and challenges originated in the indigenous world.

**Catholic Legacies**

The Wyandots had a long legacy of contact with Catholicism. By the early 19th century, they had been in contact with Catholics, particularly the Jesuits, for nearly two hundred years and contact with Catholicism continued into the nineteenth century. Many Wyandots had long incorporated facets of the Catholic religion into their own society, with aspects of Catholic ritual and practices cropping up in missionary observance of the Wyandots in Ohio. In the Michigan Wyandot communities of Brownstown and Monguagon closer to Detroit, many Wyandots retained a connection to the Catholic Church through contact with nearby French Canadian Catholics and their priests.
Knowledge of Catholicism’s important place in these societies discouraged some missionaries from even attempting to preach at Brownstown, as they “knew that they were attached to the Roman Catholic religion.” Due to their distance from Detroit and the lack of a priest stationed among them in recent decades, attachments to Catholicism appear to have been much weaker among the majority of Sandusky Wyandots. Nonetheless, the long legacy of Catholicism shaped the Wyandot understanding of Christianity. At Lower Sandusky, a number of Wyandots assembled to hear a Presbyterian sermon in 1801. Afterwards, a woman asked the missionaries to baptize her child. The interpreter told Hughes that the Wyandots “would be displeased if it would not be done.” He attempted to explain that Protestants would not baptize any of them until they converted and had a deep understanding of the Bible. During the same missionary tour, a young man also asked whether the sin of murder could ever be pardoned, likely thinking along the lines of Catholic confession. Confronting these and other Catholic-based rituals became a recurring theme in the missionary record.

**Friction with Local Traders**

The most prevalent direct challenges to the mission came not from indigenous sources, but from local traders. Several traders assailed Badger and the mission due to fears that Badger’s anti-alcohol sermons would cause the alcohol trade to collapse. Badger also held most traders in low regard as particularly poor examples of white Euro-American culture, leading to personal friction between he and the traders. In 1806, Badger weathered accusations levied by a local trader that he had disparaged the Quakers.
and discouraged the Wyandot from communicating with them. Later, another trader accused Badger (a married man) of committing adultery with Elizabeth Whitaker, a widow.

By 1808, the continuous allegations of impropriety levied by the traders seemed to be having an impact in the Wyandot community. Badger noted in his own journal that his enemies told the Wyandots that “their land would all go to pay me for what I was doing, if they permitted me to stay.” The Wyandots assured Badger that they did not believe the traders, saying that “they were glad to have missionary aid.” Despite such assurances, one particular trader soon transmitted a speech by the chiefs at Upper Sandusky to Governor Hull, accusing Badger of mismanaging “a large sum of [donation] money…for the use of the Indians; that the good people of Ohio had sent a number of cattle for them; and that Mr. Badger kept the cattle for his own use, and had never given them one dollar of the money.” Hull forwarded the speech to the Western Missionary Society, who formed a committee to visit the mission and investigate. When questioned about the contents of the letter, Tarhe admitted that the chiefs at Upper Sandusky “do not know much about it here, only what we hear from flying stories.” Other than their preaching occasionally at the Upper town and administering medicine to the sick there, Tarhe claimed to have little regular contact with Badger. As to the claims against Badger, “we cannot prove anything; we have heard them only from white people (meaning the traders).” The committee explained that the money and livestock were collected “for the sole purpose of furnishing the missionaries and the school with provisions.” Badger and the laborers at the mission were to “assist the Indians to
plough, to show them how to do their work, and to assist them in working as much as...[they] could find time to do” after completing the work necessary for the mission to function. Following the explanation, Tarhe expressed relief that the charges were false, and that “we have been told by several traders that the cattle and hogs were sent for our use, and that Mr. Badger brought seven hundred dollars with him to hire hands and purchase tools to do our work for us, and that he was keeping that money for himself…We will not listen to any more of these stories.” While the missionaries managed to assuage Wyandot apprehensions, conflict with traders remained a hindrance to the missionary establishment.

**Internal Problems at the Mission**

While the mission faced external difficulties from traders’ tales, it also encountered internal problems that threatened to divide the mission family and the Wyandot people. A key difficulty was that the mission was regularly without an interpreter, which served to limit the missionary’s influence. None of the Presbyterian missionaries spoke Wyandot or even another indigenous language. Nor was any effort made to train missionaries to speak Wyandot. Other than Badger, no missionaries spent enough time among the Wyandots to pick the language up, and Badger did not have enough time to learn Wyandot either.

As was true in most other indigenous missionary contexts, it was absolutely necessary to have a reliable interpreter. Speaking an entire sermon through an interpreter...
seems to have been awkward and tedious enough, but the missionaries had few alternatives. Occasionally, individuals such as Hampton Northrop, Samuel Sanders, and Elizabeth Whitaker would interpret, but they were not available for the day to day duties necessitated at the mission.

In the end, their only viable choice was to hire a full-time interpreter. Interpreters in the contact areas occupied “the same place that the learned do in a civilized society. Of course their services are estimated at a very high rate. Four hundred dollars per annum will be required by the person in view [William Walker, Sr.].” Walker’s desirability as interpreter included not only his skill, but that of his wife Catherine, “a serious woman; [who] can read and interpret well.” The Walker children were already bilingual, and were thought to “be of very great service in the school.” Eventually, Walker chose to accept a lesser sum to become the interpreter in 1808.

The mission also faced a related problem: a persistent lack of funds. The mission was expensive and involved a significant amount of non-spiritual work. Additionally, the startup costs required to build the infrastructure of a new mission drained the scant funds available. Numerous Christian donors were willing to support a spiritual mission, but fewer were willing to bankroll costs incurred to build missionary houses, or to teach Indians to farm, basic mechanical arts, and household arts. The Missionary Society recognized this dilemma and sought to address it. For example, in an 1808 report they were very careful to assure potential donors that all of the non-religious aspects of the missionary enterprise were merely “handmaids of religion,” tools used to both attach the Wyandots to Christianity and to enable them to succeed in “proper” society. Despite
such assurances, raising the funds necessary to conduct the mission effectively proved difficult.

**Handsome Lake**

Besides the difficulties within the mission, some Wyandot opted to explore alternative spiritual powers which existed outside of (and sometimes conflicted with) the Presbyterian mission. One such power was the prophetic movement of Handsome Lake. Handsome Lake, a Seneca prophet, experienced a series of visions in 1799-1800 which led him to call for, in part, a return to “traditional” forms of worship. Wyandot interest in Handsome Lake’s religion emerges often in the missionary records. For example, in 1804 Hampton Northrop informed Reverend George Scott that some of the Wyandot chiefs had “sent for a pretended prophet in the Cornplanter’s nation, a brother to the Cornplanter...with a design to hear him in order to form a choice who would be their teacher.” By August 1805, missionary John Anderson wrote that “both popish & pagan influence is exerting to keep them in the way to destruction. An Imposter, who is called the Prophit [sic] of the Six nations, is much talked of by the ignorant. He will endeavour to revive and uphold their old heathenism, in opposition to Christianity.”

Handsome Lake continued to attract Wyandot attention in the latter years of the Presbyterian mission. For example, while on an 1808 inspection of the mission, the reporting committee experienced the arrival of “the celebrated Seneca Prophet…with upwards of thirty chiefs and warriors.” From the missionaries’ perspective, the arrival of Handsome Lake proved deleterious. All of the Wyandots were so preoccupied with the
visit “that they could not pay much attention to the concerns of the mission.” Even more disturbing to the missionaries was their perception that Handsome Lake’s arrival “encouraged the party who were attached to paganism. Their expectations of the beneficial wonders which the prophet would perform were bounded by nothing short of raising the dead…Friendly Indians were in confusion, and the prophet’s party were impertinent.” 65 By examining Handsome Lake’s religion, the Wyandot were exploring another option that would allow them to cope with the cultural change, one could argue upheaval, created by the encroachment of American society.

Tenskwatawa

Another potential challenger for spiritual adherence arrived in the person of Tenskwatawa, the Shawnee Prophet, in May 1806. 66 Tenskwatawa had experienced a prophetic vision in early 1805 which endorsed a return to the “Indian” lifestyle by rejecting the acculturationists and their white allies. 67 He came in response to some Wyandots who had solicited his services as a witch finder. The people who sought out Tenskwatawa, usually cited as “young men,” were involved in a witch hunt designed to rid the tribe of the causes of disease. 68 These witch hunters also wanted to identify causes of the reduction in game animals and for the decline of “traditional” Wyandot culture. By the middle of May, the Prophet had labeled four women at Lower Sandusky as witches and ordered their execution. 69 As is true in most American-generated documents, these women are difficult to identify, but Joseph Badger commented that they were “four of the best women in the nation,” which probably means that they were
among the more acculturated in the community, and likely were among those who regularly attended Christian services. Tarhe and the other Wyandot chiefs decided to intercede to stop the executions.

The presence of the Shawnee Prophet and the events surrounding his activities reveal a degree of conflict among the Sandusky Wyandots. There was obviously some support for the Prophet or he would not have been asked to come to Lower Sandusky. Some expressed interest in his spiritual movement. Discontent with the decision by Wyandot leaders to cede land to the United States in 1805, coupled with frustration with the slow process of adaptation, were certainly contributing factors as well. Nonetheless, a larger portion of the tribe, including the tribal leadership, disapproved of the Prophet’s activities. From a religious perspective, some simply did not believe in his message or his spiritual legitimacy. Others – like the tribal leadership - likely resented the Prophet as an uninvited (at least through the official sanction of the tribal council) upstart who challenged their authority and interfered with their efforts to move the tribe in an adaptive direction. After his 1806 visitation, Tenskwatwa’s influence remained and grew, as shown when Badger noted that he “found them [the Wyandot] in great confusion about their prophet: part of them will not listen to him. others will.” On another occasion, Badger stated: “the Indians still keep up their pow-wow dances in obedience to the prophet.” It is clear that Tenskwatawa, like Handsome Lake, continued to find an audience among the Wyandots, and his followers often found themselves at odds with the mission and its program.
Traditional spiritual practices

Along with (and alongside) burgeoning interests in Native prophetic movements, traditional practices continued, likely as the most common form of spiritual expression. It is difficult to identify many specific references to the perpetuation of traditional practices, as they often overlapped and intersected with missionary observance of the prophetic movements, which dominated their attention. A few examples do emerge, such as Badger taking note of “great confusion among the Indians by reason of their dreams and prophets.” On another occasion, mission laborer Quintus F. Atkins witnessed the “Indians...dancing to their God” on one occasion, and dancing before Sabbath service on another. Again, a mixture of nativistic practices with missionary instruction demonstrates that the Wyandots exerted great freedoms in the spiritual realm.

A Multi-religious Milieu

The realities of the religious “stew” percolating in the Wyandot world emerges in a number of contexts. Perhaps the best example was recorded by James Hughes in the Spring of 1805. Hughes preached to a large assembly gathered at Tarhe’s home. He preached on the singularity of God, countering information he had obtained that some of the Wyandots believed that there were two gods, one who created white people, the other (called the Warrior) who created Indians. Tarhe supported his sermon in a long speech in which he “exhorted his people to receive it, for he believed it was all true, and that it was the word of God.” It is interesting to ponder, though unclear, whether Tarhe meant the specifics of the sermon were true, or simply the notion that there was only one God.
Tarhe also spent a great deal of time emphasizing the duties parents had to their children, which can perhaps be read as an endorsement of the educational possibilities offered through the missionaries. The competing religious visions emerged again a few days later, when Hughes was required to wait outside the council house while those inside “engaged in some kind of worship.” Afterward, as Hughes preached his sermon, he noted an image of the Warrior god “set up by the side of the council house, to which they pay some kind of homage when they worship. They say they do not consider it a God, but have it there to put them in mind of their God. Most of them seemed to acknowledge only one, the true God.” As he preached, a number of Wyandots, especially chiefs, exclaimed “neh toah” [that’s right] frequently. From this account, it seems that many Wyandots may not have considered it apocryphal to believe in multiple spiritual visions simultaneously, and to both honor and believe seemingly incongruous conceptions of creation.

This notion of a broad acceptance of multiple faiths is supported by Tarhe’s response to the sermon. He urged the people to “obey what our father is teaching us, and what our ancient chiefs have told us; for it is all one substance. Let us all be of one mind; one god made us all, he made us all of one blood. It is true we Indians serve the Warrior; we hold to the Warrior.” Tarhe urged his people to remember that “we are all one nation, and we should not abuse or despise one another.” This speech seems a remarkable example of both an effort to salve the growing spiritual tensions within the community and a statement on the compatibility of divergent spiritual opinions and practices, all under the umbrella of one God who created all men, while also acknowledging that the
Wyandots worshiped the Warrior. While seemingly contradictory from some perspectives, Tarhe’s appeal makes sense if considered from the context of a people able to incorporate multiple spiritual perspectives without deeming them incompatible. The impact of the mission, therefore, may not have been to define Wyandot people as Protestants. Rather, it added the Protestant perspective, and the Christian choice, to the Wyandot spiritual milieu of the time.

**Wyandot Extra-spiritual Uses of the Mission**

Before weighing the potential spiritual benefits some Wyandot people derived from the mission, it is important to consider the extra-spiritual dimensions of the Wyandot-Presbyterian relationship. From his first visits to the Sandusky country, Badger found that the Wyandots wanted far more than spiritual guidance from him. It quickly became clear that the Wyandot missionary would have to wear a variety of hats, serving as a scribe, letter reader, doctor, and technical instructor, among other tasks. When considering the broad non-spiritual uses that Wyandot people made of the missionary presence, one must look beyond what happened in sermons or religious meetings. One particular locus of use (and cooperation) was labor.

**Labor**

Many Wyandot used the mission as a source of labor. Atkins recorded that he labored for a number of individuals during his term as a mission laborer from 1806-1807. In 1806, he drew logs for Boldson, later helping him make shingles for his roof. He
plowed for Snow, Polly, the Wasp, Big Arms, and a white captive “in habits and dress no way different from the Indians.” He later made a door for “Snaygys big daughter a wiandot woman.” Badger noted in late 1806 that the mission family had “helped them...build several houses.” During the 1807 planting season, Atkins plowed for a number of days for Boldson and three other Wyandots. He plowed for a day for “Cherokee mans wife,” and in the Indian cornfield as well. By February 1807, Badger reported that the mission had plowed a cornfield of 24-5 acres for the Indians, as well as about five acres for the mission itself. They had completed a house for the mission family, and were at work on a schoolhouse as well.

The laboring relationship between the mission and the community clearly worked both ways. Badger notes, for example, that some “Wyandots came and laid up my house ready to lay on the joists. I gave them dinner.” Atkins mentioned that on June 13, 1806, a number of Wyandots helped plant the mission fields after planting their own. He also noted that on June 4, 1807 he “labored with a number of the Wiandots at putting up the schoohouse we got it up the jin [joist] this evening…” A few days later “John Bird a negro man from the upper town of Wiandots” assisted in shingling the roof. An ethic of cooperative labor seems to have developed between the mission family and the Wyandots living in close proximity to the mission.

**Medicine**

In addition to physical labor to help plant and manufacture, the Wyandots made use of Badger’s medical knowledge and access to medicine. There are a number of
specific instances in the record of Wyandots seeking Badger’s medical skills. Sickness was so prevalent in the spring and summer of 1807 that Badger was employed almost daily on healing business. Badger treated Tarhe with wine and sweet water in late May 1807.88 He administered care to “a girl about fifteen years of age [who] lies very sick with a nervous fever.”89 Barnet was also violently ill during the season, as was “a young man very sick,” who Badger watched and nursed for a number of days.90 By August 1807, Badger wrote that his son “and several Indian children” were sick.91 The frequency of his caregiver duties led Badger to complain “I am often hindered most of a day to give them medicine or inform them about some trifling business.”92

While his medical duties might be taxing, they were arguably vital to the success of the mission. John Anderson, a fellow missionary who briefly preached at the mission alongside Badger in August 1805, saw Badger’s medical skills as a key to his acceptance by the Wyandots. He noted: “Mr. Badger has gained the confidence of the Indians by giving them medicines which has, in every instance, cured their disorders.”93 While his success rate undoubtedly was not one hundred percent, his healing capabilities became an important avenue of interaction between Wyandot people and the mission.

Communication

Along with labor and healing, the Wyandots also drew upon Badger’s proficiency in English. Much like Sawantanan, the Wyandots frequently asked Badger to write to government officials on their behalf. The Wyandots would use Badger, a well versed and educated man, as a conduit to convey their thoughts and present their concerns to the
American government. For example, Tarhe called upon Badger to read papers regarding a land claim by a white adoptee, as well as writing a letter on Tarhe’s behalf to the Governor of Michigan on the matter. The same day, the Wyandots again used Badger’s services as scribe, this time to write the President to request, per the Treaty of Greenville, a blacksmith who could “do all kind of work from the gun to the hoe,” as well as a trader “who would not cheat them.”94 The Wyandot also later called on Badger to write “in answer to Some proposals made to them by the Quakers to give them and the Delawares a thousand dollars worth of Goods of their own manufacture including building them a Mill which proposals in their answer accepted.”95

Wyandot leaders felt free to call upon his services whenever they required them, particularly to read and respond to communications from the United States government. Badger was conflicted about these requests. He saw them as both an annoyance and an opportunity to couple his religious message with his duties as scribe and interpreter. In one case, he was called upon to read a speech from the Governor of Michigan for Tarhe and Walk-in-the-Water, an important Michigan Wyandot chief. He used the occasion as an opportunity to discuss the potential of expanding missionary operations into Michigan. In another instance, he took letters that had arrived at Lower Sandusky from Governor Hull and traveled to find the chiefs in their winter encampment near modern Columbus.96 With no government officials at Lower Sandusky, other than the Factor at the U.S. Trading House that opened for a few years there, Badger was the closest thing to an American official in residence, making him a good source of information and a good conduit for communication with American government officials.
Education

The aspect of the mission establishment that both the Wyandots and the mission family were most anxious to see come to fruition was the school for Wyandot children. Unfortunately, it also was one of the last things the missionaries were able to execute. The mission family suffered from the same bout of illnesses that struck the Wyandots in 1806–7, delaying the construction of the schoolhouse significantly. By late 1806, Badger estimated that he would probably open the school in the spring. 1807. 97 Badger planned for the school to accept both boys and girls from all of the tribes near Lower Sandusky. The boys would “cultivate a garden plot to [?] proportion to their number + age.” The girls would be taught “knitting, sewing, Spining, and making Cloth.” 98

Despite Badger’s optimism, it was well into the summer of 1807 before the schoolhouse was complete. Due to Wyandot economic practices, this meant that students would not come to the school in earnest until winter at least. The major problem preventing the timely completion of the schoolhouse was a high degree of laborer turnover, which left too few hands to perform the necessary work. 99 When Badger began to prepare for the school to finally open, he again discussed the matter with the tribal council. Tarhe “said if he had a child to go to school he would put it under [the mission’s] care: I found several willing to send.” Badger desired a national agreement to support the school, but Tarhe told him: “every family must act their pleasure about having their children learn.” 100 Therefore, there would be no compulsory attendance, nor even a guarantee of a minimum number of attendees. As such, the school struggled with inconsistent attendance, some of it fostered by “pagan devotees, called prophets,” who
worked to discourage women from enrolling their children in the school.\textsuperscript{101}

Despite the inauspicious beginnings of the educational program, by 1809 the school had grown to fifteen students, with a mission report comparing the children to other children in any school setting: “some are dull; some arise to mediocrity, and some higher.” The report noted that the children made significant progress learning English. The children of William Walker, Sr., the recently hired interpreter for the mission, made an important difference in the school’s success because they “can speak both the English and Wyandot language very well.” The schoolmaster indicated that the students spent most of their day in academic lessons, with regular prayer mixed in. The only manual labor duties mentioned in the report were after school when “we have our handmill to attend to, to grind corn for our supper.”\textsuperscript{102}

**Wyandot Spiritual Engagement with the Mission: Barnet**

While support for the establishment of the mission was far from universal in the first years of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, the spiritual transition of some Wyandot people along the Sandusky seems to have begun to take root for some individuals. Within the missionary record, it appears that a man named Barnet became the most important Christian convert on the Sandusky. He is, therefore, a transitional figure in the history of the Sandusky Wyandots. Barnet was one of very few males known to have attached themselves spiritually to Presbyterianism on the Sandusky. He was also among the first Wyandot males to fully embrace the Euro-American version of yeoman agriculture championed by Thomas Jefferson and diligently taught by the missionaries. Additionally, his story
circulated throughout the eastern United States in a variety of Christian periodicals and became a significant component of the spread of Presbyterian missionary endeavors in the first decade of the nineteenth century. Barnet’s story was sufficiently well known in Christian circles that Harvey Newcomb, a noted children’s author, selected Barnet as the subject of a Christian primer in the 1830s, over twenty years after his death.  

As authors such as William McLoughlin have noted, the early indigenous converts to Christianity were often of mixed ancestry and may have had an extra affinity for facets of Euro-American culture. It is important to keep in mind that this possible affinity had less to do with “race,” and more to do with the connections people of mixed ancestry maintained with European relatives and European culture. According to William Connelley, a noted ethnographer among the Wyandot in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century, Barnet’s father “was a white man, who had been made prisoner by the Indians almost in infancy. Always residing among them, he knew nothing of his parentage, and was a complete Indian in all his habits of thought, feeling, and action.” The Wyandots fully integrated the elder Barnet into the community and he married a Wyandot woman. Their son was born circa 1770. Very little is recorded about the younger Barnet (also called Eunonqu or Flying Arrow) before 1800, other than the fact that he was originally married to a Wyandot woman, with whom he had his eldest son, John. The couple had divorced by 1800 (apparently at her insistence) and Barnet quickly remarried, this time to a Shawnee woman. The couple dwelt near Lower Sandusky, the northernmost Wyandot town on the Sandusky River, and eventually had three children. Barnet’s relationship to the mission unfolds throughout its history. For
its duration, he never strayed far from the thoughts of the missionaries, and seemingly never severed his connections to Protestantism. Through words and actions, he persistently identified with the missionaries and their spiritual and cultural work.

Barnet appears in nearly every mission report. In September 1803, Barnet hosted missionary George Scott in his own home. Barnet confided privately to Scott that he wished to know more about Christianity, and that “he had been for a considerable time under deep convictions,” but that “he was under great temptations to conceal his sentiments on religion from his father’s family and the other Indians, because they laughed at him.” Despite his reticence to face the ridicule of his contemporaries, Barnet fervently desired a permanent mission among his people, and even declared “if ever a council should be called for this purpose, if the chiefs refused, he was determined to speak to them publicly; though this was contrary to their law and custom.”

Perhaps the most telling example of Barnet’s growing devotion is what was happening when no missionaries were in the Sandusky communities. In a letter Barnet dictated to a local trader soon after Scott’s departure, he explained that God urged him to speak out for the mission at both Lower Sandusky and Upper Sandusky. He felt compelled to take the matter to the chiefs at Upper Sandusky, where “some of the chiefs rose and said that it was right.” Barnet, along with another pro-mission Wyandot, little Cornstalk, then spoke publicly to the people of Upper Sandusky, where “a number of the people…came forward and gave wampum to support the cause.” As he did not have the personal authority to endorse the mission, Barnet lamented: “my eyes are steady shedding [sic] tears, that I cannot say in my letter come.”
On a return visit, Scott had a lengthy conversation with Barnet, who indicated that his level of distress had lessened since Scott’s last visit because he had more fully embraced Christian conceptions of sin and the role of God in his life, particularly the salvation that awaited himself and other sinners who accepted Christ. Barnet also hosted Scott’s sermon at his home. Barnet was also instrumental in establishing weekly meetings while the missionaries were away, though Barnet was soon supplanted by “one Reed, a chief whose name is Cornstalk, and Old Crane, who is the king of all these small nations.” While it is unclear from the source precisely why Barnet ceased to lead these meetings, one cannot help but wonder whether the decision “to conduct their societies in the Roman Catholick [sic] form, by confessing their sins, then praying for pardon” was a factor.

Barnet also seems to have worked to counter indigenous critiques of the mission. James Hughs noted that Barnet continued to publicly support the mission in spite of a growing sentiment among some Wyandots that Christianity should be rejected. He also gathered about twenty of his friends at his home to have an extended conversation with Hughs about Christianity. During Tenskwatawa’s 1806 witch hunt, Barnet was in great distress about the proceedings, particularly after the Shawnee Prophet had appointed Barnet one of the executioners of the four condemned women, though “he had not consented to be one.” Whether this was a test of Barnet’s convictions, or a potential punishment Tenskwatawa imposed because of Barnet’s spiritual preference, is unclear, but either seems a plausible possibility.
If such actions were not enough to indicate Barnet’s commitment to the mission, his choice to commit his son to the cause certainly did. In April 1804, he decided to bring his eldest son, John, to a Presbytery meeting in western Pennsylvania (no small travel feat) and leave him in the care of the missionaries, where he “expressed an earnest desire that his child might enjoy the benefits of a religious education.”¹¹⁷ When Barnet visited his son a year later, he “was asked if he did not feel troubled to leave his little boy at such a distance amongst strangers. He replied not half so much as he was troubled about his poor tribe of people who were destitute of the light of the Gospel and the precious privilege we enjoyed in this country.”¹¹⁸ He also hoped that John “would yet be a great man, and do much good among the poor Wyandots in teaching them to be christians [sic].”¹¹⁹

John Barnet remained in Pittsburgh for nearly two years, where he learned to read and write in English, by all accounts very aptly. Eventually, John was compelled to return home in May 1806. His mother came with her husband and three others with a letter from Tarhe, asking that the Presbytery release the boy to her. Barnet had not gotten her consent, or that of the chiefs, to send him. Tarhe thought that the boy likely had sufficient learning, and that he could continue at the school being built on the reservation if he did not. The Presbytery debated their duty to the father versus the wishes of the chiefs (with no mention of the mother’s desire) and gave the boy up. They felt that “the critical situation of the mission, the bad effects a refusal might have on the mind of the chief, and the danger of thereby defeating the flattering prospect of the gospel being preached, and
its happy influence felt by the benighted heathen, were considerations seriously affecting.”

One might wonder why the chiefs, particularly Tarhe, who seems to have supported the presence of the mission, would take this step. A likely reason was that the power of women, in this case particularly in terms of childrearing, mattered in the Wyandot world. Barnet had taken his son without his mother’s input, a serious breach of Wyandot custom. For Tarhe and the other leaders on the Sandusky, her rights and desires may have mattered more than the potential damage John’s removal could do the missionary relationship.

The devotion of Barnet emerges most readily during Badger’s tenure at the mission. Barnet engaged with the mission in every conceivable way. He helped Badger and his family set up their tents and cut the timber for the mission house. He hosted religious services in his home, and assisted Badger during services. Barnet sought Badger’s aid in caring for his sick child and helped the missionary’s son cut the timber for the mission house. In addition to his frequent services at the mission, Barnet functioned as a Christian leader in his own right. He renewed his own outreach to other Wyandot people, and his influence began to extend beyond his family to “a number of…Indians frequently com[ing] to his house at the hours of family worship, to join with him in prayer.” Barnet became the bulwark of Wyandot support for the mission, even to the point of assuaging missionary doubts. When the mission experienced its most intense criticism by traders and Wyandots, Barnet approached Reverend Elisha McCurdy
and “urged him to be patient and bear with the unreasonableness of the Indians, and not
give up the mission on account of the difficulties attending it.”

During the short lifespan of the mission, Barnet became, for lack of a better term,
the mission celebrity in the Protestant presses. Most of the letters and mission reports that
various Christian magazines and newspapers printed during the period include extended
discussions of Barnet and occasionally his family. Readers followed him through his
moments of doubt, when he questioned whether he was worthy of salvation. They read
about his concerns for his community, and hope that all Wyandots would one day be
saved. Barnet’s piety was a particular locus of discussion. One especially powerful
example of Barnet’s piety occurred when Badger:

told one of the chiefs, and Barnet, and some others who were present, of the prayers of good
people for them; what the society had done; of the cattle and hogs given for the support of the
missionaries, &c. Barnet was so affected with the account that he got up and prayed for about
fifteen minutes with great fervency; thanking God that he had so disposed the hearts of people to
help them; and pleading that he would incline the congress to give them their living here; and that
he would dispose the heart of all the Wyandot people to send their children to school.

Such sentiments, expressed in print to thousands of devout Christians through a number
of periodicals, clearly had an influence on the numerous donations to the mission from
across the eastern United States and the Ohio country.

The culmination of Barnet’s spiritual journey came in August 1810, he appeared
before the Western Presbyterian Assembly and expressed a general disillusion with his
earthly existence. He believed that “he must be saved, by free mercy, through Christ
Jesus.” Though he “expressed great fears of unfitness, viewing himself unworthy of the
name of Christian,” he wanted to be baptized. After long discussion with the
assembled ministers, who were greatly impressed by Barnet’s meekness and devotion to
God, they deemed Barnet fit for baptism and provided him that sacred rite. The following January, he brought his wife and three children to Washington County, Pennsylvania, where his children (Joseph, Elisha, and Sarah) were baptized.\(^{127}\) He also chose to leave Joseph with the Presbyterians, hoping “that he might hereafter be useful to his nation, in teaching them the good ways of God.”\(^{128}\)

In addition to his firm religious conviction, Barnet had almost completely abandoned hunting in favor of agriculture. He noted that he had “lost his disposition to hunt” and that “he finds his mind most comfortable when he is working in his field.”\(^{129}\) While other males had begun to gradually adopt white agricultural mores, none seem to have devoted themselves so completely to their crops as Barnet. Thus, Barnet had adopted not just the religious beliefs of the mission, but the farming ethic taught by the mission and endorsed by the Jeffersonian government.\(^{130}\) If there were a “fully converted” Presbyterian Wyandot, Barnet was the most outstanding example.

**Elizabeth Whitaker**

Another local individual who emerged as a key supporter of the mission was Elizabeth Whitaker. Whitaker and her late husband, both former captives of the Wyandots, had established a general store at Lower Sandusky to provide for the Wyandots, other Native people, and some nearby white and black settlers. Whitaker’s home “has been a free lodging for all the missionaries who have visited them.”\(^{131}\) She consistently emerged as a willing participant during religious services, sometimes acting as an interpreter. In the process, Whitaker seems to have grown more attentive to religion
herself, along with her eldest daughter, and she proved an important ally of the missionary cause. Like Barnet, Whitaker also entrusted her son, James, to the Presbyterians.\textsuperscript{132}

**Other Wyandot Advocates and Practitioners**

Despite the paucity of records about individual Wyandot engagement with Protestantism, some fleeting references do emerge. One example was George Scott’s discussion with Long House, “one of the chiefs of the Wyandots.” Long House spent significant time with Scott, conversing through Northrop and expressing his thanks to Scott for “explain[ing] to them the scriptures, of which they were ignorant.” He also indicated that his people “had great need of instruction.”\textsuperscript{133} While Scott took this communication as a man potentially seeking a new religion, Long House may simply have been kind, or interested in learning more about Christianity from an intellectual rather than religious perspective.

A further example was the 1805 report by James Hughs that a man called Broken Legs, who had been a leading figure in the Wyandot religious society that met between missionary visits, delivered a long exhortation. In response to the influence of Handsome Lake, particularly the activities of an unnamed Wyandot woman in promoting his religion, Broken Legs called on the people to return to the true way that they had just heard from Hughs’ sermon. The alternative was “if we go on this way; God will stop us and take us away if we do not repent.”\textsuperscript{134} This prompted “a number” to form a circle and sing a hymn they had memorized.
Another individual mentioned specifically in the record was a woman Badger called “a Jew.” Her appearance in the record increased after Badger treated her for sickness in May 1807. Her condition was so dire that Badger had to “attend on the Jew three or four times a day, and watch with her one night with Samuel our interpreter.” After her recovery, she came to the mission to “get her hoe ground, and get some milk.” She wept openly during service that day. Other individuals appear in the record, but few are named. Following one meeting, a Wyandot man named Taynbonca, “addressed the assembly to consider at length in his own language upon the importance of this attending to the Gospel which was offered to them.” He later gave Atkins a large cut of deer meat from a recent kill.

More frequently, general references to groups of Wyandots pepper the missionary record. Often, missionaries emphasized how attentive audiences were to their sermons. A typical example appears in George Scott’s 1803 journal, where he noted after a sermon that “there was a solemn attention given during the discourse, and I thought some appeared feeling.” Of course, Scott’s reading of his audience could be questionable, and certainly is based on his particular perspective from the pulpit. As was often noted about the Wyandots and most other Native people of this region, the audience may simply have been courteous in allowing the missionary to deliver his speech.

Attaching spiritual significance to these frequent displays of courtesy is difficult, both for modern observers and the missionaries themselves. Despite these difficulties, numbers of regular attendees during worship may also indicate degrees of interest in, or even adherence to, Presbyterianism. Generally, Wyandots attended summer and fall
meetings in greater numbers than in the winter or spring due to their residence near the mission in Lower Sandusky. In the winter months – the time of the hunt – few remained in town. Atkins, who was more diligent in his accounting of Wyandot attendance than Badger and other missionaries, asserts that on many Sabbaths all who remained in the village in the winter (5-30 individuals) attended services. During the summer, attendance tended to be higher, with upwards of 100 in attendance.\textsuperscript{139} Other vague outlines of Wyandot engagement with Protestantism offer possibilities of spiritual adherence.

Reports such as that of a group of Wyandot hunters in winter camp on the Scioto engaged in Christian prayer, outside of the gaze of the missionary, are tantalizing, but ultimately inconclusive.\textsuperscript{140}

**The End of the Mission**

Despite the clear interest of some Wyandots in the mission, and the missionary hope that the mission was beginning to take root, the Presbyterian mission foundered. In 1810, Badger left the Sandusky for good, citing fatigue among other factors. With his exit, the mission continued briefly under a series of short-term missionaries. There were some signs of success. An 1811 missionary visit indicated “the School was still in a promosing [sic] condition, that the farm has been pretty well attended to the last Season.”\textsuperscript{141} Ultimately, while Badger’s exit was a blow, the major problem the mission ultimately faced was the onset of the War of 1812, which disrupted Wyandot society and lifestyles for several years, creating a form of civil war pitting Wyandots against each other in the process. The last significant gasp of the Presbyterian missionaries on the
Sandusky was a February 1811 petition to Congress, calling on the federal government to grant the request of Moses Byxbe of Delaware, Ohio, to erect a grist mill adjacent to the mission at Lower Sandusky, citing the “great difficulty in procuring bread for the support of said mission, from the want of a mill near the missionary station” as a rationale.\textsuperscript{142}

The apprehension about a war between the United States and Great Britain absorbed so much attention, from Wyandot and missionary alike; the school fell by the wayside. With the outbreak of war in the region, especially the fall of Detroit in October 1812, the Presbyterian mission dissolved.\textsuperscript{143}

**Conclusion**

What can we make of the Wyandot-missionary contact of the early 1800s? Clearly, the Wyandots exerted a high degree of control over their engagement with the mission. While they could not dictate which missionaries decided to contact them in the first place, the decision to establish a permanent mission was ultimately made by the Wyandots. The level of engagement with that mission when established was left to the individuals in the community. Some chose to participate in extra-spiritual ways, some to engage spiritually with Presbyterianism, and some to ignore or even oppose the mission. The mission on the Sandusky was based on voluntary participation, and the missionaries had no power to compel obedience. The continued presence of traditional practices, along with the flirtation of some Wyandots with Handsome Lake and Tenskwatawa’s religions, demonstrates the flexibility of early 1800s Indian country in Ohio. The presence of Presbyterianism was one of several alternatives in the Wyandot spiritual world, but an
important one. While this situation changed after the War of 1812, the first decade of the nineteenth century represents an exploratory period for the Wyandots, when multiple spiritual possibilities cohabitated the same ground, and often the same bodies.

But what lasting impact did the first Protestant mission to the Wyandots have within the Wyandot community. Ferreting out specific numbers of converts, or defining the “authenticity” of practitioners, is not possible. With so few individuals emerging from the record, and such slipshod numerical accounting, it is not possible to clearly identify the depths of Christian attachment among large segments of the Wyandot community.

One thing that is clear is that Wyandot people gained sustained exposure to Protestantism, with some developing ties to the mission. Another clear point is that Barnet was firmly attached to Protestant Christianity. When he died, the mission lost its most important convert. Badger noted in his memoir that Barnet “died in the fall of 1812, and from the best information I could get, he supported his christian [sic] character to the last.” From Badger’s perspective, Barnet was the only truly converted Wyandot. Though some “were attentive to religious instruction, and were reformed in their habits,” none but Barnet had shown “conclusive evidence of a change of heart.”

If the longest standing missionary only claimed one “true convert,” then was the mission a failure? Or were his standards different from those of the Wyandots themselves, where elements of the mission program (whether they be material, spiritual, or simply regularly attending services) could plausibly be adopted and adapted without “truly” converting in the eyes of the Presbyterians? When considered in these terms, the mission had more impact on the Wyandot people. The fact that Protestantism only grew
stronger and more widespread among the Wyandots after the war also lends support to
the notion that the Presbyterian mission, while not accomplishing the goals of the
missionaries, served to establish the early bedrock of Wyandot Protestantism that had a
profound influence on large numbers of Wyandot people. Indeed, a new tradition had
begun to take shape.
“You say the Great Spirit loves all, white, red, and black men, that do right. Why do you, then, look at Indians as below you, and treat them as if they were not brothers? Does your good Book tell you so? I am sure it does not. Now, brothers, let us all do right; then our great Father will be pleased, and make us happy in this world, and after death we shall all live together in his house above, and always be happy.” -Mononcue, 1819

Introduction

Following in the wake of the Presbyterian mission in the early years of the 1800s, Wyandot Christianity experienced years of disruption. As the War of 1812 began, missionary activity came to an end. Most of the Sandusky Wyandots underwent a forced relocation to southwest Ohio as their homeland became a militarized zone. By 1813, the Wyandots agreed with the United States to send warriors into the field as allies of the Americans, serving under William Henry Harrison’s command. As the war in the west rapidly shifted in favor of the United States, Wyandot leaders like Tarhe and Between-the-Logs became instrumental in bringing many Native Americans back into a peaceful relationship with the United States.\(^2\) When the war ended, the Wyandots re-established themselves on the Sandusky, resuming their agricultural and hunting activities. Despite their alliance with the Americans, however, pressures to cede more land amplified after the war, as Americans no longer viewed Native Americans in the region as military threats. As a consequence, the Wyandots and other peoples in northwest Ohio ceded most of their land in the late 1810s, retaining small reservations.\(^3\) For the Wyandot, their major reservation, called the “Grand Reserve,” encompassed the Sandusky River country around Upper Sandusky. The Wyandot also had a smaller reservation at Big Spring.
Despite the disruption of the war and treaty negotiations, Wyandot engagement with Protestantism had only just begun. This chapter considers the establishment of a permanent mission to the Wyandots, beginning with the activities of a lone preacher acting on his own initiative. By the early 1820s, the Methodist Episcopal Church established their authority over the mission, bringing missionaries and material goods with them. As Methodism began among the Wyandot, a small but growing core of Wyandots saw various reasons to affiliate with the church, beginning a relationship that would only grow and change over time. This chapter examines the early establishment of the mission, the relationship the Wyandots maintained with the mission, and the uses they perceived in the establishment of Wyandot Methodism.

The Arrival of John Stewart

As the Wyandots were considering U.S. government pressure for land cessions in late 1816 and early 1817, a missionary named John Stewart arrived among them. Stewart, described variously as an Afro-Indian or a mulatto from Virginia, had recently converted to Methodism at a camp meeting in Marietta, Ohio. Stewart’s story parallels the conversion narratives which were common for Methodist converts. After his initial conversion, Stewart lapsed back into his old ways of drunkenness and sin. Stewart finally reached an epiphany and felt a calling from God to travel to the frontier and spread Methodism to the Ohio Indians. After a brief stop at a small Delaware village, Stewart made his way to Upper Sandusky in November 1816. Although William Walker, Sr. initially thought that Stewart was a runaway slave,
Stewart assuaged his apprehension after conveying his conversion story. Walker then introduced Stewart to Jonathan Pointer. Pointer, a black man whom the Wyandots captured as a boy, was fluent in Wyandot. Stewart solicited his aid as interpreter, though Pointer was initially hesitant to aid Stewart and did not believe in his cause. Initially, Stewart found the Wyandots less than receptive to his preaching, though they seem to have immediately taken a liking to his singing. After overcoming accusations that he was a runaway slave levied by some of the white traders on the Sandusky, Stewart commenced his efforts to convert the Wyandots away from traditional religious practices and towards the Methodist faith, though some of the Euroamerican traders continued to hamper him with accusations that he was a runaway slave.

It is interesting to consider the implications of the partnership between Stewart and Pointer, both black men with deep Indian connections. Stewart claimed to have both African and Indian ancestry, though he never specified a particular tribe or community of origin. This heritage was part of the motivation to seek out a promising Indian community to spread his religious message. It is also reasonable to attribute his choice to the fact that the largely white audiences of southern Ohio were unlikely to accept an African-American preacher, particularly one who was not licensed. Pointer, whom the Wyandots had adopted at a young age, was fluent in Wyandot as well as English, though he was apparently illiterate. He had served informally as a local interpreter for the Wyandots, but adopted whites like Robert Armstrong, William Walker, Sr., and Isaac Williams were the men that the U.S.
government consistently turned to for such services in official capacities. Though Walker was a proficient writer, neither Armstrong nor Williams could write. Whether government officials preferred them to Pointer on the basis of American definitions of race or because Pointer was allegedly a contemptible leech is unclear. However, one can logically consider his service to Stewart an elevation in his status as an interpreter. Whether this service led to a more prestigious position in the Wyandot community is not self-evident, though Pointer is certainly a more visible presence in the written record after 1816. It is also interesting that Walker and other Wyandots directed him to seek Pointer’s assistance in lieu of other interpreters. It could very well have been due to the perceived racial connections between the two men, or because Stewart’s mission was considered relatively unimportant in the grand scheme or Wyandot life. Regardless, it is significant to note that the mission that would become the flagship of Methodist missionary efforts hinged on the efforts of two African-indigenous men.

**Wyandot Christian Legacies**

The Wyandots on the Sandusky were no strangers to Christianity. Roman Catholic priests had traveled among them since before their Huron ancestors were dispersed by the Iroquois in the seventeenth century. The Wyandots still had some contact with Roman Catholics when they visited their brethren in Michigan and Canada, though there is no record of any white Catholic presence at Sandusky after the American Revolution. As discussed in chapter one, in the two decades before the
War of 1812, the Quakers had sporadically sent missionaries to the Wyandots, while the Presbyterians had established a mission there for several years under the direction of Joseph Badger. During the War of 1812, however, the Presbyterians were forced to abandon their missionary efforts and did not renew them at war’s end. Despite the lapse of the mission, some of the Wyandots appear to have retained some Christian beliefs.

**Religious Contentions**

Stewart found himself challenging traditional modes of spirituality early in his mission. Stewart decided to attack these indigenous modes of worship boldly and directly. When Stewart raised objections to traditional feasts, dances, and beliefs in witchcraft, he faced hostility from many of the Wyandots. John Hicks and Mononcue, two of the chiefs, raised objections to Stewart’s denigration of traditional religion. Hicks felt compelled to “rise in defence of the religion of my fathers; --a system of religion the Great Spirit has given his red children.” The Wyandots appreciated Stewart’s intention to help them give up alcohol and to educate them about whites. But they were not willing to “have the customs and institutions which have been kept sacred by our Fathers, thus assailed and abused.”

Mononcue echoed Hicks’ sentiments, contending that the Bible had been written for the benefit of white men, not Indians. The white God “never intended that they [Indians] should be instructed out a book, a thing which properly belongs to those who made it and can understand what it says...Ours is a religion that suits us red people, and we intend to keep and
preserve it sacred among us, believing that the Great Spirit gave it to our grandfathers in ancient days.”13

This sort of resistance would become the norm for Stewart and those missionaries who followed him. Many of the Wyandots believed that the white man’s religion was not meant for them, and a majority were unwilling to abandon traditional feasts and religious rites, despite the pressure Stewart and his successors applied to do so.14 Although many Wyandots like John Hicks and Mononcue disagreed with Stewart’s preaching, Hicks did admit that the traditional Wyandots were “willing to receive good advice from you.”15 This sentiment seems to have been common among the non-Christian Wyandots, who were willing to use the missionaries for “good advice” or possible material or educational gain while refusing to join the Methodist faith. Missionaries could be useful links to the outside world, even if their religion held no appeal.

In addition to combating traditional spiritual practices and beliefs, Stewart attempted to wipe away the Catholicism that some Wyandots openly expressed. Many of the early attendees at Stewart’s sermons began to sing Catholic songs, carry old family rosaries, and pray to the Virgin Mary. Stewart objected to these Catholic traditions, raising the ire of some of these potential converts. As James B. Finley recounted, some of Stewart’s audience, while on business in Detroit, consulted the Catholic priest there, who told them that “‘none had the true word of God, or Bible, but the Catholics.’”16 Many of these Catholic Wyandots accused Stewart of leading them astray and perhaps preaching from the wrong Bible. Ultimately, they consulted
William Walker, Sr., who assured them that Stewart was using the correct Bible and a suitable Christian hymn book. Finley credits William Walker’s wife Catherine, a mixed-blood who was an early convert to Methodism, as “influential in putting down the superstitions of the Catholics.”

Due in part to the Walkers’ efforts, many of the Catholic Wyandots appear to have abandoned (at least openly) Catholic ritual and returned to Stewart’s prayer meetings.

**Early Methodist Conversions**

Though indigenous adoption of Methodism proceeded slowly, Stewart did manage to win over several influential Wyandots in his first two years of labor among the Indians. One of the earliest, and likely the most important for the early history of the mission, was one of the principal speakers of the tribe, a middle-aged chief named Between-the-Logs. During these early years of Methodist activity at Upper Sandusky, Between-the-Logs became the primary mouthpiece of the Christian faction, speaking at nearly every recorded Methodist gathering and prayer meeting. Stewart also managed to appeal to some traditionalists during his first years at Upper Sandusky, such as his early critics Mononcue and John Hicks. Mononcue revealed the struggle between traditional practices and Stewart’s preaching when he privately told Hicks that “‘I begin to feel somewhat inclined to abandon a good many of our Indian customs, but I cannot agree to give up painting my face...inasmuch as ceasing to paint will be jeopardizing my health.’” Hicks admitted that “‘I hardly know what to do.’”

The spiritual tension both men expressed was a common bond among those
indigenous persons who contemplated different and, in some ways, incompatible visions of the supernatural. Eventually, both would become stalwarts of the Christian faction.

While the importance of securing leading male converts is emphasized (perhaps overemphasized) in the missionary record, the significance of female conversion to Methodism as a key contributing factor in the larger group conversion experience of the Wyandots should not be underestimated. At a quarterly Methodist meeting at Zanesfield in November 1819, about sixty Wyandots made the lengthy trip to discuss Stewart’s mission. During the meeting, Between-the-Logs delivered a history of religion among the Wyandots. He admitted that the Wyandots had treated Stewart “ill, and gave him but little to eat, and trampled on him, and were jealous of him for a whole year.” When Stewart decided to leave the Sandusky briefly in 1817, Between-the-Logs said “our squaws told us that we were fools to let him go, for the great God had sent him, and we ought to adopt him.” The female Wyandot converts then “told us what God had done for them by this man.” The men decided to hear Stewart preach again, and “the Great Spirit came upon us so that some cried aloud, some clapped their hands, some ran away, and some were angry.” The urging of the female Wyandots bore fruit among some of the men and political leaders after that meeting, for “we were convinced that God had sent him unto us; and then we adopted him, and gave him mother and children.”

The Wyandots reconfirmed the power of females in their decision to adopt Methodism again the next year. At the end of 1820 the Wyandots invited Reverend
James B. Finley to meet with them at Negrotown, an African-American settlement a few miles west of Upper Sandusky. The subject of the discussion was the establishment of a permanent Methodist mission to the Wyandots. Mononcue delivered a speech on behalf of the whole, and initiated the talk by giving the answer of the “queens” of the tribe. The women stated that they “want him [Finley] to keep coming and never forsake us; and we let him know that we love this religion too well to give it up while we live; for we think it will go bad with our people if they quit this religion.” They further emphasized their desire that Stewart would remain among them, “and our brother Jonathan [Pointer], too, and to help us along as they have done.”22 The male members of the counsel concurred with their female counterparts. Females clearly wielded significant power and influence over the process of Wyandot conversion and succoured Stewart’s mission in its infancy, despite their comparatively poor representation in the written accounts of the mission.

**Wyandot Resistance to Stewart’s Message**

Despite the apparent inroads that Stewart’s preaching had made, the vast majority of Wyandots, including many of his converts, continued to engage in traditional feasts and dances. Stewart attended a feast in early 1817 in which even his most fervent supporters participated. Stewart began to doubt the efficacy of his ministry and decided to leave the Wyandots for several months in 1817. Upon his return, he found that some of his converts had reverted to non-Christian custom, but some had continued to follow his teachings in his absence. While Stewart continued
to gather followers one or two at a time, traditionalists continued to challenge his efforts. The most vigorous opponent of Christianity for Stewart, and later for James B. Finley, was a chief named Bloody Eyes (also called Two Logs), who was also the brother of Between-the-Logs. Bloody Eyes not only objected to Christianity, but to the fact that a black man was preaching to the Indians. He said that blacks were “‘created by the Evil Spirit’” and that Indians should not lower themselves to listen to an African-American preacher.23 It is evident that local whites, especially the whiskey traders Stewart criticized, contributed to this attitude in an attempt to prevent Stewart from preaching against alcoholic consumption. The non-Christian Wyandots and many neighboring white people continued to use Stewart’s race as a reason to critique his religious efforts for the remainder of his life.

**Christian “Competition”**

As Stewart’s mission began to bear fruit, other missionaries visited Sandusky to preach and offer assistance to the Wyandots as well. In an undated narrative, likely from mid-1818, which appeared in a Connecticut newspaper in January 1819, Henry George, a missionary appointed by the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions, traveled to Sandusky to preach to the Wyandots and praised Stewart’s work. Another Baptist missionary, Alvin Coe, visited the Wyandots in November 1818 with George. Coe recorded the religious testimonials of several Wyandot men and women, including the chiefs Peacock, Bloody Eyes (interestingly the chief opponent of Stewart), and Between-the-Logs. Most testified that they had experienced the true word of God, and
Peacock thanked the Baptists for coming to preach to them. The Baptists re-appointed George to serve “for three full months, a missionary among the Wyandott and Sandusky Indians.” George fulfilled his appointment to complete satisfaction, “but several considerations induced the board to discontinue the station.” The major consideration was the unwillingness of the Baptists to commit a full-time missionary to the Wyandots, and “mere visits to the Indians promised much less success than the residence of a missionary among them.”

The Society of Friends, longtime visitors to the Sandusky Indian communities, continued to express concern for the Wyandots, writing to and visiting Secretary of War John C. Calhoun to discuss the future of the Ohio Indians. They urged Calhoun to resist the efforts to remove the Indians of Ohio, which had steadily gained proponents in Washington after the War of 1812. If removed from the locus of white civilization, they warned that the Wyandots might lapse back into paganism. The Society of Friends even proposed the establishment of a Quaker school at Upper Sandusky in February 1820, pre-empting the proposed Methodist school discussed below. The Quaker school never materialized, though Calhoun continued to highlight the insignificant Quaker missionary activities on the Grand Reserve. This visitation of and interest in the Wyandots (the Methodists would say interference) from other denominations continued into the early 1820s. In his 1821 mission report to the Ohio Annual Conference in Lebanon, Moses Henkle, a Methodist missionary who worked with Stewart, lamented that “two Presbyterian Preachers were with the Indians & told them the Methodists had promised them a school & had not started it
they (the Indians) would most probably be deceived by the Methodists, & advised them to suffer them [the Presbyterians] to erect a school & it should immediately be done.”

Henkle’s great fear was that another sect would convince the Wyandots to dismiss him and Stewart and replace them with other missionaries who promised to deliver more immediate benefits. These fears might have been well-founded if other missionaries could have followed through, but there is no indication that any other sect managed to do more than pay lip service to the Wyandots.

The Wyandots themselves certainly took note of the increased missionary activity on the Sandusky after Stewart began his work. Between-the-Logs, in his discussion of the history of religion among the Wyandots, noted that “as soon as this work was among us at Sandusky, almost every week some preachers would come and tell us they loved us, and would take us and our preacher [Stewart] under their care, and give us schools, and do all for us that we wished.” Between-the-Logs wryly added that “now they said they cared much for us; but before Stewart came, they cared nothing for us.”

The Wyandots did not approve of the demeanor of the new visitors either, since they scolded and upbraided them without any visible commitment to their salvation. The Wyandots also rejected the lamentations of some of the local Wyandot-speaking white people who told them that the Methodists were tools of the devil who had bewitched them. These naysayers even hearkened back to the massacre of the Moravian Delawares during the American Revolution and argued that the Methodists “want to get you tamed, and then kill you, as they did the Moravian Indians on the Tuscarawas river.” Both the overtures by other religious
denominations and the warnings espoused by some local whites would have some impact on the community, especially those who rejected Stewart and/or Christianity, but they did not persuade the Wyandots to expel Stewart’s nascent mission or accept an alternative denomination. Thus, the door was open that allowed the Methodists to develop a full-fledged mission on the Sandusky.  

Enter the Methodist Episcopal Church

Coinciding with these multi-denominalional visitations to Upper Sandusky, the Methodist Episcopal Church finally heeded Stewart’s inroads into the Wyandot community. Stewart, though a Methodist, was neither an official missionary nor a licensed preacher when he arrived at Sandusky. He did receive a preaching license in 1818 at the behest of nearby white preachers who approved of his efforts and character, but the Methodist church proper did not take an active interest in the mission until 1819. Beginning in 1819, Wyandots began appearing at camp meetings in Northwest Ohio in significant numbers. Their presence and apparent piety impressed many white observers, prompting one to write: “O father- it would no doubt have melted and enraptured your soul, to have seen their sable faces bathed in tears of penitence and gratitude, piety depicted in their countenances, and love and joy sparkling in their eyes.” Discounting the racialized language of the author, this widely-published letter and word-of-mouth information about the Wyandot exposure to Methodism spread rapidly throughout Ohio Methodist channels. The governing apparatus could no longer overlook the Wyandots, and some saw the Sandusky as an
ideal proving ground for their missionary impulse. Therefore, at the 1819 meeting of the Ohio Conference, the Methodists appointed James Montgomery to travel to the Sandusky to be the denomination’s first-ever sanctioned Indian missionary. The Methodist leadership did not ignore the first missionary, however, as they also approved the “employ [of] John Stewart, a man of colour to cooperate with Brother Montgomery on his mission.” Of course, it is reasonable to read the appointment of a white minister to the post as supplanting the position of Stewart, which it did in part. However, Stewart was not able to manage the mission alone due to complications with tuberculosis, a disease which eventually caused his early death.

The Appeal of Methodism

One of the important questions about the relationships of Wyandots and missionaries is simply: why did the Wyandots gravitate towards Methodism? One obvious answer is that the Wyandots had already forged a relationship with Stewart, and the Methodists were able to take advantage of his individual efforts and seized upon the opportunity to adopt (or co-opt) his nascent mission. From the Wyandot perspective, the Methodists made the most significant and sustained contact at Upper Sandusky after the war, and offered the best opportunity for meaningful contact. Aside from sheer opportunism on both parties’ parts, the nature of Methodism and Methodist practices in the early 19th century held more appeal for Wyandots (and Indians generally) than other denominations. Methodists built their followings and reputations along the American frontier by an emphasis on ministerial charisma and
oration as opposed to liturgy or learned sermons.\textsuperscript{37} The personalities and, indeed, the
teatrics of Methodist ministers drew interest from ordinary Americans, even those
who had little knowledge of English. Methodists also did not consider reading
essential to worship. In fact, a number of frontier preachers were barely literate or
even illiterate. Religious enthusiasm, emotion and the ability to connect with
worshippers on a personal level were of higher value in the early church. As Karim
M. Tiro argues in his excellent study of William Apess’ ties to Methodism, “the
ability to elicit the desired reaction from the audience became the ultimate criterion of
authority.”\textsuperscript{38}

The group nature of Methodist worship, which typically relied on community
practices such as love feasts, camp meetings, and weekly class meetings, encouraged
individual oral communication of such events as conversion experiences, struggles to
maintain a good Christian lifestyle, and appeals to the group to maintain moral order.
The community and communal aspects of Methodism were particularly appealing in
early Ohio, where white communities tended to be dispersed and religion represented
a significant unifying force in their lives.\textsuperscript{39} Communal decision-making and activity
of this type meshed very well with the communal nature of most public practices
among the Wyandots. The heavy reliance on singing hymns also held broad appeal
for the Wyandots, who responded much more quickly and enthusiastically to songs
than to preaching. Numerous visitors to the mission took note of the Wyandot zeal for
singing hymns, several of which the interpreters had translated into Wyandot very
early in the mission process. Methodism also tended to appeal to lower and middle-
class Americans rather than the upper classes; drawing core followers from different socio-economical groups than most of their competitors, particularly the Congregationalists and Presbyterians. Therefore, preachers were both more accepting of different types of adherents and accustomed to preaching in a variety of environments and occasionally extreme conditions. The Arminian nature of Methodism, with an emphasis on very personal forms of salvation, direct revelation from God, and the rejection of religious predestination, also allowed adherents to exercise a high degree of personal control of their own spirituality. Direct revelation is a particularly important aspect of the potential linkages between Methodists and Wyandots. Many early Methodists gave great credence to dreams and other forms of unconscious communication with God, taking these supernatural forms of direct revelation quite seriously. As John Wigger has stated, “a great many early Methodists believed in the efficacy of prophetic dreams, visions, and supernatural impressions and were not afraid to base day-to-day decisions on such phenomena.”

Perhaps the most compelling reason the Wyandots chose Methodism was the history and reputation of the Methodists, who many regarded as more inclusive of women and non-whites than most other denominations. Not only did they allow people like Native Americans and African Americans to become members, they also provided for a modicum of non-white leadership in the lower church apparatus. The
Methodist missionaries made efforts to give the Wyandots positions of authority within the mission, though they were positions of less power than the missionary himself wielded. Additionally, the Wyandots would have the opportunity to serve their own and other indigenous communities by becoming ordained ministers and missionaries. This possibility was intriguing for both parties. For the Wyandots, as for other Native Americans, “the organizational structure of the Methodist church offered responsibility-and, by implication, authority-as class leaders, exhorters, and preachers, to individuals who were denied any active role in conservative churches by virtue of their lack of education and social standing, if not their race.” The power to indigenize Christianity in this way was virtually unique to Methodist Indians. The white Methodist leadership recognized the advantages that a Native missionary would have among indigenous populations in terms of language and cultural connections. All of these combined factors encouraged the relationship between the Wyandots and the Methodists.

**The Establishment of a Mission**

From 1819 on, the Ohio Conference appointed missionaries to serve one year terms in service to Upper Sandusky. The first missionaries were only expected to attend to the mission every fourth week, meaning that the missionary would spend no more than one or two Sabbaths preaching to the Wyandots. Stewart remained the only permanent fixture on the reservation, and both parties immediately contemplated a more extensive relationship. At a mid-1820 Ohio Conference quarterly meeting,
several Wyandot chiefs arrived to discuss the prospects of establishing a permanent mission at Upper Sandusky. While these chiefs were interested in the mission, the aforementioned lamentations against the Methodists were having some effect in the non-Christian community. Between-the-Logs admitted that “we ourselves have full confidence in you, but some of our people have become uneasy; for certain white men tell them you keep a large book, and in it you charge us for all you are now doing; by and by, you will come and take away our land.” Assurances that no such charges would be asked assuaged many of the Wyandots, though these charges of chicanery continued to plague the mission for many years. The Methodist ministers agreed to further support the mission, promising to continue sending an itenerant preacher. They also “charge[ed] your good and faithfull [sic] teacher John Stewart to remain among you & be your constant & stationed Preacher and helper...& desire your friend & brother Jonathan Pointer to stay & live among you & be your constant interpreter & Exhorter.” In July 1820, James B. Finley traveled to Upper Sandusky to ask the Wyandots “if you want them [the Methodist leadership] to keep sending you preachers any longer, to tell you the good word, or if you have any choice in preachers to come and teach you.” Mononcue, once an opponent of Christianity but now a convert, replied that “we want him [Finley] to keep coming and never forsake us.” The Christian Wyandots also wanted “brother Steward [Stewart] to stay always amongst us.” The Wyandots promised to “live in the right way...and we will try to make our head Chiefs and all our people better.” This comment is revealing of the divisions within the tribe. The head chief, Duonquod, and
the war chief, Warpole, were both staunch opponents of Christianity and did not participate in the establishment of the Methodist mission. The younger chiefs, for the most part, chose to support the mission. Despite these fissures, the Christian Wyandots continued to solicit the assistance of the Methodists for religious instruction and the promise of schooling. All told, the Christian faction of the tribe obtained three main categories of assistance from the Methodists: schools for their children, improved infrastructure and material assets obtained by the Methodist Missionary Society, and religious instruction and training.

**The Mission and Education**

Finley spearheaded the establishment of the mission school. John Stewart had sporadically educated a few children, but he had limited time and education for such an endeavor. Early in 1821, Bishop William McKendree wrote to Finley and agreed that “the School particularly deserves our most serious attention and utmost exertions.” The educational format should “not only teach the art of reading, but the rudiments of agriculture and husbandry.” A few months later, Enoch George, a leading Methodist from Baltimore, wrote to Finley to “encourage you to persevere in this Laudable undertaking.” At the August 1821 meeting of the Ohio Conference, the Wyandot chiefs submitted an address to the Methodists. The Wyandot chiefs stated:

We farther inform you that lately our council have resolved to admit a missionary school, to be established amongst us, at Upper Sandusky; and have selected a section of land for that purpose, at a place called Fort Meigs, where there is spring water and other conveniences; and all other necessary privileges that may be required for the furtherance of said school, shall be freely contributed, as far as our soil affords; Provided, the same
does not intrude on any former improvements made by our own people, which are not to be intruded upon. Moreover, we will endeavor to supply the school with scholars of our own nation sufficient to keep it in action; and we will admit children of our white friends who live amongst us.\(^{51}\)

The Wyandots not only asked for a school, but requested that the new teacher be a preacher who could “teach and baptize” the children. This is an interesting request because, along with Christian chiefs like John Hicks, Between-the-Logs, and Mononcue, the non-Christian head chief, Duonquod, was a signatory to the letter.\(^{52}\)

On the heels of this request, the Ohio Conference outlined the rules and regulations for the Wyandot mission Indian school and placed it under the leadership of Finley. The rules included provisions for raising funds and procuring goods, paying the superintendent of the school, and fostering cooperation with the Christian Wyandot leadership.\(^{53}\) Consequently, Finley traveled to Upper Sandusky in October, bringing along household goods and farming utensils, “to commence a Missionary School among the Wyandott Indians.” Initially, the school had fourteen children.\(^{54}\) By February of 1822, Finley reported that he was struggling to establish the school due to lack of space, not lack of interest, as some parents were “so anxious to have their children educated, that they did not feel willing to wait until I could be prepared to take them.”\(^{55}\) He emphasized the dire need for space, since he was “fully convinced that without suitable buildings we can do nothing with satisfaction or much success.”\(^{56}\) Finley placed a dozen children under the tutelage of Stewart and educated the rest himself. Once a permanent school was built, Finley was hopeful that fifty students would attend, constituting nearly half of the children at Upper Sandusky, as well as some children from Wyandot settlements near Detroit and on the River.
Canard in Canada. Finley and his assistants quickly erected a rude log building that served as the first home of the mission school.

Charles Elliott, the missionary assigned to teach the boys at the school from 1822-1823, benefitted from this new mission school building. When Elliott arrived in October, he had only four or five children at the school. In less than a month, the number grew to thirty-seven. Elliott found the children very industrious, sober of thought, and quite peaceful. The educational program at the school consisted of basic spelling, reading and writing for both boys and girls. Girls were also taught to “spin, sew, knit, weave, cook, and do all sorts of housework necessary for comfortable living.” Boys were taught to farm and received intense religious training, which would enable them “to instruct their parents and the other members of their respective families in the great doctrines of the Gospel.” Girls and boys both learned on the job. Girls, under the instruction of a young white female teacher, learned domestic skills while providing the food, some of the clothing, and cleaning for the mission school. Boys chopped wood, husked corn, and cared for livestock. Finley highlighted the role of industrious farm labor and the example that the missionaries themselves set when discussing the mission corn crop in an 1823 letter. In it he wrote: “we are now working it with all our might. I still am able to hoe my roe & help two little Indian boys that hoe on each side of me.”

Everyone lived at the mission house, which consisted of four large rooms, a kitchen, a mission family room, a girls bedroom, and a boys bedroom. Generally, the school seemed to run well during Elliott’s brief months at the Grand Reserve, but one
statement in particular is revealing of the power relationship between the mission and the Wyandots. When he first arrived, Elliott was unfamiliar with Indian customs of disciplining their children. Therefore, he was “peculiarly careful not to take any measure that might give umbrage to the nation in our first commencement; for this might raise such a prejudice against us as to render us entirely useless to them; nay, it might altogether destroy the school establishment among this people.” Unlike post-Civil War missions, the Methodist mission, while supported in a minimal financial way by the United States government, had very little in the way of power over their “flock.” If the Wyandots did not approve of the school or the mission for any reason, they could very easily abandon the Methodists with no major repercussions.

Judging by the Wyandot interest in the education program, the Christian Wyandots appear to have been well satisfied with the mission school. Between-the-Logs spoke on behalf of the Christian sect in January, 1823, in a letter Finley wrote to raise awareness of, and funds for, the mission school. Between-the-Logs mentioned that the Treaty at the Foot of the Rapids of the Miami included a proviso for a school, which:

many of the chiefs of our nation agreed that it was right, and that it was a subject on which we ought to think; to this, after consulting, we consented. But the government has not yet sent us a teacher. Brothers; you have; and we are glad and thankful the mission and school are in a prosperous way, and we think it will do us much good to come. The Wyandots had offers from other missionaries who promised to establish schools in the past, “but we always refused, expecting government would send us some which they promised to do, and which was most consistent with the wishes of our chiefs.” The Christian chiefs decided that the Methodists were good and would provide a
useful education for their children. The Wyandots’ willingness to send their children was readily apparent later that year, when Finley claimed that fifty children lived in and learned at the more substantial and recently-constructed mission house. By February 1824, the school appeared to be well established, especially with William Walker, Jr., a quarter-blood Wyandot from the prominent Walker family, established as the new boy’s schoolteacher. Finley now counted fifty-three students who were not only performing well in the classroom, but also in the fields, as the mission raised between two and three thousand bushels of corn, many vegetables, and produced one hundred-twenty yards of cloth.

Naming Practices at the Mission

A notable phenomenon that occurred at the Methodist school was the practice of assigning English names to the students. While it was common mission practice to give children with one name a Christian first name, a complete obliteration of Indian names was not as common. As Charles Elliott explained, “when they came to school, they were without English names, and their native names sounded so strange and so harsh, and were withal so long, that we found it necessary to give them names in our own language.” He thought that the Wyandot children “seemed considerably pleased” with this arrangement. Most were named after prominent Methodists such as Francis Asbury, Finley, Bishop McKendree, and Joshua Soule. Another method of naming was through sponsorship. Elliott records that on October 21, 1822, the (Christian) chiefs were assembled to select a boy and a girl who had been sponsored
by the Juvenile Finleyan Missionary Mite Society, a children’s group created to raise money and acquire goods for the mission. The children of two chiefs, John Hicks’ son and Mononcue’s daughter, were chosen and renamed Francis Asbury and Mary Fletcher. In two letters, Thomas Mason informed Finley that the Juvenile Finleyan Missionary Mite Society collected $100 to pay for four years of education for an Indian boy to be named John Summerfield. In another letter from Mason, the Juvenile Society sponsored a girl for four years to be named Hester Ann Rogers.

Interest in these renamed Indian children continued well after the initial purchase of naming rights. For example, Moses Hand asked Finley to “give our love to the Children and especially those who are immediately under the Patronage of the Juvenile Society of Baltimore.” Perhaps most strikingly, Bishop William McKendree took a keen interest in his namesake and personally provided “a Testament and suit of cloaths [sic] from William McKendree to the Indian boy that is named after him.” This practice of renaming children may seem benign on the surface; simply a matter of convenience for the missionaries or a means of raising funds for the mission. As evinced by the case of Hicks and Mononcue, some of the adult Indians were even complicit in this process. But the alteration of a personal identity signifier as essential as one’s name at such a young age must have had some impact on these children. They were already learning English and Christianity, in addition to their practical agricultural or domestic education. This naming process represents a key break between traditional and Christian life and a clear method of assimilation employed by the missionaries.
The Mission and Material Gain

While the educational program provided benefits for the Christian children of the nation, the Christian Wyandots as a whole experienced significant material gain from their association with the Methodist mission in the early 1820s, prompting more Wyandots to support the Methodists. Not surprisingly, as the visible material benefits arising from the missionary presence increased, church and school membership increased as well. Finley’s collection of personal letters is rife with correspondence from Methodists all over the United States who were purchasing goods and making clothing for the benefit of the Wyandot Mission. For example, Thomas Mason “sent a large box of clothing + bed clothing prepared by the Manager of the Methodist Female Missy. Society” of New York City. In an 1822 letter from John Davenport, items “bought by subscription” and forwarded to the mission included nine divine songbooks, two combs, thirty-four yards of velvet cloth, and needles and thimbles. Davenport continued to forward items purchased for the mission, including medicine and “considerable of Articles...for the Mission,” as well as a box of religious tracts from the Religious Tract Society of Baltimore. James Tawler gathered donations from Cincinnati, Dayton, and Xenia to forward to the mission, including such practical household items as four door handles, a coffee pot, and blankets; and food like dried apples, dried beef, and pieces of bacon. The donations also included useful implements for a practical education, including two kegs of nails, a bridle, and 2 sickles for boys to use in building and agricultural trades. Girls received scissors, four yards of calico, and four yards of cotton shirting. As this
was a religious endeavor, one worn Bible headed the list of goods.\textsuperscript{79} Nathan Emery of Worthington, Ohio, had been informed that “the Indians were in great want of potatoes to plant.” Emery’s parishioners raised forty or fifty bushels to send for the Wyandots’ use.\textsuperscript{80}

Some Methodists were also able to raise funds for the purchase of necessary items for the mission family and the Wyandot students. Martin Ruter, publisher for the Methodist Book Concern in Cincinnati, informed Finley that Methodists in Cincinnati had created a local Missionary Society for the aid of the Sandusky Mission. They had raised thirty dollars for Finley’s use. Additionally, a plow and chain had been purchased and sent for the Wyandot’s use. Less than one month later, the Missionary Society raised another twenty-eight dollars.\textsuperscript{81} Bishop William McKendree wrote Finley and listed over twenty individual donors who gave him a total of $58.30 for the mission. He additionally had drawn four hundred dollars from the Methodist accounts for use of the Wyandot mission.\textsuperscript{82} Greenberry R. Jones, a Methodist minister in West Union, Ohio, raised $115 by subscription for the mission.\textsuperscript{83}

James B. Finley compiled the most extensive list of donations made to the mission in an 1823 report about the Wyandot mission, which was distributed to Methodists around the country. In sum, the mission received $1672.21 in donations from a variety of sources. The majority of the funds ($1000) came from the New York Missionary Society, also called the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church.\textsuperscript{84} The rest of the funds came from a variety of ministers and
private donors from South Carolina, Virginia, North Carolina, and Ohio. Some donors were “sundry colored friends” from the south, a widow, and a “deaf and dumb man.” This money was used to buy necessary items for the mission, including a new wagon, axes, a spinning wheel, augers, chisels, a log chain, brick, hogs, and beef. A significant sum was required to pay for the missionary, teachers, laborers, and interpreters for the mission. In addition to monetary donations, the mission also received a variety of goods, some of which are referred to above, including bacon, pork, soap, and other necessary items. All told, this inventory provides a glimpse into the extent of funds and goods raised by the Methodists and how that money was spent for the benefit of the Wyandot school and practical training program.  

Many other Methodists attempted to raise money for the Mission, but had difficulty in the process. For example, Aaron Wood “inquired for bacon and found it scarce the People have parted with all the Pork they could spare to pay their debts.” Charles Thorn of the Granville circuit was only able to raise a small sum for the mission “on the account of the public Buildings going on in this circuit and the loss of Br. Whm. Cunningham’s two horses.” In addition to such practical concerns, some ministers, like James Tawler, found that their parishioners were opposed in principal to spending money to establish Indian missions. Tawler stated that: “mention Mission and the dogs of averice roar like bull dogs at an intruding villain on their masters treasures.” Despite these problems, it is clear that the Methodists were able to raise a great deal of money, goods, and good will for the mission. The Wyandots clearly benefited materially from the Methodist mission.
The other source of funds exploited by the mission came from the United States government. The Methodists founded their Missionary Society at precisely the moment when the federal government chose to allot $10,000 per annum for the “Civilization of the Indians.” These monies were to be used to fund philanthropic societies, especially religious bodies, who would further the federal government’s aim to assimilate the Indians into the American mainstream, particularly those who established schools for Indian children. The United States earmarked these monies to civilization programs they deemed appropriate, and the Methodists were keenly aware that they could tap into this funding source. Congressman John McLean, a Methodist himself, wrote Finley in February 1823, urging him to apply for money from the Civilization fund. The mission received $500 in 1823 and $800 more in 1824 for the benefit of the Wyandot students. These monies, coupled with the aforementioned donations from the Methodist Church and its members, represented a substantial outlay of funds on behalf of the Christian Wyandots.

Wyandot gains by virtue of the presence of the Methodist mission were not restricted to disposable assets alone. In March 1823, Indian subagent John Shaw reported that the Methodist mission had made or were in the process of making a variety of improvements to the Grand Reserve. Buildings included a 20x23 log meeting house and a 24x24 log building which served as a stable and hay house, both erected in 1821. A one and one-half story school/boarding house, 20x48 feet, which included four apartments, a stack of brick chimneys, which was nearly completed, and a planned 20x40 log building which would serve as a new schoolhouse for the
male students provided for the comfort of the students. Another building in the planning stages was a two story part-stone building which would serve “as a depository for the different article[s] of the dairy.” Additionally, the missionaries had already erected a smoke house, log barn, and log kitchen. All told, these buildings were valued at $1950, a rather substantial investment by the Methodist Missionary Society. In addition to structures, the Methodists had helped the Wyandots enclose one hundred-eighty acres of land with rail fences and clear and cultivate ten acres of bottom land. Livestock included three oxen, an unknown number of milk cows, and a number of young hogs. Finally, a number of farming implements, many likely coming from the donations discussed earlier, constituted another $261.50 in assets. All told, Shaw calculated that the mission possessed $2855.50 in assets. These mission assets clearly represented a significant outlay by the Methodists, who revealed their commitment to the Christian Wyandots through these investments. The final, and most lasting, construction project at the Methodist mission in these early years was the building of a limestone church, completed late in 1824. As mentioned previously, John C. Calhoun had personally met with Finley and authorized the payment of $1300 from Civilization Fund, most of which was used to pay for the church. The church became the most lasting monument to the Methodist mission and still stands at Upper Sandusky today. The most significant result of these material gains from the Wyandot perspective was that the Christians, especially the children at the school, had access to these resources, which often far outstripped those available under the auspices of the federal government. The only means of utilizing
these new assets was to cooperate with the Methodist missionaries and at least appear Christian.

**Wyandot Methodism as a Spiritual Phenomenon**

The last type of gain made by the Wyandots as a result of the establishment of the Methodist mission was the significant increase in Christian spirituality among them. Religion is impossible to quantify, and true conversion nearly impossible to determine. However, there are some clues indicative of the power of the Gospel among the Christian sect. Raw numbers of converts are probably not very reliable as a gauge of faith, because people could come and go freely from the church. Statistically speaking, the number of converts climbed from a handful in Stewart’s earliest missionary efforts to Elliott’s 1822 estimate of between sixty and seventy. By 1824, Finley claimed two-hundred sixty followers, but that number certainly includes Senecas, Mohawks, and Delawares living on or near the Grand Reserve and may well include Wyandots from outside the Grand Reserve. The relative strengths or weaknesses of individual faith cannot be discerned from such totals, but it is safe to say that the numbers of converts did grow from 1816-1824.

Another source of information available are the words of the Wyandots themselves. The writings of Finley, Elliott, and Mitchell are replete with examples of speeches and religious exhortations, most of them by a handful of Wyandot chiefs. The language and tone used in these speeches are generally duplicative and convey a fairly standard and rehearsed narrative format. All such speeches indicate that God
saved the speaker from sin, usually drinking and “heathen” customs, through the vehicle of Methodist missionaries. Once saved, the speaker was abundantly thankful for his (on rare occasions her) conversion. They used these experiences to convince others of the righteousness of Christianity in hopes of affirming the listener’s Christian values or to convince the non-Christian to repent and seek the word of God. These stock narratives are not especially revealing about the impact of Christianity, other than to affirm that some Wyandots told other Wyandots, other Indians, and non-Indians that they were saved.

Of course, the most interesting examination of faith may be among the children who lived, learned, and worked in the mission. It is quite difficult to gauge the faith of individual Wyandot children in the first years of the mission, since they left no notable written records in the period. The missionaries were also very vague about expressions of individual faith among the children. However, one tragic incident does to some degree demonstrate the impact of the Christian gospel on one child and her family. William Walker, Jr. wrote to Finley in his absence and had the unfortunate duty of informing him that “Death! Stern Death!! [sic] has robbed the Mission of one of its brightest ornaments!! [sic]” Hannah Armstrong, the daughter of the interpreter Robert Armstrong, died on April 19, 1824 of an unknown illness. Walker’s mother, present at the deathbed, informed him that during her final hours, the girl called to her father and told him “Oh papa I have been praying all the time, and all is well.”97 She repeated that “all is well now” and died soon thereafter. That Hannah spent her last
hours praying and offering condolence to her grieving father indicates the power of her faith in Christ. It was a faith she developed while a student at the mission school.

**Religion in Action**

Perhaps the best evidence of religious conversion and the impact of Methodism in the nascent stages of the Methodist mission is in the actions of those men about whom the missionaries chose to write. Again, the utility of such information is occluded, because actions do not equate to faith. Nor can we say how much influence the missionaries had on this process. In other words, it is difficult to know whose idea it was to attend meetings or write speeches. However, actions do indicate the willingness of the Christian Wyandots to travel to a variety of locales and spread their message. Ultimately, the Wyandots did not have to do anything to spread Christianity. The fact that some of them did is good evidence that they cared about their new faith and that they wanted the mission to succeed. In the process, these converts were able to demonstrate their faith to the missionary, their community, and the communities that they visited.

Several chiefs, including Mononcue, Scuteash, John Hicks, George Punch, and Peacock were regulars on these religious tours. The most visible and most recorded Wyandot speaker is Between-the-Logs, who became an indispensable member of the pro-Christian faction. On nearly every trip, Between-the-Logs was the primary speaker for the Indian party. He became in many ways the figurehead of the Christians, and was very likely the most famous Methodist Indian of his day judging
by the number of times he appeared in published letters and journals. The first noted appearance the Wyandots made was at an 1819 quarterly meeting of the Lebanon circuit. Sixty Indians, including Between-the-Logs, Mononcue, John Hicks, and Scuteash, attended. This total, which included Wyandots from Upper Sandusky and Solomon’s Town, also probably included a smattering of non-Wyandots as well. Finley mentioned that the Wyandots could already sing several hymns in English and displayed a solemn countenance. Between-the-Logs spoke to the assembled white audience, stating that “I am happy that we who have been so long time apart, and have been enemies to one another, are come together as brothers.” He also gave examples of the good works of God, including the washing away of sins like alcoholism. His sentiments were echoed and enhanced by Hicks, Scuteash, and the other principal speaker for the Christians, Mononcue. This pattern would repeat itself around the state and beyond, where these chiefs and a few others became itinerant evidence of the work of God among the “heathen.”

Over the next several years, the Wyandots continued to make public appearances, submit speeches and letters to spread the gospel, and to raise money for and awareness of their mission. The Methodist ministers, Finley in particular, made sure to publicize these meetings and addresses, often producing the full speeches that the chiefs orated. These translations can be considered fairly reliable since the translators present at the various meetings, Robert Armstrong, Jonathan Pointer, William Walker, Sr. and Jr., and Isaac Walker were all either Wyandots or adopted Wyandots who also were members of the mission church. In 1820, as mentioned
previously, the Wyandots submitted an address to the Ohio Conference asking that the mission continue at Upper Sandusky. The next year they made the request for a mission school discussed earlier. In July 1822, several Wyandots made an appearance at a camp meeting on the Delaware, Ohio circuit, where some white Ohioans encountered the Methodist Wyandots for the first time. The mere presence of these converts provided evidence to the public that the Gospel was indeed spreading to the Indians, and convinced some white doubters of the efficacy of religion among the Wyandots.\(^9\) That same year, Between-the-Logs, John Hicks, and Mononcue addressed the Ohio Conference at its annual meeting in Marietta.\(^1\) In 1823, the Wyandots attended another Delaware circuit camp meeting and the Ohio Conference once again.\(^2\) Their progress in adopting Christianity impressed Bishop William McKendree, who toured the Grand Reserve in June and remarked that “they manifest a relish for, and begin to enjoy the benefits of, civilization.”\(^3\) In 1824, Wyandot chiefs traveled once again to the Ohio Conference and addressed the Methodist leadership, while Reverend (later Bishop) John Soule toured the Grand Reserve late in the year, reporting the success of the school and church.\(^4\) These types of meetings, especially the annual Ohio Conferences, provided the Wyandots with the opportunity to solidify relations with the church leaders from around the state and to demonstrate the authenticity of their conversion. This encouraged the white Methodists to continue their support of the mission and school.
The Beginnings of Wyandot Missions to other Indians

Along with these encounters with white Methodists, the Wyandots also began to spread Methodism to other Indians.\textsuperscript{104} Several Wyandots became effective preachers in their own right, especially Between-the-Logs and Mononcue, who became Methodist exhorters, and a Wyandot named Squire Gray Eyes, who became “an itinerant missionary among the scattered settlements of the Wyandots, and some other Indian nations.”\textsuperscript{105} They also accompanied Finley on his own missionary excursions. For example, in 1822 Finley visited several neighboring tribes to preach. His companions and fellow orators were Between-the-Logs, Mononcue, and John Hicks. All spoke on behalf of Christianity, especially Between-the-Logs, who told the Senecas that “‘I thought it was my duty to come and show you this rich treasure- I mean the religion of Jesus Christ.’”\textsuperscript{106} In December 1823, Squire Gray Eyes, Mononcue, and Jonathan Pointer traveled through “the wilderness” with Finley on a tour of southern Michigan, preaching at places like Saginaw and Detroit to groups of Ottawa, Ojibwe, and Michigan and Canadian Wyandots.\textsuperscript{107} These tours may not have gained many converts initially, but the Wyandots did demonstrate a willingness to spread the gospel, even to audiences which could sometimes be hostile to Christians. These Christian exhorters and preachers became indispensable to Finley. He was “very unwilling to part with him and them so long, in consequence of their services in the Church,” when Between-the-Logs and some other Christian leaders left the Grand Reserve on an extended hunting trip. Between-the-Logs did go, but he led the hunters in their own church services every Sunday.\textsuperscript{108} William Walker, Jr. made note that as
soon as Between-the-Logs and his party returned to the reservation, “he sent word round to his neighbors to come to his house the next evening for the purpose of holding a prayer meeting.” At the meeting the returning Indians, including Between-the-Logs, James Harryhoot, and Summadowat, greeted their guests and exclaimed to all that “Altho [sic] I have been wandering and suffering a long time in the wilderness, yet I know I have not backslidden any.” Such personal testimonials of faith certainly indicate a high level of religious devotion and had an impact on the mission community.

**Shifting Traditions**

A final example of how some Wyandots demonstrated their faith in the early years of the mission is the fact that they were willing to part with traditional customs, even though they sometimes faced the wrath of the non-Christian faction. The most striking single illustration of this conflict between Christian and non-Christian is the story that Between-the-Logs told both Finley and Elliott about his near-death experience with his brother, Bloody Eyes (a.k.a. Two Logs). Bloody Eyes had “‘often endeavored to persuade me to quit this new religion, by all the arguments in his power, as he loved me much, and was anxious for my welfare.’” Between-the-Logs tried to convince his brother that Christianity had changed him for the better by allowing him to give up vices such as whiskey. In fact, he had killed his first wife in a drunken rage. When Between-the-Logs refused to relinquish Methodism, Bloody Eyes came to his brother’s house, threatening to kill him rather than see him give up
tradition. Taking his brother’s hair in one hand, his tomahawk in the other, Bloody Eyes threatened to strike. Rather than fighting, Between-the-Logs began to exhort God’s word to his brother. Defeated by the words of God, Bloody Eyes left and Between-the-Logs stated that “he has never molested me since.”\textsuperscript{111} While this account may seem a bit contrived, it does illustrate a broader problem with becoming a Christian. More than half of the Wyandots did not convert in this period, and to be Christian challenged traditional authority. As mentioned previously, the head chief until 1823, Duonquod, and the war chief (head chief after Duonquod’s death), Warpole, were traditionalists as well as the nominal leaders at the Grand Reserve.\textsuperscript{112} They consistently opposed the missionaries and the Christian Wyandots, appearing at prayer meetings in traditional garb and interrupting meetings completely from time to time. They also continued to hold feasts and athletic events in opposition to the missionary teachings. The polarization of the two groups was not total, but they did often divide on key issues. Perhaps the most dramatic, and well documented, example of the rift revolved around the removal of John Shaw as Indian sub-Agent in 1824.

**Missionary Interests v. Government Interests**

Initially, Shaw and the missionaries were exceedingly complimentary of each other, both in terms of personal character and professional conduct. Finley and Charles Elliott were both grateful to Shaw for his assistance and encouragement of the mission in the first few years of his employment. Shaw stated that he had:

\begin{quote}
never been so zealous as some others in my opinions of making Christians of the Indians by a great deal of Preaching; yet it must be conceded that the Methodists have made some rare
\end{quote}
conquests here, a number of dissipated and immoral Characters amongst the Wyandots have been reclaimed and are now quite respectable members of the Methodist Society.\textsuperscript{113}

In the same letter, Shaw praised Finley personally, calling him his friend.\textsuperscript{114} From Shaw’s arrival in 1820 until 1823, relations between the subagent and the missionary establishment seem to have been quite amicable. However, fissures developed in 1823, and they became public record soon thereafter.\textsuperscript{115}

By February 1824, complaints about Shaw made their way to John Johnston. Johnston reported that Robert Armstrong, one of the Wyandot interpreters, “gives it as his opinion that Mr. Shaw cannot be useful any longer to the Indians.”\textsuperscript{116} Johnston decided to travel to Upper Sandusky in March to investigate the charges, agreeable to the wishes of Shaw.\textsuperscript{117} Johnston determined that Shaw had acted “unwisely” and “lived unhappily with his wife, has had a fondness for his female servant, tho [sic] I believe he has not acted criminally with her.” The Christian Wyandots raised other objections to Shaw’s personal comportment, and Johnston felt that “on this ground they have great cause of complaint against Mr. Shaw for violating the Sabath [sic] and not countenancing them in their religious progress.”\textsuperscript{118} Despite these difficulties, Johnston hoped that Shaw and the Methodist Wyandots could compromise, deeming Shaw a generally honest man.\textsuperscript{119}

Shaw wrote to Cass and recounted his testimony in the hearing, arguing that he conducted the government’s business with due diligence and contending that the Wyandots wanted him to provide services and favors far beyond the purview of his office. He also alleged that an unrepresentative group was trying to get rid of him and that “two or three of the leading Chiefs [are] in the woods, and know nothing of this
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transaction, and of the Wyandot nation there is not one fourth of all the men at this investigation!"120 He further chalked the clamor for his dismissal up to the sale of an ox owned by the Wyandots, which Shaw had sold under the assumption that they wished it sold. Hicks, one of the Christian chiefs, later claimed that he never agreed to the sale and wanted to keep the ox himself. Shaw got the ox back, but not before Hicks and Mononcue, “two of the most zealous of the religious party led the van against me.” Shaw pointed the finger at the Methodists more generally for his troubles, accusing them of spying on him to find any little faults that they could exploit to foster his removal. Shaw, a member of the Society of Friends, accused the Methodists of religious discrimination, as he “was the only religious man not of their sect on the Reservation.” He had occasionally gone to Methodist meetings in the past “willing to encourage the Indians in doing well, but for the last six months I declined entirely.” He stopped going to the meetings because “the object seemed now to get me removed and the expression was used that they ‘wanted none but Methodists here.’”121 Despite the charges and investigation, Shaw stated that Hicks and Mononcue came to see him a few days after Johnston left and said they had no problems with his management of the mills or government properties, convincing Shaw that “they [the complaints] had been infused into the Indians improperly.”122 The only logical source in his mind was Finley, though he also felt that Robert Armstrong had been unfaithful to him.123
In response to the charges that Finley had unduly influenced the Wyandot prejudices against Shaw, John Johnston provided Finley with a letter clearing him of any wrongdoing in the case, stating that:

There was not any facts or circumstances developed, that could be construed in any degree, to implicate Mr. Finley or any of the persons belonging to the Mission. On the contrary, the most clear and satisfactory testimony was produced, to shew [sic] that Mr. Finley or the persons attached to the Mission, never interfered in any way whatever, to encourage the Indians in their opposition to Mr. Shaw.124

Despite the acquittal of wrongdoing from Johnston, it seems unlikely that Finley or those affiliated with the mission had no influence on the animosity between Shaw and the Wyandot leadership. William Walker, Jr., serving then as the teacher at the mission school, wrote Finley in May from Upper Sandusky while Finley was in Washington, D.C. to raise money and awareness for the mission. In the letter, Walker made note that “Warpole and his remaining sattalites [sic] have had a great dance— and a great ‘Wabanow’ it was too.”125 Walker informed Finley that he would “be astonished if I tell you that their Great dance was honored with the august presance [sic] of ‘Irimy[?]’ Broadbrim’ [Shaw].”126 Shaw “harangued the multitude, and brought into use all the eloquence his poor empty noddle [sic] was in possession of,” which Walker posited as a last-ditch effort to appeal to the pagan segment of the tribe and shore up his flagging leadership on the Grand Reserve. In addition to his distasteful association with the non-Christian Wyandots, Walker further detailed a dramatic fight between Shaw and Anna, his wife, culminating in “quite a scuffle” during which Shaw “choked her to make her promise to return and submit to his Royal Sovereign again.” When Anna refused, no Wyandots present would agree to help him, even a
religious leader among the non-Christians called “Nathan the Prophet.” The disdain Walker shows toward Shaw in the letter, and the frank way in which he outlines this disdain to Finley, indicates that the mission leadership were none too satisfied with Shaw’s conduct. To think that the missionary personnel, both Wyandot and white, did not express their dislike for Shaw in the community, at weekly class meetings, or in private discussions seems very unlikely.

Regardless of the sources of the accusations or the feelings of the Christians, relations seem to have improved briefly. By late May Isaac Walker, one of the government interpreters and brother of William Walker, Jr., wrote to Cass that the Wyandots “are now all perfectly satisfied with Mr. Shaw, several of them expressed regret that charges were ever made against him.” Even John Hicks, the principal critic a few months before, “said that he was perfectly reconciled with Mr. Shaw that at the investigation every bad feeling had been removed.” However, Shaw’s actions outlined in William Walker’s letter had infuriated James Finley, who determined to actively criticize Shaw to his superiors. Finley wrote to Cass to complain about Shaw’s attendance of the traditional feast, where he “gave them a Long talk [and] his presence had the effect [sic] of strengthening their [the non-Christian] cause.” Finley argued that Shaw’s actions had discouraged the Christian Wyandots, who thought that their “cause for which the[y] had been laboring for five or six years was about to Sink [and they] was very much discouraged.” Finley went to great pains in this lengthy letter to outline the successes of the mission; claiming that he had over 250 converts and that all but two of the chiefs were among them. Of these
two, one was “very old and unable to do business” and the other was Warpole, “the Worst man on the Reservation (I think believed so by all) a perfect Drunkerds [sic].” Warpole and his followers, a band of fools and drunks according to Finley, were gaining preferential treatment over the majority of the community. Finley also contended that Shaw was attempting to injure both his and the mission’s reputation among the nearby white communities, which could not help but have a detrimental affect on the mission. Finley urged Cass to remove Shaw and put the money to better use on more mechanics or useful implements for the Wyandots. Finally, he encouraged Cass to contact others who would corroborate his story, such as Robert Armstrong, James Rankin, or William Walker, Jr., all mixed-bloods and Christian. For Finley and his supporters in the community, there could no longer be a positive relationship with Shaw.

The leadership of the Indian Department further weakened Shaw’s position when Thomas McKenney, the first Commissioner of Indian Affairs, expounded upon the benefits of the religiously based education and civilization efforts among the Indians and ordered that “all agents bearing the authority of Govert. [sic] and whose personal connection is direct with the Indians, shou’d [sic] sanction & second this plan of renovating the morals & enlightening & improving these unfortunate people.”129 The government decided that the missionary movement must be supported and seconded by government agents, and the difficulties between the Methodists and Shaw could not be ignored. McKenney spoke directly to the turmoil at Upper Sandusky, contending that “the question is not which of the two is wrong, but
whether the Mission is impeded in any way, in the prosecution of its labours [sic]...by Mr. Shaw.” Ten days after McKenney’s circular letter, Secretary of War John C. Calhoun terminated Shaw’s duties effective at the end of August, deeming the continued presence of a subagent at Upper Sandusky unnecessary. Calhoun placed Finley in charge of the government properties on the Grand Reserve, deciding that a unification of the earthly and spiritual interests of the Wyandots would be the most effective means of executing the government’s duty to them. Calhoun also felt that by giving Finley the authority of the government on the Reservation, it “gives to the principals of these important missionary establishments an influence and standing among the Indians, which is fully merited by their exemplary zeal and conduct, and which cannot but produce beneficial consequences.”

**Conclusion**

By the end of 1824, the Methodist mission had made a great deal of headway at Upper Sandusky. The mission had erected a new church, and the school was near capacity. Finley was contemplating procuring a wool carding machine at the mission that would process both Wyandot and Euroamerican wool and provide a new source of income for the Wyandots. Both a grist mill and the sawmill, built with government funds resulting from land forfeitures, were now managed by James B. Finley. Goods and funds poured into the Wyandot Mission from Methodists around the country who eagerly followed the progress of the mission through the pages of The Methodist Magazine and numerous other religious periodicals. On the surface, it
might appear that the white Methodist missionaries and the Methodist Episcopal Church were the dominant power in this relationship. In some ways, they were. The Methodists controlled the mission purse strings, the school curriculum (the nominal approval of a board comprised of Wyandot chiefs aside), the influx of donated goods, and, after John Shaw’s dismissal, the duties of the sub agency as well. The Methodists themselves certainly were eager to credit their missionaries, and God of course, for the success of their mission. In fact, the Methodist success story at Upper Sandusky encouraged the Methodist church to further the efforts of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Missionary Society carried the gospel and a practical education to other “heathens” in the United States and elsewhere beginning in the early 1820s.

Despite the power that the Methodists did wield in this relationship, it would be highly inaccurate to presume that the Wyandots were powerless or passive in this bargain. It must be remembered that the Wyandots requested that the Methodists establish schools among them. Once the school was founded, the Wyandots voluntarily sent their children to attend. The missionaries had no way to compel the Wyandots to attend school, other than to convince parents that the school would do their children some good in the future. Statements by missionaries like Elliott demonstrate that they were aware of such a power relationship and were cautious to avoid offending or angering Wyandot parents. The Wyandots also, of course, chose whether or not to attend church and profess their faith. Finley himself admits that never more than half of the tribe joined the church during this era, leaving a huge
contingent of “heathen” Wyandots to continue a more traditional ceremonial life. Even among the Christian converts, it is reasonable to assume that some traditional practices and beliefs continued during this era, as evinced by Stewart’s experiences with his early converts. Such crossing over almost certainly went on during the early 1820s as well, though Finley for obvious reasons downplayed or ignored such “backsliding.” The Wyandots also made every effort to appear at various camp meetings and conferences to proclaim their true faith and the good that the missionaries were doing for their spiritual and educational well-being. While the missionaries encouraged these activities to prove that they were accomplishing good works among the Indians, the Wyandots were also looking out for their own interests. By appearing before the Methodists, the Wyandots were able to secure links to the wider Christian world and assure that the Methodist Church continued to take an interest in their well-being. And lastly, while faith cannot be quantified and is not provable, it would be unwise to write off these religious conversions as matters of convenience or done purely for educational gain. Some Wyandots appear to have gained a great deal of spiritual satisfaction from their conversion to Christianity. A few, like Between-the-Logs and Squire Gray Eyes, became Methodist exhorters and preachers themselves.

The Wyandots did have a great deal of influence over their relations with the Methodists. But this relationship came at a price, as some traditional practices certainly suffered. The Wyandots who became Christian appear to have given up many ceremonies and religious practices, at least openly. The naming practices that
missionaries used with their students is also an example of the Anglicization of the
Christian Wyandots. While there is no textual evidence to prove or disprove that these
children or their community used these names at home or privately, the fact that white
names were imposed on many Wyandot children and used at school and church must
have had some impact on their formation of personal identities. The final and most
obvious toll that the mission period took is that it created a dual community, divided
by faith and practice. Although this division did not boil over into civil warfare, it did
strain relations between the Christian and non-Christian factions. The story of
Between-the-Logs and his brother Bloody Eyes is reflective of the power of this
separation. Whether or not this move away from more traditional beliefs was good or
bad for the community is subject to one’s interpretation. The only certainty is that
things did change and would continue to do so as the missionary enterprise reached
maturation.
THREE: A MATURING WYANDOT MISSION

“There are a number of pious and established Christians in the Wyandott nation who are making progress in the divine life and who oppose sin in all its variety of forms.” – Russell Bigelow, 1828.

Introduction

Following the early years of the Methodist Mission, with the passing of the torch from John Stewart to the Methodist Episcopal Church, the arrival of James B. Finley, the decision of a significant number of Wyandot people to bind themselves to the mission, and the building of the stone church in 1824, the Wyandot Mission seemed on its way to a stable future. Indeed, over the next two decades, the Methodist Wyandots and the white Methodists forged a firm friendship, which I will argue yielded significant benefits for both parties. A symbiotic relationship developed, linking the Methodist missionary project to the success and failure of the Wyandots and, more importantly, linking the future of Protestant Christianity among the Wyandots to the success of the mission. More importantly, it is critical to examine, on a much deeper level, what meanings the mission had for those Wyandots who chose to participate in the missionary enterprise. Of particular import in this chapter is an examination of the increased leadership roles taken by Wyandots themselves, their (and their missionaries’) efforts to further publicize the mission in a variety of ways, and the evolution of the mission from a foreign, outside entity among the Wyandots (as it had been into the 1820s) into an institution that became a key thread woven into the fabric of the Upper Sandusky community. Rather than dwelling on considerations of convert “authenticity”, this chapter instead argues that a mission developed which was largely led and controlled by Wyandot people themselves,
many who began fully integrating concepts of being “Methodist” into their concepts of being “Wyandot.”

Glimpses of the Mission: James Finley and white Methodists

As is apparent in both chapter 2 and this chapter, James B. Finley devoted much of his time and attention to writing reports about the mission, both to the U.S. government and, more importantly and frequently, to the Protestant Christian reading public. Despite the frequency of information flowing from his pen, many Methodists from around the United States wanted more consistent, and more targeted, word of the doings of the Wyandots, particularly Wyandot children. The Baltimore Conference Missionary Society, for instance, wanted to know about the children at the school, as well as “the influence the mission has had with neighbouring [sic] Tribes.”2 The Philadelphia Conference Society made a similar request, specifically about information on the children at the school.3 The hunger for information about the Wyandots even led Finley to consider publishing a journal or newsletter from the Grand Reserve. He discussed the possibility with his brother John, who thought it both a good and feasible idea, particularly arguing that it would be a novel undertaking and give it pre-eminence over the other existing religious publications. He did think the initial expense would be significant, particularly as equipment and a journeyman printer would be needed. However, John Finley noted that some young Wyandots could learn the trade and take over the business, and that it would both encourage Wyandot literacy and provide an example other Native American communities might follow.4 The reports coming from the
mission certainly provided a vicarious means of living the missionary experience for those in far eastern cities. Two of the Philadelphia Society “fancied we were standing not far distant from your place of worship listening to the cry of Indian mourners, and the shouts of the pious” as they heard Finley’s report on the mission read to them. The message moved the Society to donate numerous pieces of clothing to the Wyandots, while also requesting that a Wyandot convert write all or part of a letter to them in Wyandot, with Finley giving the translation.\(^5\)

In 1827, the eighth annual report of the Missionary Society noted the successes of the previous year, but recounted two great negatives befalling the Wyandot mission. One was the poor health of James B. Finley, which forced him to resign his duties as missionary. The other was the death of Between-the-Logs. The Missionary Society noted for his early conversion to Methodism and his oratory abilities as “a most eloquent defender of Christianity in his native tongue.”\(^6\) The death of the most well-known and beloved Methodist Wyandot proved a newsworthy event, particularly the firm belief those who knew the man had that he had entered the Kingdom of Heaven with eyes open and soul converted.

Despite his retirement from the mission, Finley continued to receive word from others about the status of the enterprise. James McMahon reported on a quarterly meeting in February 1827, where a number of Wyandots who had “fallen off” renewed their faith, while others came for the first time. He also reported, however, that the school was “quite too large” to prosper. McMahon thought Finley was much needed at the mission, both for the school and for the Wyandot families who needed constant visits and consultations.
with a spiritual authority. A few weeks later, James Gilruth, the new missionary, wrote Finley about the activities at Upper Sandusky. He painted a picture of a well running school and farm, though he gave a rare glimpse of disharmony within the school. Jacob Young, one of the students, wanted to fight a schoolteacher for striking another student, William McKendree. Gilruth “gave him [Young] a good flogging [sic]”, and both boys were no longer enrolled in the school, which Gilruth interpreted as a positive outcome. Gilruth also refused to marry an unidentified man and woman because Finley had already married the woman to another man, but she refused to live with him and he moved on and “took another wife.” Gilruth again reported on the mission in May, noting problems between himself and Charles Cass, the Sub-Agent. Cass was impinging, in Giruth’s view, on the rights of the mission, but had been thwarted “through the influence of Mononcue.” Such disagreements between government officials and the mission would continue, as evinced in some of the materials discussed in Chapter 5.

**Numbers**

Perhaps one of the first factors to consider when weighing the influence of the Methodist movement at Upper Sandusky is a statistical measure, namely the number of members of the mission. Missionaries, Indian agents, and outside observers all contributed both hard counts and estimates of Wyandot Methodists, including church members and children attending mission schools. Table 3.1 compiles these numbers from several sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th># Members</th>
<th>#Children</th>
<th>#Exhorters, Preachers, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 1826</td>
<td>Seventh Annual MMS Meeting&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Nondescript, but laboring among their brethren in the forest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1827</td>
<td>Eighth Annual MMS Meeting&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>About 300</td>
<td>About 70</td>
<td>Four Wyandot preachers: Mononcue, Squire Gray Eyes, Herrehoot, and John Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1827</td>
<td>Russell Bigelow to James Finley&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>According to Bigelow, a growing student body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>State of Affair</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1828</td>
<td>Ninth Annual MMS Meeting&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Pious chiefs assisting the missionary, two converts serving as missionaries to other tribes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1829</td>
<td>Tenth Annual MMS Meeting&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Five exhorters, twelve class leaders, two missionaries to the Seneca and Shawnee. A branch mission established at Big Spring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1829</td>
<td>Annual Mission Report&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>40 (plus unnumbered students at Big Spring)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1830</td>
<td>Eleventh Annual MMS Meeting<strong>17</strong></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1830</td>
<td>Annual Mission Report<strong>18</strong></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1831</td>
<td>Twelfth Annual MMS Meeting<strong>19</strong></td>
<td>238</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Monthly visits by exhorters to new converts/potential converts among the Wyandots and Shawnees in Michigan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1831</td>
<td>Annual Mission Report<strong>20</strong></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1832</td>
<td>Thirteenth Annual MMS Meeting<strong>21</strong></td>
<td>246</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1832</td>
<td>Annual Mission Report<strong>22</strong></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1834</td>
<td>Annual Mission Report²³</td>
<td>191*</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Number lower due to several families moving to Canada, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>River Huron Wyandots separating into their own mission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1835</td>
<td>Annual Mission Report²⁴</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1838</td>
<td>Nineteenth Annual MMS Meeting²⁵</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Review of History of American Missions to</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Heathen…²⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 3.1 indicates, the reported numbers of Wyandot Methodists fluctuated significantly through time. Keeping in mind that the total number of Wyandots at Upper Sandusky (and nearby Big Spring) numbered in the vicinity of 500-600 for most of this period, official reports indicated that around half of the Wyandots (sometimes slightly less than half, sometimes slightly more) were members of the Methodist church. As discussed in Chapter 2, one must carefully weigh such statistics, as they never included detailed lists of members or other means to “prove” the accuracy of the counts, as well as the possibility that missionaries might overestimate numbers to demonstrate their success. Despite such concerns, the fact that most of the numbers in Table 3.1 are culled from the official mission reports (sent to both the federal government and the Methodist Missionary Society) does lend them some credence, unlike casual estimates by visitors and others with limited attachment to the community. When these numbers are considered in concert with other data (presented later in this chapter), it does provide a fairly reliable assertion that aside from the Wyandot government itself, the Methodist Church comprised the largest body of Wyandot people engaged in any civic/official institution on the Grand Reserve. At the very least, the church counted a substantial percentage of the population as its adherents, making it an important cultural institution.

**Wyandots as Itinerant Representatives of the Mission**

An important step in the maturation of the Methodist mission was the development of Wyandot exhorters and preachers, some of whom served as itinerant Methodists to surrounding indigenous communities, becoming missionaries themselves.27
This process had begun in the early 1820s, as discussed in chapter 2, but was becoming more pronounced in these later years. By the mid-1820s, Wyandot enthusiasm for becoming missionaries seems to have ratcheted up. James Finley, for example, reported in late 1825 that: “some of our chief speakers seem to be much drawn out towards the other [nearby] tribes.” Locally, Wyandots continued to be notable attendees and speakers at a variety of missionary meetings and activities, with some soliciting their presence. For example, a missionary on the Grand River requested that Finley bring “those Preachers and friends you think proper” to a camp meeting in February 1826.

Henry O. Sheldon, a frequent attendee of numerous Camp Meetings and Annual Conferences throughout the 1820s and 1830s, frequently noted in his journals that Wyandots spoke, sang, and preached at such meetings. He recorded that John Hicks “prayed in his native tongue with fluency, it had a solemn effect.” The next day, Sheldon remembered that two Wyandots “spoke very handsomely.” A few days later, Sheldon noted that Hicks spoke again, through the interpreter, Brother Walker. At another meeting, Sheldon heard Hicks and James Harryhoot speak to the assembled Methodists. At yet another meeting, he heard a speech by Summonduwat. At a later meeting sometime in the 1830s, Sheldon remarked that an Indian spoke, and “made a sensible speech for an Indian. He related the manner of Beavers making their dams + applied it.”

These activities even reached beyond the region. According to John Dunbar and Samuel Allis, ABCFM missionaries in Kansas in 1834, a Wyandot preacher traveling to Kansas to contemplate proposed removal plans proselytized to the Shawnee while on the journey.
In late 1825, Finley touched on another aspect of potential Wyandot itinerant activities. Finley agreed with a correspondent that if three or four of the Wyandots were to travel east and speak about the mission to Methodists there, it would increase the zeal of the various missionary societies for the missionary cause. Wyandots could serve as living embodiments of the efficacy of the mission, both to encourage more support for the mission and the idea that Indians were indeed worth saving. The proposal for some Wyandot converts to tour the east came to fruition in 1826. Finley proposed that the two most famous (and devout) Wyandot converts, Between-the-Logs (soon to die, as mentioned above) and Mononcue, go with Finley and an interpreter and meet with Bishop McKendree in July in New York City. The plan gained the approval of the leaders of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who thought it would be a boon to the entire missionary operation the Methodists had around the world for their eastern core of members and donors to see living embodiments of the efficacy of the missions.

The tour of the two converted Chiefs became a major event in the Methodist world. Thomas Mason wrote to Finley to ask that he and the Wyandots stop and hold a meeting at Newburgh, New York on their way to New York City. While on the tour, various entrepreneurs wished to exploit the presence of the two men for financial gain. Charles Irish, owner of the Castle Garden in New York City, offered to allow the men and their friends to tour his facility (in the process, using their presence to sell more tickets to a public desirous to view the curiosity of the two Wyandots in their city). Stephen Dando, a Methodist in New York, replied to Irish to inform him that the Methodists objected to the notion of making the two men a public spectacle, though they
would not object to a private invitation for the men to view the Garden. While on their tour of the east, the Methodist Episcopal Church commissioned likenesses of both Mononcue and Between-the-Logs, which were engraved and published in the *Methodist Magazine*. For the devout readers of the magazine, the ability to visibly identify such esteemed mission celebrities only could have deepened the connection reading audiences felt with the two men, and the Wyandot mission more generally.

The travels of Between-the-Logs and Mononcue inspired a great deal of interest among Methodists on the east coast in the wake of the tour. Elnathan Raymond wrote from Brooklyn, noting that he was moved to reflect on the power of Christ in bringing about the Wyandot spiritual conversion, and urging Finley to give his love to the two men who had stayed with him while visiting New York. Francis Hall, writing from Ithaca, noted that Methodists sent numerous items to him intended for the recently departed Wyandots, and informed Finley that the visit had exceeded his wildest expectations in inspiring the Methodists’ fervor for the mission. Hall later asked Finley to remember him and his family to Between-the-Logs and Mononcue, their friends they had made during their missionary tour. Alexander McCain, until that point a doubter of the missionary cause, wrote from Baltimore after the Wyandot tour to inform Finley that he had been inspired to send fifty yards of cloth for the use of the children at the mission, with a merchant donating an additional fifty yards for the cause. The two Wyandot men became so notable to the Methodist establishment that Bishop McKendree wrote directly to them to convey his spiritual wishes for the entire Wyandot Nation, and to inform them of his proposed visit in 1827.
Outing as Education of Children

As the missionary establishment stabilized and grew in importance, the educational program for students also underwent some significant changes. While the school itself continued to focus on providing basic elementary-level preparation coupled with vocational programs, a movement began to “out” male students. John Johnston was an advocate of this system, arguing that scattering students to white families for part of the year was the only way to ensure that the mission did not expend labor and money with no return. If such a policy were not enacted, Johnston argued Finley’s mission would be added to the lists of those failed missions to the Indians of the past. Johnston personally had made arrangements at the Methodist Seminary in Worthington, Ohio, to provide for the education of his namesake, currently at the Mission school, to study and become a minister, if his parents were agreeable to the idea. Soon after, Johnston reported that his namesake would be attending the Seminary, where Johnston paid for his room, board, clothing, etc.

Finley pursued the outing system with both the Methodist leadership and by contacting individuals to which students could be sent. Russell Bigelow, a future missionary to the Wyandots, had arranged for several of the boys to be placed around Hillsboro, Ohio, with one individual “anxious to have one.” By late 1825, fifteen of “the oldest and best learnd [sic]” had been distributed to various “good families” until the following fall “so that they may learn the language & habits of white men more perfectly.” This was the first step in a long-term Methodist plan to take older boys and girls to white-dominated parts of Ohio to ensure their rapid acculturation. Despite the loss
of the fifteen boys at the school, Finley argued that many younger students had begun to arrive and replace them. Finley received a dual letter from John Collins and John Reeves of Lebanon, Ohio. Collins indicated that seven boys had been sent to his district, and he would find places for them. Reeves noted that the Wyandot boy James B. Finley, left in the care of a Brother Waddle, “is a fine boy and I think will do well.” One student, Francis Hicks, arrived in Cincinnati in the care of William Raper. Raper determined to give Francis private lessons in English for one hour a day to prepare him to enter public school, as his relative lack of English skills “might have an unfavourable [sic] tendency.” While it is difficult to determine from the limited information how Francis felt about his outing, Raper did note that “things all appear [sic] strange to him no person to speak Wyandott with far from home etc. all contribute to make him uneasy.” Raper found him an intelligent youth despite the disadvantages and difficulties he encountered.

Russell Bigelow informed Finley that he had placed several youths. One named Isaac remained with Bigelow at Hillsboro. Another named George was living with John Wright in Chillicothe. The Deer Creek Circuit (in central Ohio) agreed to take two boys, while there was room for two more with a Brother Brandriff and two more with the Brown family if Finley had them to send. Bigelow had also heard that Finley was sending John Hicks, Jr., to live with Brother Chenowith on Darby Creek near Columbus. John Johnston noted that John McLean, another Wyandot youth, was at school near his home in Piqua, and that his namesake still attended the Seminary in Worthington. Jacob Young, writing from Newark, Ohio, told Finley that Mononcue had delivered both
Thomas [Clocke?] and Jacob Young (his Wyandot namesake) to him for placement in schools. Thomas, after a few days with another Methodist, returned to Young and “manefast [sic] a strong & constant desire to learn a trade [distinct?] prefference [sic] to the tayloring [sic] business,” leading Young to send Thomas to a tailor in Athens, where he was doing well. His namesake remained with Young, but he reported that “I am sorry to say that he has not pleased me Quite so well as Thomas.” Jacob the younger had wandered around several places while Young the elder was away, and when he tried to place him in an academy in Lancaster, Ohio, he refused to go. The Wyandot youth promised he would be willing to go to the Lancaster Academy for three months in the future, which Young hoped would actually happen, and that Finley would approve his plan for both boys to learn trades. There seems to have been no lack of Methodist families willing to take in the young Wyandot boys to steer them on the “path of civilization.”

A Maturing Mission: Children’s Education at the Mission School

While the push to institute an off-reservation outing program for Wyandot males gained brief momentum in the mid-1820s, the bread-and-butter educational activity at the mission continued to be the on-reservation school program. The annual mission reports compiled by the missionaries (and often reported through the Indian agent) provide both an overview of the educational activities at the mission and a general picture of the Grand Reserve, particularly the activities of those Wyandots associated with the mission. This section examines the key points in these reports over a fifteen year span, providing a
picture of a changing, fluctuating, but always active religious community. In statistical
terms, Table 3.2 provides a basic overview of the student headcounts, culled from annual
reports to the federal government in the 1820s-1840s.
Table 3.2: Wyandot Mission School Statistical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year ending Sept. 30</th>
<th>#Males</th>
<th>#Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number boarding at mission</th>
<th>Number living at home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Approx. 65</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40 at Upper Sandusky, plus others at Big Spring</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Approx. 50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42 total, 30 in the Summer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>About 25</td>
<td>About 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>About 30</td>
<td>About 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These data show that while the number of students fluctuated year-to-year, a relatively steady student body of 40-60 students attended the mission schools from the mid-1820s to 1840. It is impossible based on the records available to know how many years individual students enrolled at the school, how often such students attended while enrolled, or the overall level of education most students received during their educational careers. However, with likely 1/3 to ½ of the total Wyandot children attending each year, the influence of the Methodist school(s) on said children cannot be underestimated.

White Methodists also continued to donate funds with the understanding that they would have naming rights to the child they supported. Female children at St. Anthony’s Church Sunday school (presumably in Philadelphia) donated money to support a male Wyandot child, to be named Gregory T. Bedell after their minister. They promised to continue supporting him as they could, but also wished to hear about him at least every three months. Once the boy could write himself, they wished to hear directly from him once a quarter afterward. The Baltimore Missionary Society, whose Juvenile Wesleyan Missionary Society had already raised funds to name two boys Joshua Wells and Job Guest, wished to provide clothing for the boys. A follow-up letter from the Juvenile Society assured Finley that they continued to work for the benefit of the Wyandots, and wondered about the current status of the boys they had sponsored and named. The Juvenile Society once again asked Finley to communicate the desired information, including whether the four total students they had paid for (Job Guest, Joshua Wells, Rachel Lilly, and Yelverton T. Peyton) had actually been named. By “an article of their constitution [the Juvenile Society children] are allowed the privilege of naming one
Indian child for every fifty dollars paid.” The correspondent continued to press Finley to provide detailed information about the mission and school to satisfy the donors and stimulate their desire to provide further donations.\(^5^6\)

While the mission-based school had been the dominant educational program for the first decade of the mission establishment (and would continue to be afterward), ideas to both improve student access and reduce costs also gained traction. By 1828, new missionary Russell Bigelow suggested a profound alteration in the style of conducting the mission, being “clearly of the opinion that the nation is ripe for a change…which will relieve the Missionary and diminish the expences [sic].” He brought a plan to the National Methodist Council for consideration “to erect small and cheap school houses in the different neighborhoods on the reservation in which schools shall be established (as far is practicable under the [tuition?] of members of their own nation) and let the parents board and clothe their children and send them from home as other people.” Bigelow argued that a school should also be continued at the mission “to which the children of the neighborhood may be sent from home to either of the schools [and] let them be boarded at the Mission House together with some of the most promising Boys who cannot be taught at the Branch Schools.” The report concluded that, while upwards of 65 Wyandot students attended the school as some point during the year, a much lower number appeared at any single time, with parents inclined to remove their children for large parts of the year for a variety of reasons. Bigelow believed that such practices hindered their progress, though many did seem to demonstrate some degree of learning. While Bigelow felt Wyandot children learned to read and spell about as well as any children, they
struggled to understand the rules of arithmetic. This is likely a reason he supported schools scattered throughout the Wyandot community, allowing students convenient access to education while also being regularly available to parents and home.57

As part of Bigelow’s plan, the next year the Methodists had erected a schoolhouse at Big Spring, doubling as the local meeting house, and the small school had done well. Several regular students at Upper Sandusky had opted to go to the Big Spring school closer to home, reducing the number of scholars at Upper Sandusky to 40. Bigelow also reported that “should more of these Branch schools be put in operation, the No. of scholars would increase as by that means several would be induced to attend, that have never been at school. It is in agitation to erect another small House, as soon as the officiary [sic] have determined on the place.”58 A school house was also built on Tymochtee Creek, where Francis A. Hicks, a highly educated younger Wyandot who had gone to school at the Upper Sandusky mission, taught for three months during the winter. The school closed during the summer, due to both the farming needs of the teacher and the “difficulty of getting the children to attend regularly.” Both the mission school at Upper Sandusky and at the Big Spring branch were doing “tolerably well.”59 While the regionalized school plan yielded results, the mission-based school continued to be the focal point of Methodist Wyandot education. By the filing of the 1830 report on the mission, missionary Thomas Thompson depicted a thriving school, now divided into a male and female school taught by two different teachers, which he felt particularly benefitted the girls. He counted about 50 regular students.60
By 1832, Russell Bigelow noted that the year had been “marked with more serious difficulties than any former since our connexion [sic] with the establishment.” The major difficulties alluded to by the missionary were the pressures on the Wyandots to sell their lands, which “had a particular influence in makeing [sic] the people careless in sending their children” to school. While around fifty had attended at least part of the year, the regular attendance fell short of the previous year. Bigelow argued that the removal proposals had prompted a number of adult Wyandots “to revive the chase” and take their children with them. Despite these issues, he reported that the children who were at the school were clearly improving in their knowledge of English, enabling the teachers to abandon Wyandot interpretation except on rare occasions with them. This policy was carrying over to the missions work with adults as well, with Bigelow arguing that the parents were making slow but encouraging progress in their attainments of the English language. Additionally, the Big Spring sale (see chapter 4) forced the closure of the school there. Initially, the Methodists planned to send the teacher to Michigan and set up school among the Wyandots there, as many of the Big Spring Wyandots planned to resettle there, but the Methodists abandoned the plan “in consequence of the delay of removal, but more particularly from the strong opposition of the Heathen party [in Michigan] incouraged [sic] by the Roman Priest.”

Two years later, with the removal crisis subsided for a time, the children at the school were making considerable progress, and the Infant school system recommended by the Superintendent (requiring the procurement of new materials from the Infant school at Worthington, Ohio) was the new method of instruction. The Wyandot Nation had
raised nearly $100 for support of the endeavor, $50 of which went to Cincinnati to buy more materials. The materials had not arrived at the time of writing, which had “been discouraging, to the Nation and rendered our school much smaller, than it would have been, several of the people having concluded to wait till the arrival of the aperatus [sic] before they would send in their children.” A total of 42 children, 30 in the summer, had attended the school, with many being more steady attendees than normal. The missionary also taught a Sunday School with 25-30 attending. 

Agent Purdy McElvain’s 1836 report to the War Department indicated a small but successful core of students at the mission, with the older students showing encouraging progress in their studies. The total cost of the mission school totaled $967.73, with much of the cost in boarding the 25 students living there. 

By 1838, the Wyandots used monies earned from a treaty they signed in 1836 to replace the old log school house with a new 24’x20’ one and one half story school, complete with a stonewalled cellar, lathe and plaster walls, and ample seating, writing desks, and other supplies for the pupils. McElvain judged the students quite bright, and noted that they “acquire the English language with a great deal of ease when kept at school regularly.” Boys worked the farm evenings and during morning recess from school, with the “larger ones” working an additional day per week. Girls manufactured most of the clothes at the mission. The new school house proved a “very commodious one” for the mission, though the Mission house and the missionary’s quarters were quite decayed. And while the construction of the school had delayed the school year until December 1838, after it opened it had been “in a verry [sic] prosperous condition.”
Student enrollment varied between 30 and 55, with an average of 40, who progressed well under the manual labor school system in place at the mission. Assistant missionary Rezin Sapp also noted the efforts then underway by the Methodist Episcopal Church to “have their language reduced to a written one,” as was being done “among some of the Western tribes [sic],” with the hope that it would “give a new impulse to the school and perhaps a new tone to the nation, It is very difficult to effect much by the present plan of teaching from the circumstances of the aboriginal language being used in the transaction of their business as well as by the entire nation.”

In 1840, the mission had a frame barn (42’x60’) erected, though the Mission house continued to decay. Missionary James Wheeler also explained the method by which students boarded at the mission by the final years of the Ohio mission school. Parents brought children to the mission with the understanding by both parties that the child would remain “a sufficient length of time to learn to read and write, if no longer.” Parents sometimes supplied some of the clothing for their children by agreement, sometimes all clothing. More parents had begun supplying these resources themselves for their children, perhaps indicating some degree of higher prosperity economically which enabled them to do so, as well as a commitment to keep children at school for longer periods of time. Wheeler deemed their progress in learning slow, but not slower than should be expected for children studying science, for example, with very few reference points in their own previous learning, “and no knowledge of the language in which it was to be studied.” Wheeler noted how embarrassing this was for the children, and the
children subsequently advanced slowly in all studies other than writing. The proclivity of Wyandot children to “imitate” made writing a “very pleasant study” for them.  

A Maturing Mission: Notable Conversion Activities

As the mission developed, one of the persistent themes was the continued efforts to convert “heathen” Wyandots. In February 1825, Finley reported that in a three week span, ten new children attended the school, twelve “heathen” Wyandots joined the church, he baptized thirteen people, and six couples were married, an astounding amount of activity in a few weeks, during the winter no less. The most important of these conversions was Warpole (Rontundee), the hereditary war chief and a stalwart of the “pagan” party. Finley told Lewis Cass that Warpole “has at last yielded to become a Christian and has thrown himself into the Bosom of the church.” Finley believed his conversion to be genuine, and noted that several of Warpole’s “party” joined along with him. Finley was confident that this was a sign that the whole Nation would, in the near future, join the Methodist Church. Along with such a notable new convert, Finley also indicated that “one or two young men” had come to offer to live at the mission and labor for a year with only room and board in return, simply “to learn to work.” Lewis Cass congratulated Finley for converting “the most difficult man in the pagan party”, Warpole, as did John Johnston, who thought Finley had “gained much” by the conversion. On his visit to Upper Sandusky in 1827, Bishop William McKendree made detailed notes about Warpole and his conversion. Warpole had, upon the death of Duonquot, become both War Chief and Head Chief until a successor could be selected. Warpole had long been
opposed to Christianity, but his conversion brought both himself and many of his
followers into the Wyandot fold. As shall be seen in chapter 4, Warpole’s conversion
did not last, but for a time he became a symbol of the efficacy of the Methodist mission
for those interested in its success.

Importantly, Finley deemed these converts authentic. Reflecting on the successes
of 1825, he opined that “a Majority of all that belong to our Church are Sincier [sic]
Christians.” His opinion rested not just on his religious observations, but also the fact that
they “are growing in knowledge & the habits of white people fast.” Men and women
were dressing in American style, they raised sheep to provide wool for winter clothing,
hogs for the slaughter, and “some…have gotten feather Beds.” As shall be seen in
chapter 4, the notion of tying economics and lifestyles to missionary adherence was
commonplace, though the data to support such assertions is, at best, questionable.

Glimpses into the continued belief that “heathen” Wyandots were nearing a point
of conversion continued in the years that followed. In 1831, new spiritual classes began at
Broken Sword Creek, “a place hitherto famous for Heathen Feasts.” That same year,
similar classes on the River Huron in Michigan yielded a significant increase in
adherents. In the 1832 annual mission report, the missionaries noted that there were
hopeful signs that more of the “heathens” were interested in converting, as one of their
leaders had recently requested that the missionaries deliver a sermon to his people, with
approbation about the results. Signs of new conversion continued throughout the life of
the mission in Ohio, providing Methodist Wyandots and missionaries alike with hope that
they could save the “pagans” amongst them.
The Mission and Removal

Throughout the debate over removal, which appears periodically in subsequent chapters, the majority of Methodist Wyandots opposed removal. Without question, most of the missionaries who served at the Wyandot Mission joined their membership in opposing any schemes to remove the Wyandots west. Many argued that such pressures served to hinder their efforts to convert Wyandots and encourage male-led agricultural pursuits. In early 1825, James Finley feared that such pressures would disrupt the progress of the mission, and that the Wyandots were losing confidence in the U.S. Government, as they believed “they should not be spoken to on this subject any more.”

A few days later, in a speech written to the John Quincy Adams, the new President, the Wyandot chiefs engaged in a lengthy verbal coupling of their conversion and desire to retain their lands. After outlining the successes of the missionary establishment, the chiefs noted that in the 1817 treaty they had kept only a small piece of land for themselves, which the President promised to “make us a good title to our Land and make a strong fence around ourselves.” They argued that the faith and honor of the U.S. was at stake, and promises should be kept to allow for their continued development on their own lands. If the removal pressures continued, it would have a detrimental impact on the nascent mission and the goals of improvement for adults and children alike. The tone of the speech maintained that the Wyandots were a small, relatively weak and helpless, people dependent on the good will of the U.S. Government for their future success and happiness. An intensive (and quite conscious) linking of conversion to anti-removal sentiments was clearly made. In his reply on behalf of the President, Thomas
McKenney emphasized the government’s devotion to the improvement of the Wyandots and all Indians, heaping special praise on the Mission and James Finley in the process. He also asserted that, while removal would never be forced, if the Wyandots should decide that removal was better for them (it seems clear McKenney was certain it would come to this in the future), the U.S. stood ready to make such arrangements with them.\textsuperscript{78}

Correspondence between Finley and other Methodist ministers dwelt at length on the topic of removal. David Young, for example, wrote of his struggles to come to grips with the federal removal bent. While it was ultimately God’s will, Young wondered whether the Wyandots and other Native Americans were to be scattered as were the Biblical Jews.\textsuperscript{79} Finley reported that the anxiety over removal was working against the missionary cause.\textsuperscript{80}

Writing again in 1826, the one negative source of energy Finley noted was a growing uneasiness about the prospects of removal. One chief, Finley noted, even said he would sooner poison himself than ever be removed. Finley recommended that the Wyandots should not be pressured to remove, as it would inhibit their progress in the missionary endeavor. Despite these worries, the people continued to respond to the mission, and prospects for the future were bright.\textsuperscript{81}

By 1831, the Wyandots investment in vast improvements on the Grand Reserve. As Wyandots built “New Houses + several Double Hewed Log Barns,” all signs indicated a growing, adapting community. The Wyandots grew a record amount of wheat, and “enlarged corn fields may be seen in every Direction.” Despite these apparent salad days, the missionaries noted their fears that the growing pressure to remove would
stop all the progress on the reservation. These fears, as shall be seen, continued to cast a shadow over the mission until the era of removal, though they never caused the Wyandots to cease their religious and economic activities.

**Perspectives on the Mission: The Lieb Reports**

The United States government, which during the Adams administration generally adhered to the Civilization Program, became highly interested in the progress of the mission at Upper Sandusky. The success of the educational program among the Wyandot children was of special import in the minds of the War Department and the Office of Indian Affairs. Thomas McKenney, writing in his official capacity as head of the Office of Indian Affairs, greatly approved of the educational system at Upper Sandusky, which he felt was more useful than even the systems used among white Americans. The manual labor school system, featuring school days divided between standard school age education (reading, spelling, writing, arithmetic, geography/history, science) and practical education in farming, trades, sewing, and cooking, would produce not only young Wyandots with academic skills, but also skilled farmers and mechanics.

The federal government, investing taxpayer monies in such enterprises as the Upper Sandusky mission, sought assurances that their money was well spent. In 1825, the War Department decided to appoint an outside observer to investigate several missions to vet the efficacy of the missionaries in their assimilationist goals, particularly in educating Indian children. Lewis Cass suggested Judge Lieb of Detroit for the task, arguing that more thorough mission reports would both ensure the high character of the missions
themselves and increase public approval of their activities.\textsuperscript{85} The Secretary of War approved of Lieb’s appointment.\textsuperscript{86} In his 1825 report, Lieb noted that the school establishment had been closed due to the “sickly season”, and Finley was absent from the mission at the time as well. While noting his disappointment with the situation, Lieb based his report on the material evidence available, including the “considerable progress” evident in the students’ writing and ciphering. The state of the mission and farm quite impressed Lieb, who explained the amount of improved land and crop yields in detail. While it is difficult to divine much about the children from his report, other than basic demographic data (see Table 3.3), he noted from his conversations with the teachers that “the children are well pleased with the benefits they derive from the industry, care and attention of their Teachers.”\textsuperscript{87}
Table 3.3: Scholars at the Methodist Mission School in 1825

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Blood Quantum</th>
<th>Present State of Advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis A. Hicks</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac P. Driver</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James B. Finley</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Armstrong</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Walker</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Yo[u]ng</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Pelham</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling and Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William McKendree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Hill</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling and reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch George</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Walker</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silas Armstrong</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Wright</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Half</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Fowler</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Roberts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Elliott</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling and reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Clark</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas McKee</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Half</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Clark</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Clark</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McLean</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Cotter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Spelling and reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Cotter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Spelling and reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Gould</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling and reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gibson</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry W. Warpole</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Johnston</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Summerfield</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Mudeater</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Reece</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Whatcoat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ellis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hicks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wesley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Half</td>
<td>A.B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Wright</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Half</td>
<td>Spelling and Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaretta Gray Eyes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling and reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Rununess</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Brooke</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Warpole</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaretta Elliott</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Washington</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Young</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Fletcher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pointer*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Half Negro</td>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Adams</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Driver</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Hopkins</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Reeves</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Half</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Mudeater</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hooper</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Mudeater</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Pipe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Half</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza J. Hansberger</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary J. Miller</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Whole</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Armstrong</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Spelling and reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nancy Pointer was the daughter of Jonathan Pointer, the African-American interpreter, and his wife, a Delaware woman.*
Lieb’s student list demands close scrutiny. Not only does it provide one of the few comprehensive lists of students at the school ever recorded, it also provides a wealth of information about evolving perceptions of both accomplishment and racial identity. As one would expect, the younger children tended to be at more rudimentary levels of education, with a significant number of students focusing their attention exclusively on spelling skills, though there were significant numbers of older children also at that early stage of their education. One might argue from this limited data set that racial identity had some (weak) correlation to academic achievement. Many of those described as “quarter” Wyandots (see Chapter 5 for a more focused discussion of race and identity) tended to be classed in the higher academic achievers, though Lieb listed a number of “whole” Wyandots at a similar level of advanced achievement. It is clear that correlations between age, education level, and identity are not hard and fast. Perhaps the most notable aspect of this list of students is the diversity in terms of age, educational achievement, and perceived racial makeup. Though imprecise and (like all classifications of race) problematic, Lieb’s list reveals an educational environment populated by Wyandots from all walks of life.

A more interesting question may be: from where did Lieb divine his racial classifications? The extant record is unclear, and several possibilities present themselves. Did Finley keep a list of students with charted racial identities? Possible, but unlikely as Lieb had no contact with Finley on this trip, and Finley did not directly manage the school. Lieb might also, of course, have judged the children based on their physical appearance and asked (or assigned) them a blood quantum. This also seems implausible.
The missionaries had temporarily closed the school, and many of the students were with their families in winter hunting or sugar camps. The most likely source was William Walker, Jr., serving as schoolteacher at the time. A “quarter-blood” himself, Walker seems to have been quite conscious of growing distinctions (or, at the very least, notations) in the Wyandot community based on racial terms. Race ideology was beginning to fully form in the United States and western Europe at this time, and Walker, an educated and well-read mixed blood man, would certainly have been aware of such ideas. Further, as the son of an adopted outsider who was both part of and distinct from the Wyandot community, Walker, Jr. would certainly be cognizant of social and political distinctions within the Sandusky community. It is also interesting to note, as detailed in Chapter 5, that most observers and Wyandots in the early 19th century asserted that there were virtually no “full-blooded” Wyandots at all, making the large number in this list (39 of the 56 students listed) dubious. Of course, Walker may have used the term to indicate those of more traditional upbringing, or he may have classified those who had no non-Wyandot parent (notice there are not ¾ bloods, or 5/8 bloods, etc.) as “whole” Wyandots, regardless of the biological heritage of their parents. At any rate, close examination of this racialized column on Lieb’s report indicate that a wide variety of Wyandot children, with seemingly little significance to racial admixture, attended school at the mission.

Of all of Lieb’s observations on his tour, however, the most interesting may be his opinions on the influence the mission was having on the adult population. He marveled at the quality and quantity of neat log homes, complete with shingle roofs and stone or brick chimneys. He also asserted that the adults were clean and neat in appearance, with
manners and deportments “assimilated to their white neighbours.” He found the adults strongly in favor of individual property ownership, which in his view was evidence “as strong as any which could be offered of their advancement in civilization.” In fact, a surveyor was busy dividing the Grand Reserve into separate tracts to be occupied in severalty. In four years, he noted 56 couples had been married in Christian services, while only two couples had divorced in that time. Lieb provides no statistical evidence that his observations of the adults was directly tied to Methodist influence (he does not provide any inkling of which adults were or were not adherents to the church, nor does he compare the living situations of church members and non-members), though his report can certainly be read as indicating such.  

The War Department decided to employ Lieb for a second year, not only to collect useful information about the schools, but with the idea that such visits and reports would encourage continued efficiency at the missions. Lieb submitted his second report on the Upper Sandusky mission in December 1826. He found it in “the most flourishing state; all was harmony, order and regularity.” He credited Finley, particularly, with the success of the mission. Finley had so much influence, in Lieb’s view, that evidence of his labors “are every where visible they are to be found in every indian [sic] and indian [sic] habitation.” The Wyandots lived in “good comfortable dwelling[s] built in the modern country style,” comfortably furnished in a fashion and level “equal, at least, in all respects to the generality of whites around them.”

Lieb found the Wyandots to be “a fine race” and argued that “their civilization [had been] accomplished,” with little difference between them and whites on the frontier.
Hunting, it seemed to Lieb, was only a sporting activity for them by 1826, as the Wyandots had abundant cattle, rich soil, and a comfortable lifestyle. Their garb resembled white neighbors, their houses (with brick chimneys and glazed glass windows) were similar, and, in fact, “a stranger would believe he was passing through a white population if the inhabitants were not seen.” Lieb was so gushing in his praise that he argued not only were the Wyandots “entirely reclaimed” and the most successful Indians he visited, but their removal would be a cruelty, as the Wyandots of Upper Sandusky “ought to be cherished and preserved as the model of a colony should any be planted and nurtured in remote places from our frontier settlements.”

In terms of education through the mission, Lieb argued that the whole reservation was in effect a school, with the mission providing the example for all the community, not simply the students. In the schoolroom itself though, Lieb found seventy children ages four to twenty (34 boys, 36 girls), with all “contented and happy.” This total was much higher than the previous report (56), indicating an increased interest in the mission and its school. Practical mechanical skills coupled with basic spelling, grammar, math, reading, and writing, continued to be the educational program. The farm was growing rapidly when compared to Lieb’s prior visit. Lieb also provided a description of the new store developed on the Grand Reserve (see chapter 4 for more information on the store). The store had “every species of goods suited to their wants, and purchased with their annuities—an account is opened with each individual who deals there and a very small profit required.” The operator of the store was William Walker, previously the teacher at the mission school, who Lieb described as a “quadroon…trustworthy man, and well
qualified by his habits and education to conduct the business.” This new business enterprise allowed the Wyandots to purchase nearly any item they might want at home for a reasonable rate and sell their surplus at a fair price, insulating them from the temptations (and usury) they might well face dealing with white merchants. Lieb, unfortunately, did not provide a detailed list of the students at the Methodist Mission at Upper Sandusky for this year.92

Excerpts of Lieb’s 1826 report even found their way into the *Methodist Magazine* and a variety of other religious publications, providing corroborating proof to eager readers that their efforts to raise money and goods, their emotional investment in the missionary cause, and their virtual friendship with Wyandots like Mononcue and Between-the-Logs were not in vain, but bearing tangible fruits.93 By January 1828, the War Department decided to end Lieb’s employment as an inspector of the schools, in part due to a reduction in the department’s contingent fund and partially because “there is now no longer any necessity for them.”94

**The Wyandot Story in Contemporary Methodist Histories**

As the mission began to reach maturity and became a self-sustaining operation, largely controlled on the ground by the Wyandots themselves, the early history of the Wyandot Mission became historical fodder, with two major examples incorporating significant reference to the enterprise. In 1832, Nathan Bangs, a prominent Methodist minister and leader of the Missionary Society, published the first history of the Methodist missionary cause. The Wyandot mission played a prominent role in the book, being the
first Indian mission for the Methodists. Bangs recounted the story of John Stewart and the origins of the mission, followed by a fairly detailed overview of the mission in the 1820s, based heavily on Finley’s reports on the mission and published letters. Bangs’ position in the Methodist Episcopal Church hierarchy made his study particularly representative of the church establishment and their observations of their own missionary activities. Due to their prominent place in the early years of the missionary enterprise, the Wyandots provided a great deal of the evidence Bangs used to demonstrate the ongoing efficacy of the Methodist missionary project.  

By the late 1830s, the Methodist Missionary Society approached James B. Finley to write a history of the Wyandot mission. Finley seems to have agreed relatively quickly to the proposition and began to collect his personal correspondence (much of which survives in archives at the Hayes Presidential Library in Fremont, Ohio, and the Archives of Ohio United Methodism at Ohio Wesleyan University in Delaware, Ohio), which along with his published letters in missionary periodicals formed the large majority of his eventual publication. Wishing for more information, Finley solicited the aid of William Walker to collect historical data about the Wyandot that he could use in the book. Walker, who had been collecting bits and pieces of Wyandot history in his free time whenever a good source of information was at hand, saw the task as “Herculean.” Walker described the need to compile a correct history of the major events in Wyandot history, such as wars, negotiations, treaties, etc. He also argued that the story would not be complete without consideration of the Catholic missions among the Wyandots in the 17th and 18th centuries, as well as Badger’s Presbyterian mission of the early 1800s. After
thinking about Finley’s request, Walker refused to aid him with the publication, feeling that “the Church ought not to touch this or ought not to publish this work.” While Walker expressed his personal friendliness with Finley, and said he would do all Finley asked if it were purely for his own use and benefit, Walker compiled a list of reasons for his opinion on the book.  

Walker argued that no church maintaining an active mission “can write an impartial History of the nation, especially when writing of the merits of missions which may have preceded them…nor can strict impartiality be observed in writing of its own operations whether successful or unsuccessful.” Walker referenced the publication of John Heckewelder’s narrative as an example of a recent work full of “gross misstatements” about the Wyandot and Delaware. Walker did not believe Heckewelder had intentionally distorted the facts, but lacked familiarity with the motivations and thoughts of the Wyandots themselves.  

Walker did concede that the Methodist Church had a right to publish a history of the Wyandot mission, even if he thought it a bad idea. In concluding, Walker remembered a similar request a decade earlier, when he was asked to collect information about John Stewart for the publication of the biography of his life (referenced in chapter 2). Walker recalled that he had received “severe flagellations…from various quarters for so doing, especially, from those occupying high seats in the Synagogue.” Even the Wyandot Chiefs at the time had “come in for a share of the censures of of [sic] the Church.” Walker felt that the Wyandots had been badly treated by Methodist leaders for
their part in constructing Stewart’s biography, and the memory partially crystallized Walker’s refusal to participate in the history of the mission.\textsuperscript{98}

Despite Walker’s reticence, Finley wrote him at least one more time to request more information about a number of items pertaining to Wyandot history.\textsuperscript{99} Finley forged ahead with a manuscript, which received the approval of a committee formed by the Ohio Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The committee recommended that the information was valuable and should proceed to full publication.\textsuperscript{100} Finley came to Upper Sandusky in the summer of 1838, after his manuscript had been sent to press, in order to collect more information for a general history of the Wyandot he might write in the future. Walker agreed to aid him this time, drawing up an agreement for their partnership. He had not yet read the history of the mission, not doing so until months later when George I. Clark bought a copy from Cincinnati and lent it to Walker.\textsuperscript{101}

Upon reading the book, (consequently the most frequently used historical source for the Methodist mission to the Wyandots ever since) Walker found himself “disappointed, mortified yea, and disgusted.” He asserted that it “abounds with misstatements of facts, in fancy pictures, in pure fictions, having nothing to rest upon, recording transactions that never took place nor anything approaching to a resemblance.” He felt Finley’s imagination had been allowed to run wild in the book, leading to a story of the Wyandot Mission as HE WANTED IT TO BE, not as it was. Walker maintained that the book had brought Finley’s reputation for truth and accuracy into question, and his standing “was much damaged among his Wyandott and other friends in that locality.”
Because of this lack of faith in his work, Walker “never heard of but two copies being bot [sic] by Wyandotts.”

Walker provided further evidence for the unreliable nature of the history, as he recalled that Reverend James Wheeler, the missionary among the Wyandot just after publication of the book, would read passages from it at church meetings. The audience (the people about whom the book was written) responded to the stories as follows: “Some were admitted to be, in the main, true: of others the listeners seemed at a loss, embarrassed—no one recognizing the facts as stated_unwilling to interpose a flat contradiction.” As Wheeler read more passages, the reactions got even more negative. One specific example was Wheeler’s reading of Finley’s account of the conversion of James Washington, then present at the reading. The Wyandots looked constantly to Washington for his reaction. Washington stated that he did not know why Finley had changed the story, as Finley certainly should have known the true story of Washington’s conversion at a prayer meeting at his brother Matthew Peacock’s house. Wheeler, appalled by the reports he got from the Wyandots, wrote to Finley about the problems the Wyandots had with the book, to which Finley angrily retorted. Wheeler tried to follow up and press the matter, but Finley (ever an active pen otherwise) refused to reply, ending the correspondence.

As a result of Walker’s disappointment with the History of the Wyandott Mission, he wrote Finley and cancelled their agreement to write a general history of the Wyandot, unwilling to commit any material he collected into the hands of a man who would distort the facts. Finley refused to reply to the letter, and “he became sour towards me, as I was
informed by some of his friends.” Despite the loss of his key potential informant, Finley went on to write a number of books and articles in newspapers about Wyandot history, most of which Walker maintained were full of inaccuracies, fantasies, and outright lies.\(^\text{104}\)

Of course, the extant critique of the accuracy of Finley’s publications largely comes from the memory, pen, and opinions of a single Wyandot, but one who certainly played a key role in the early history of the mission, serving as a schoolteacher, steward, and other positions with the missionary establishment. At the very least, Walker’s opinions of Finley’s missionary recollections should raise caution. Despite such criticism, however, Finley’s published works have long been the most cited materials for the history of the Wyandot mission.

**Wyandot Methodism as Exemplified in Wyandot-Produced Religious Records**

The final consideration of the evolution of the Methodist mission into a Wyandot-centered entity considers materials Wyandot Methodists maintained for themselves. One of the greatest sources of insight into the inner workings of the mission is a ledger book of Wyandot origin, maintained by the Wyandot leadership of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Upper Sandusky. Most of the entries seem to have been made by William Walker, Alexander Long, and John M. Armstrong over a period of nearly thirty years. The ledger contains both the Records of the Stewards of the Methodist Episcopal Church (1835-1855) and the Records of the Quarterly Mission Meetings (1827-1850). Both sets of records provide useful glimpses into the Wyandot Methodist activities, and
demonstrate the growing identification of many Wyandot people as Methodists in charge of their own church and mission activities.\textsuperscript{105}

As the focus of this dissertation is on the Ohio period, the Records of the Stewards prove limited, but still give some glimpses into the financial workings of the Methodist Society formed by the Wyandots at Upper Sandusky. From its founding in April 1826 until March 1835, a total of $245.20\frac{1}{2}$ had been paid to the treasurer, mostly in the form of collections at camp meetings and quarterly meetings. Between 1835 and 1843, Wyandot Methodists at these various meetings donated a total of $193.61 through these collections. The Wyandots expended nearly all donations each year, with only a modest carryover (a few dollars) from year to year. A number of standard items appear frequently in the ledger of expenditures, particularly candles and elements for communion (bread and wine). The largest single expenditure was for the services of a sexton (essentially the caretaker for the church property and services). A number of individuals served as sexton, including Alfred (June 1835 entry), George I. Clark (September 1835-June 1841), and Adam Brown (June 1841-removal). The sextons typically earned $20/year ($5/quarter), though Brown earned a lesser amount for a few quarters in 1842-3. Otherwise, only the purchase of a few brooms, the purchase of some window lights for the church, and payment to whitewash the meeting house once appear in the expenditure records. While the records are relatively vague, they do indicate a community taking charge of their mission, church, and spiritual lives.\textsuperscript{106}

The Records of the Quarterly Mission Meetings yield a far richer (and more complete) picture of the Wyandot role in leading their own religion. These records make
note of many of the issues that would be commonplace in the daily workings of Wyandot spiritual life, many of which appeared in other forms in white-generated mission reports. These include mediating disagreements, providing missionaries for other Indians, arranging committees and hiring workmen for the upkeep of the mission, enforcing religious discipline, and the routine examinations of Wyandot Methodist leaders (stewards, exhorters, preachers). What these records indicate is a mature, fully functional Wyandot-led mission community, where the people themselves exerted a great deal of control over their own church and its activities. Below are several examples from the quarterly meetings exhibiting the day-to-day activities of the Methodist Wyandots.107

One key area of activity of the quarterly conference leaders was the encouragement of missionary activities to other Native Americans, which also would tie into the activities of the Missionary Society at Upper Sandusky (discussed in the next section below). In January 1828, for example, the Wyandot leaders of the Methodist Church recommended Squire Gray Eyes and James Harryhoot to serve as missionaries to travel among nearby tribes of Indians, under the direction of the superintendent of the Wyandot Mission.108 At the February 1832 Quarterly Meeting, the conference requested that a branch school be established on the River Huron in Michigan. To raise revenue to support Exhorters who would visit “the Brethren on the Huron river [sic] & in Canada”, it was suggested that a collection be taken up in the Methodist classes. The decision was made to attempt to raise money amongst themselves (the Wyandot Methodists) to defray the missionary expenses of those who would be sent to the mission to visit the Wyandots there. The class leaders would bring the matter before their classes to ascertain their
opinions on financing the missionaries. There is no record for May 1832, so it is unclear what the decision of the classes was on this subject.109

Another common type of entry in the quarterly record was the routine maintenance of mission buildings and grounds. In January 1828, the leaders agreed to hire someone to fence in the meeting house and graveyard. William Walker was given the task of finding a laborer to complete the job. By October 1834, the fence needed repair, and the leaders of the Methodist church appointed the stewards to enclose the graveyard by a partition fence to separate it from the meeting house, if funds were available for the purpose. In October 1835, the effort to raise money to fence the graveyard continued, with the hope that all monies could be raised by subscription. If not, the stewards were authorized to collect if from the Missionary Society (see next section).

In December 1828, the Quarterly Meeting Conference recommended the erection of a schoolhouse at Big Spring as a branch of the main school at Upper Sandusky, while in August 1829 the leaders approved a resolution to build a new school house at Upper Sandusky. The Wyandots also made decisions on the type of education offered at their schools, as evinced in October 1833, when the church leaders agreed to adopt the Infant School system. Later, in April 1836, they discussed the educational system in place at the mission school and how it prepared the children for their futures, presumably on the Grand Reserve. The leaders resolved that “we the members of this conference believe it will be for the future wellbeing [sic] & general good of the Children of this Nation to learn the art of Farming & Housewifery.” As such, the conference authorized the missionary to
“employ the boys on the farm & the girls in the House each working day 4 hours,” splitting the time between morning and afternoon.\textsuperscript{110}

As with any official religious body, the Wyandot Methodists also had to mediate issues of morality and adherence to the faith within their church. One such area was the annual examination of stewards, exhorters, and preachers in the community. From 1829-36 (for which records exist in the ledger), all were examined and approved of with two exceptions. In August 1831, John Hicks Sr., “was charged with immoral conduct & his licence [sic] not renewed.” At the June 1835 meeting, another longstanding leader faced censure, as “the Licence [sic] of Mononcue was placed in the hands of the preacher till he should make acknowledgement for some imprudences.” The “imprudences” were not explained, but Mononcue seemingly remained in the good graces of the church afterward.

At that same meeting, a significant step in the permanent establishment of the mission as a Wyandot-led entity occurred when Squire Gray Eyes and James Harryhoot were licensed to preach as full ministers, the first Wyandots who had risen above the status of exhorter. The conference also noted that “in view of their labours as Missionaries in the Wyandott Nation they were recommended to the Ohio annual conference for deacons orders.”\textsuperscript{111}

In addition to the behavior of church leaders, the quarterly meetings also invested a great deal of attention in the activities of all church members. In January 1828, for example, the leaders approved a rule that “if any of our members take up & live with a man or woman as man + wife without being lawfully married [they] shall be expelled.” By May of the following year, the members of the Wyandot Mission created rules for
legal divorce. If any man left a woman, or vice versa, to commit adultery with another person, “the innocent person, shall be clear from the guilty one & be at liberty to Marry again, after obtaining a divorce.” Divorce cases would be heard by a panel of seven people appointed annually for the purpose, with the missionary serving “for the time being” as president. A trial would be held by the panel, with the alleged innocent party presenting information to support their claims. The panel would inform the accused party of the trial in advance, and give the accused the chance to present their side of the story. If the case were found to be valid, the divorce would be granted, and the person who had been wronged would be free to marry again with no repercussions for their membership in the church. The first divorce panel consisted of Henry Jacquis, Lump on the Head, John Barnet, William Walker, George I. Clark, John Hicks, Sr., and Battiste Hicks. The same seven were re-elected to serve at the February 1830 meeting. In February 1831, the Quarterly Meeting appointed nearly the same committee (replacing John Hicks, Sr. and Battiste Hicks with Mononcue and Russia Hicks) to serve another year. The next year, the mission leadership reappointed Barnet, Jacquis, Walker, Lump on the Head, George I. Clark, and Russia Hicks; replacing Mononcue with Summonduwot. The first (recorded, at least) appeal of a decision of the committee on adultery came when Tat-a-men-to-at appealed the decision finding him guilty of adultery. He was cleared of the charges and restored to the Methodist Church at the Quarterly Meeting. Another key disciplinary decision came in February 1829 when Warpole, the longtime leader of the traditionalists on the reservation who had converted and become a Steward of the church, was the subject of a complaint about his conduct. He answered by asking to be released from his
Steward position, which was granted. Recall that Warpole’s conversion had been considered a great coup by James Finley and several American officials, and his departure from the church would signal his renewal of efforts to oppose Methodist activities on the Grand Reserve.\textsuperscript{112}

The other major disciplinary decision in the record was the July 1836 case of William Walker, who appealed a committee decision to try him for immorality (intoxication). After examining the evidence and hearing testimony, the committee confirmed the earlier decision and expelled Walker from the Methodist Church. With Walker expelled, the committee appointed George I. Clark the new Recording Secretary. Walker’s expulsion would mark a major disagreement between himself and the Methodist leadership at Upper Sandusky, which carried over even after removal to Kansas.\textsuperscript{113}

The other critical Wyandot-generated record of the maturing Methodist Mission is a ledger book containing the “Register of the Missionary Society of Upper Sandusky” (1828-47). The official members of the Church and the missionary agreed during a meeting on September 6, 1828, that the time was right to form themselves into the Wyandott Missionary Society. The Wyandot Missionary Society would serve as an auxiliary branch of the Ohio Conference Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The membership created a Constitution for the Missionary Society with a number of key articles. The second article defined the purpose of the Society, which was “to assist the [illegible word] Annual Conferences more effectively to extend their missionary labors throughout the United States and elsewhere.” The third article defined the leadership structure, consisting of a President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer,
and five Managers, all elected annually from the membership in the Methodist Church. All members would be required to contribute a minimum of fifty cents annually to remain a member of the Society, or a one-time minimum payment of five dollars to become a lifetime member. Any funds (after deducting expenses) collected by the Society would then be given over to the parent Ohio Conference Missionary Society for the support of their missionary activities. The annual meeting would occur on the first Saturday each September.¹¹⁴

Throughout the life of the Missionary Society, a fairly stable leadership structure developed. An interesting transition very early on was the move away from the white missionary serving as the President to Wyandot people in that capacity (see Table 3.4). Wyandot men occupied all other offices (Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, Managers) for the entirety of the Missionary Society’s existence. While there was overlap between the leaders of the Missionary Society and the Methodist Quarterly Conferences, the Missionary Society drew from deeper levels of the Methodist membership.¹¹⁵

The original list of members (see Table 3.5) numbered fifty-seven individuals donating a total of $28.50. Table 3.5 shows a mixed body of Wyandot Methodists, some from mixed-ancestry families, other from the “full-blood” or more traditionalist families (see Chapter 5 for more on issues of race/ancestry). The next year, a number of new members joined the Missionary Society (see Table 3.6). In addition, several individuals donated money to the missionary cause. As Tables 3.5 and 3.6 show, the number of total members of the Missionary Society (including those with “withdrawn” notices beside their names in Table 3.5) rose to 74, while seven others had donated to the missionary
endeavor. By 1833, the last year a comprehensive member list appears in the ledger, the number of members has risen to eighty (see Table 3.7). While a number of members appear on both the 1828/29 and 1833 lists, several new names had appeared by 1833. An interesting phenomenon is the appearance of larger numbers of non-Anglicized names on the 1833 list, many of whom were women.\footnote{116}

In terms of financial contributions to the missionary cause, Table 3.8 shows the total monies forwarded to the Ohio Missionary Society for their activities from those years available in the records. While there is no clear trend in terms of donations, it is interesting to note that the most money given in a single year was 1842, when the Wyandots were in the process of negotiating their removal from Ohio. Despite the weight of American expansion and, one might assume, ambivalent feelings towards white Americans and their institutions (including the Methodist Church), there is no indication from this scant record that Wyandot Methodists had grown disconnected from their religion, another indication that the hard feelings ginned up by Indian removal did not sever Wyandot Methodists from the religion they had made their own.\footnote{117}
Table 3.4: Leadership of the Wyandott Missionary Society, 1828-1845

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>1828</th>
<th>1829</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1831</th>
<th>1832</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Rev. Thomas Thompson</td>
<td>Rev. Thomas Thompson</td>
<td>John Lewis</td>
<td>John Lewis</td>
<td>Alexander Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Samuel Brown</td>
<td>Samuel Brown</td>
<td>Samuel Brown</td>
<td>Samuel Brown</td>
<td>Silas Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>John Hicks [Sr.]</td>
<td>John Hicks [Sr.]</td>
<td>Russia Hicks</td>
<td>Russia Hicks</td>
<td>James Harryhoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Francis A. Hicks</td>
<td>Francis A. Hicks</td>
<td>John Barnett</td>
<td>John Barnett</td>
<td>John Barnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Lump on the Head</td>
<td>Doctor Gray Eyes</td>
<td>Henry Jacco</td>
<td>Henry Jacco</td>
<td>Henry Jacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Robert Armstrong</td>
<td>Robert Armstrong</td>
<td>Stand in the Water</td>
<td>Stand in the Water</td>
<td>Stand in the Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Summonduwot</td>
<td>Summonduwot</td>
<td>John Hicks Jr.</td>
<td>John Hicks Jr.</td>
<td>Squeendehyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office:</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Alexander Long</td>
<td>Alexander Long</td>
<td>Alexander Long</td>
<td>Alexander Long</td>
<td>Alexander Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Silas Armstrong</td>
<td>Silas Armstrong</td>
<td>Silas Armstrong</td>
<td>No other records</td>
<td>Silas Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>William Walker</td>
<td>William Walker</td>
<td>William Walker</td>
<td>John M. Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>James Harryhoot</td>
<td>John Hicks, Sr.</td>
<td>John Hicks, Sr.</td>
<td>John Hicks, Sr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>John Barnett</td>
<td>James Bigtree</td>
<td>James Bigtree</td>
<td>James Bigtree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Henry Jacco</td>
<td>Francis Driver</td>
<td>Francis Driver</td>
<td>George Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Stand in the Water</td>
<td>Mononcue</td>
<td>Mononcue</td>
<td>Mononcue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Squeendehty</td>
<td>John McLean</td>
<td>John McLean*</td>
<td>Summonduwot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Died, March 1835*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>1838</th>
<th>1839</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1845</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Silas Armstrong</td>
<td>Silas Armstrong</td>
<td>Silas Armstrong</td>
<td>Silas Armstrong</td>
<td>James Wheeler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>No other records</td>
<td>Francis A. Hicks</td>
<td>Francis A. Hicks</td>
<td>Francis A. Hicks</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
<td>None listed</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
<td>George I. Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>John Hicks, Sr.</td>
<td>John Hicks, Sr.</td>
<td>John Hicks, Sr.</td>
<td>John Hicks, Sr.</td>
<td>John Hicks, Sr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>James Bigtree</td>
<td>James Bigtree</td>
<td>James Bigtree</td>
<td>Squire Gray Eyes</td>
<td>Squire Gray Eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>George Armstrong</td>
<td>Summonduwot</td>
<td>Matthew Mudeater</td>
<td>No Fat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Francis Driver</td>
<td>Francis Driver</td>
<td>Francis Driver</td>
<td>Matthew Mudeater</td>
<td>Matthew Mudeater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Summonduwot</td>
<td>None Listed</td>
<td>None Listed</td>
<td>David Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5: List of Original Members, Wyandott Missionary Society, 1828

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Notations (if any)</th>
<th>Name/Notations (if any)</th>
<th>Name/Notations (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. George Punch Sr.</td>
<td>25. Thomas Thompson</td>
<td>44. Ronuness (withdrawn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Russia Hicks</td>
<td>31. James Bigtree</td>
<td>50. Sarah Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Saint Peter</td>
<td>34. Tazhee (withdrawn)</td>
<td>53. Mary Fletcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Standing in the Water</td>
<td>36. John Barnett</td>
<td>55. Tall Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. George I. Clark</td>
<td>37. Francis A. Hicks</td>
<td>56. Mrs. Big River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Doctor Gray Eyes</td>
<td>38. John Lewis (withdrawn)</td>
<td>57. Rebecca Walker (withdrawn)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6: New Members and Donors to the Missionary Society, 1829

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Member Names</th>
<th>Donors (and amount donated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Henry Johnston’s wife</td>
<td>1. Mrs. Peacock ($12.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Matthew Warpole</td>
<td>2. Blind Woman ($25.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mrs. Warpole</td>
<td>3. Samuel Rankin ($25.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Charles B. Garrett</td>
<td>4. Mrs. Mudeater ($25.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mrs. Bigtree</td>
<td>5. Mary Mudeater ($25.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Henderson Going</td>
<td>6. Ronneay ($25.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mrs. Harryhoot</td>
<td>7. John Punch ($25.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Thomas Clark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Isaac Williams [unclear, Mrs.Sr.?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. S.W. Thornburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rebecca Hicks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mrs. Barnett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Synontah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Catharine Gray Eyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Widow Zanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mrs. Squire Gray Eyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. John Wesley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.7: List of Members of the Missionary Society, 1833^{21}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Long</td>
<td>Silas Armstrong</td>
<td>William Walker</td>
<td>Rain an cooh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.I. Clark</td>
<td>John Barnett</td>
<td>Henry Jacquis</td>
<td>David Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand in the Water</td>
<td>James Harryhoot</td>
<td>Squeendehty</td>
<td>Nendaynue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hicks, Sr.</td>
<td>Summonduwot</td>
<td>James Washington</td>
<td>Nancy R. Pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Chief</td>
<td>Russia Hicks</td>
<td>Saint Peter</td>
<td>John D. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Armstrong</td>
<td>Doctor Gray Eyes</td>
<td>Francis A. Hicks</td>
<td>Mrs. Standingwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squire Gray Eyes</td>
<td>Samuel Brown</td>
<td>Catharine Warpole</td>
<td>Mrs. Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Hicks</td>
<td>Hannah Walker</td>
<td>Sarah Barrett</td>
<td>Hoocuhquondooroo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hicks Jr.</td>
<td>Mary Fletcher</td>
<td>You mur ree hoo</td>
<td>Alfred [unclear: Choctaw?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gray Eyes</td>
<td>Sarrahess</td>
<td>James Rankin</td>
<td>Mendee’s Granddaughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Driver</td>
<td>Syuontoh</td>
<td>James Bigtree</td>
<td>Mentootoooh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McLean</td>
<td>Mrs. Big River</td>
<td>Matthew Warpole</td>
<td>Jacob Hooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Warpole</td>
<td>Charles B. Garrett</td>
<td>Mrs. Harryhoot</td>
<td>Kayroohooh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Clark</td>
<td>Isaac Williams</td>
<td>Rebecca Hicks</td>
<td>Matilda Gray Eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Barnett</td>
<td>Catharine Clark</td>
<td>Mrs. Squire Gray Eyes</td>
<td>Mendee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Gray Eyes</td>
<td>John Punch</td>
<td>Big River</td>
<td>Mrs. Rankin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Driver</td>
<td>Mary Hicks</td>
<td>Polly Summondowot</td>
<td>Dot soo ya nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dot to meh teh</td>
<td>Francis Mudeater</td>
<td>Robert R. Charloe</td>
<td>Polly Mudeater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Peter’s wife</td>
<td>Sally Frost</td>
<td>Blind Woman</td>
<td>Ronuness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Punch, Sr.</td>
<td>Russia Hicks wife</td>
<td>Mrs. Isaac Williams</td>
<td>Dotsoonoicue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.8: Total Monies Forwarded to the Ohio Missionary Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>$28.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>$33.37½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>$49.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>$44.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>$43.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>$31.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>$53.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Meanings of the Mission for the Wyandot People

During his efforts to compile information for his history of the mission, James B. Finley solicited the aid of the current missionary S.N. Allen, to collect information about Mononcue. In his interview, Mononcue remembered his deep connection to his faith, dating from the years that Finley served as missionary in the 1820s. He was so moved religiously that he became an exhorter, spreading the message of Christ to other Indians. He recalled a time when he travelled from Big Spring, where he had held a meeting, and praying at Betty Wright’s house with her family. Wright was an African-American adoptee. On the ride home, he was deep in prayer when he found his horse sprinting at full speed. Unable to stop the horse, Mononcue leapt off, knelt at the root of a tree and prayed. He then felt “like a Creature that had been killed with the trunk of its body full of blood.” The scene then changed, and Mononcue “felt like the [aforementioned] Creature would look when the Butcher would take a clean cloth, + wipe it all clean. He thanked God that he had wiped his hart [sic] clean from all Sin.” From that point to the writing of the letter (1838), Mononcue strove to do good and spread the Gospel to the best of his ability.¹²³

In the same letter, Allen recounted a story from the recent Quarterly Meeting of the Methodist Society. In the throng of attendees was an old lady of 60 or 70 named Bullhead (presumably the wife of Captain Bullhead, a stalwart traditionalist). Lady Bullhead spent her years “holding fast to to [sic] Paganism,” but had recently, in Allen’s opinion, been shown God’s wisdom. God had “we trust Converted her Soule.” She had long been associated with the traditionalists (described by Allen as wicked and intemperate), whose
leader according to Allen was George Washington. When Washington’s wife visited Lady Bull Head to “see if this new Religion was good for any thing,” she found Bull Head’s house clean, bedding clean, clothes clean, and all whiskey gone from the home. Washington’s wife had gone home and declared that “there was something in the new Religion, sayd [sic] she must have it.” Allen believed with the conversion of Mother Bull Head and the looming conversion of Mrs. Washington, an era was on the horizon when God would find his way into the hearts of all of the Wyandots.  

By 1841, Isaac Dawes observed a Wyandot community in which “some of those who were formerly members of the church and on the road to Zion have backslidden”, but with many still on the path to salvation. Overall, Dawes observed that since 1838 there had been a decrease rather than an increase in church members. He reported the death of several key women who were devoted to the church, including Mrs. Bigtree, old Synontah, and the widow of Samuel Brown. He also lamented the loss of Summonduwat in 1840 at the hands of the white men who murdered him, along with Nancy Coon (a.k.a. Little Nancy) and her husband, who was not a Methodist. The late Mr. Coon was the brother of Summonduwot’s wife Mary (nee Fighter), and was hunting with Summonduwot at the time of the murders (see Chapter 5 for more discussion of this incident). The incident had a profound impact on the Wyandot Nation generally, but especially on the Methodist Church, where Summonduwot and Nancy Coon were “regular in their attendance…but their seats are now vacant.” Due to the feeling of inevitability regarding removal, according to Dawes, the Wyandots had generally ceased making any improvements to their lands.
Even in light of the removal crisis and subsequent agreement to remove to Kansas (discussed in subsequent chapters), and keeping Dawes aforementioned letter in mind, one might suspect that interest in the Mission would decline, if not from consumption with the removal process than perhaps from despair, or even a rejection of American-associated institutions. However, a letter from Squire Gray Eyes to James B. Finley paints a different picture. Writing in May 1843, on the very verge of removal, Squire Gray Eyes, the leading Wyandot preacher and missionary, described a revival of Methodism. He reported that the “cause of religion has prospered more abundantly than years heretofore.” Between 50 and 60 new members joined during the preceding winter/spring, and Gray Eyes was quite optimistic for the future of Methodism among the Wyandots. Gray Eyes noted his advancing age, which had sapped his body of its old strength, but his soul and the power of God fueled his desire to shepherd more Wyandots along the Christian road. Gray Eyes hoped Finley could make a final journey to Upper Sandusky before the removal in June, as he believed Finley’s presence could work much good with those Wyandots newly interested in the church. Gray Eyes thought the preparation for removal was very similar to the preparation all Christians made to go to heaven, drawing comfort from the parallels in a moment that had to be incredibly challenging and depressing to those, like Gray Eyes, who had hoped to remain in Ohio.\footnote{127}

**Conclusion**

As the materials in this chapter seek to demonstrate, the Methodist mission to the Wyandots underwent a key transition in the years after the initial establishment of the
enterprise in the late 1810s/early 1820s. By the end of Wyandot occupancy in Ohio in the early 1840s, the Methodist faith had become an ingrained feature of the community, with approximately half of the Wyandot people engaged in Christian worship at any given time. With the increased involvement of Wyandots with the mission, from children to the elderly, Methodism was becoming, for practitioners at the very least, a Wyandot institution. While white Methodists continued to wield influence over the mission and its portrayal to the outside world, Wyandots grew into their faith and began to assert more direct influence and control over their religious institutions. Indeed, one can argue that by the time of Removal, Methodism had become a kind of tradition for a significant segment of the Wyandot population.
FOUR: ECONOMICS AND ADAPTATIONS

“Money with the Wyandots is everything.” — John McElvain, 1834

Introduction

The Wyandot people of the early 19th century dwelt in a region of natural bounty, particularly for an agricultural society, as the farming Wyandots well knew. Proponents of the federal civilization program had long argued it would sustain the Wyandots through their adaptation to American-style male-dominated farms. As George Washington remarked to Wyandot chiefs visiting Philadelphia in 1796,

> your lands are good. Upon these you may raise horses and large flocks of cattle, by the sale of which, you may procure the conveniencies [sic] and necessaries of life in greater abundance and with less trouble than you do at present. You may also by a little more industry raise more corn and other grain as well for your families as for the support of your stock in winter.²

Washington hoped that all would reflect on this and follow his proposed course of change, and “when the Government shall be informed that they have taken this wise course and are sincerely desirous to be aided in it, they may rely upon receiving all necessary assistance.”³ For the most part, the men who succeeded Washington in the presidential office echoed similar beliefs about the Wyandots and their lands. Indeed, numerous Wyandot men did begin to convert to agriculturalists, pushing women into increasingly domestic-centered roles. However, as this chapter demonstrates, Wyandot people found a multitude of ways to exist economically, both within and without the Grand Reserve community.

Simultaneously with the development of the Methodist mission into a fully-functioning Wyandot institution, many Wyandot people engaged in great cultural and
economic changes. A large percentage of Wyandots became more directly involved in the market economics of the broader American society around them, with some experiencing limited successes as merchants, farmers, and in other occupations. Many also engaged in various forms of consumerism both on and off the Grand Reserve. At the same time, many Wyandots experienced a variety of economic problems, including mass debts to creditors, litigation based on their economic activities, and persistent loss of resources to thieves and interlopers. Regardless of the specific results, the Wyandot people were indeed changing economically in the 1820s-1840s. Several patterns emerge, but a key source of discussion is the interconnection (or lack thereof) between adherence to Christianity and economic adaptation, considering the relationships between these aspects of culture change in the Wyandot world.4

Initial Observations: A Land and People of Bounty

In the wake of the establishment of the Methodist mission, reports from the missionaries portrayed a people rapidly on the road to economic development. James Finley noted in late 1825 that “new houses allmost [sic] constantly going up this summer,” with rapid improvements in terms of fencing land, planting crops, and raising livestock.5 Contrary to assumptions one might make about the impact of Jackson’s election, and a general perception that Native Americans waited with baited breath as the axe of Indian removal fell, information coming out of Ohio proved quite the contrary. Agent John McElvain argued in February 1830 that the Wyandots, Shawnees, and Senecas of Lewistown were nearly to a man devoting themselves to farming, and if left in
place for a few more years would “become respectable citizens, + good farmers.” McElvain reported by May 1830 that Indian farmers were being more industrious than ever. He stated that “the Indians this season are cultivating almost double the quantity of ground, than they have done in any former year…I can truly say that I have never known them so industrious as they are at present.” He took this as a sign that they would no longer rely on hunting for subsistence. Early the next year, he opined that the Wyandots “are improving much” and were thriving, aside from complaints that $175 of their annuity payment was not made in November. Most of the information flowing out of Upper Sandusky by the 1830s indicated a community largely invested in male-led agricultural pursuits. For example, McElvain noted to the Secretary of War the desperate need on the Grand Reserve of the yearly allotment of blacksmith supplies used to keep farming implements in repair, “as they are at this time turning their attention almost entirely to agricultural pursuits.”

In fact, every indication in the midst of the pressure to remove is that the Wyandots were preparing to live in Ohio for the foreseeable future. They began to plan to replace their badly worn-out mills at the cost of several thousand dollars. Such an outlay certainly demonstrated that the Wyandots planned to stay on their lands and continue their agricultural developments. McElvain worried that the lands on the Grand Reserve were increasing dramatically in value, especially due to a contemplated railroad running from Dayton to Lake Erie which would pass through the reservation. In 1834, the Wyandots continued to discuss rebuilding their mills, which “many of them say good mills is all that’s wanting to make them independent + happy.” Not only would these
developments further increase the funds necessary to remove the Wyandots in the future, they might prevent their removal altogether.\textsuperscript{11} The Wyandots did indeed hire a Mr. Post to rebuild their sawmill and to erect a new dam for the mill, which McElvain saw (in economic terms) as a “very correct and judicious step on their part.”\textsuperscript{12}

It is interesting to note that John McElvain made it very clear to the Secretary of War that the Wyandot Chiefs were NOT rebuilding the mills on the demands of a minority (whether defined in terms of economic interest, racial admixture, or both), but “so completely are the chiefs under their [common Indians] control that they do not appropriate a single cent to any object whatever unless first sanctioned by the nation at large.”\textsuperscript{13}

In 1838, Purdy McElvain provided a detailed description of the Grand Reserve for the Office of Indian Affairs. He noted Upper Sandusky’s position between Lake Erie and Columbus, being nearly equidistant from both. The “most important and leading thorofares [sic]” passed through the Reserve. Tributaries and springs fed the Sandusky River consistently, though the water was hard due to extensive limestone deposits. The limestone was plentiful, and of both blue and white type. Sulfur springs could produce, in McElvain’s opinion, large quantities of pure sulfur, carbonate of soda, and sulfate of magnesia. In terms of landscape, the reservation was split nearly evenly into cleared prairie lands and woodlands. The diversity of trees (various types of oak, hickory, walnut, elm, and sugar maple, was typical of much of the rest of the state and region. The prairies contained rich black loam, producing great quantities of grass and hay. All of the lands, even those with thin soils on ridges, produced a rich bounty of crops.\textsuperscript{14}
The Wyandots produced a wide array of fruits (apples, peaches, cherries, wild cherries, crabapples, grapes, raspberries, strawberries, may apples), nuts (walnuts, white walnuts, hickory nuts, beech nuts, hazelnuts, acorns), and crops (corn, wheat, oats, buckwheat, potatoes). Of particular note was also a cranberry swamp reserved to the Wyandots, about 160 acres, yielding 4000-5000 bushels of cranberries, which could bring .50-.75/bushel for sale locally, or $1.00-$1.25/bushel “when taken any distance.”

Additionally, the Wyandots produced large quantities of pigs for both their own use and to sell on the market. McElvain presented a scene of increase and advancement in his report. The Wyandots “presented indisputable evidence of increased industry”, with the Nation full of “bustle and hurry.” The blacksmith shop was particularly busy as Wyandots brought in large numbers of farm implements to be fixed, and new items being made as well. He stated that “more new fields were fenced an more corn planted” than any year McElvain previously served at the agency, and the Wyandots were, in his view, “manifestly on the rise as an Agricultural people.” The lack of game further drove the Wyandots into the arms of male agriculture. McElvain remarked that a “large majority” of the Wyandots appeared “happy and contented”, and “peace and harmony” between the Wyandots and their white neighbors pervaded the reservation. The only dark clouds were the attachment of “the lower class of Wyandotts” to alcohol, which was easy to acquire from surrounding whites, and frequent property theft (particularly horses) by “wandering vagabond whites.”

15
The Outside World Comes to the Grand Reserve

In the years after the establishment of the Methodist Mission, the Wyandot Reservation quickly became a central hub in the growing white travel, trade, and settlement routes though northwestern Ohio. For example, in early 1825, the Ohio Assembly appointed commissioners to construct and repair a road connecting Xenia to Upper Sandusky, which would also pass through the towns of Springfield, Urbana, and Bellefontaine. Missionary James Finley noted that same year that a turnpike would be built “to superseed [sic] the Mud & Watter [sic] of the Black Swamp.” The next year, the state authorized the building of a road from Upper Sandusky to Fort Defiance, in the northwestern corner of the state. This new roadway would improve transportation from Upper Sandusky to the southwestern parts of Ohio, potentially providing more economic opportunities for Wyandots involved in various business enterprises. Of course, new roads could also escalate the influx of white Americans into Wyandot territory, further exacerbating pressure to remove, or at the very least to interact with whites whether individual Wyandots wished to or not. A number of these cultural contacts yielded negative consequences, as Native Americans across Ohio reported significant losses of property to encroaching white settlers and travelers, who conversely made claims against the Native Americans. As John Johnston complained, the Indians under his charge were losing funds from their annuities to pay for the white claims against them, while he had the inability to compensate them for the losses they suffered at the hands of white settlers.
In 1828, the Postmaster General of the United States recommended the use of $21,000 state revenue to construct a road through the Wyandot Reservation and a road connecting the Big Spring Reserve to the Reservation. The road would be vital for the mail route connecting Portland, Ohio, and Cincinnati.21 Road construction continued rapidly into the 1830s. An 1833 announcement in a Bucyrus newspaper noted that changes to existing roadways would be considered, including extending a road from Norwalk to intersect with the Upper Sandusky-Urbana road near Cranetown, the former home of Tarhe.22 The next year, the Ohio State Assembly passed an act to lay out a new state road from Delaware County to Upper Sandusky.23 The same year the state authorized the relocation of a road connecting Dublin to Upper Sandusky.24 Yet another road, this time from Bucyrus to Upper Sandusky, was approved for survey the following month.25 The state of Ohio continued to develop new roadways in the late 1830s. One act established a roadway from Seneca County to Marion County, cutting through Little Sandusky along the way.26 Two months later the Ohio Assembly authorized the building of a free turnpike road from Champaign County to Upper Sandusky.27

The net result of this activity was an increased American presence among the Wyandots, and the growing interconnection of the Grand Reserve to the rest of the state. Indian Agent John Johnston made note that the main road connecting Cincinnati and Lake Erie passed through the center of the Grand Reserve, with “an uninterrupted stream of travel by daily mail stages and in every other way going along this great thoroughfare.” From his perspective, this traffic brought many intelligent visitors to the Reservation.28 Such travel could sometimes overwhelm available resources, as when
Johnston later complained about having to take lodging at the public house in Upper Sandusky on “a hard bed among hostlers, stage drivers and travellers [sic] of every description.”

As John McElvain noted in 1833, Upper Sandusky, roughly in the center of the Grand Reserve, had become a major hub of activity for whites traveling along the state roads there, especially with the growth of travel to and from New York via the Great Lakes. Many travelers were forced to stay the night at Upper Sandusky, or at least seek refreshment, due to the distance from white settlements. McElvain wished for permission from the Office of Indian Affairs to build a tavern under the control of the War Department, as the only one in Upper Sandusky was a “filthy tavern kept at that place by a Mr. Garrett.” Charles Garrett, in McElvain’s view, charged exorbitant prices for poor service. Garrett had married one of William Walker’s sisters, and according to McElvain’s description was like other intermarried whites in claiming extensive tribal privileges. In Garrett’s case, this was a claim to exclusive rights to maintain a public house. Garrett opposed removal since he “is making an easy living + may I say a fortune.”

Garrett also occasionally made additional revenue supplying provisions for to special occasions, such as annuity payments.

Even famed English writer Charles Dickens visited the Grand Reserve, recording the event in his travelogue *American Notes*. In 1842, Dickens and his wife spent one night in Upper Sandusky at the “log Inn, which was the only house of entertainment in the place.” While Dickens and his wife slept in a large room of adequate comfort, his travel companion, after being bitten by bedbugs in the attic, retired to the coach parked
outside. While there, the pigs in the town “looking upon the coach as a kind of pie with some manner of meat inside,” which made the man so afraid that he refused to come out until daybreak. Dickens noted that no alcohol was permitted on the Grand Reserve, though it was easily (and expensively) available from “travelling pedlars [sic].” Dickens also made a few observations about the Wyandots he met, “riding on shaggy ponies” and looking, to Dickens’ eyes, “like the meaner sort of gipsies [sic].”\(^\text{32}\)

Infrastructure expansion and increased American travel proved a double-edged sword in a variety of ways. While these trends brought more economic opportunities by the 1820s and 1830s, it also drove outsiders to an increased desire to end the Wyandot presence on their Ohio lands, a thought process that permeated the entire post-War of 1812 period. As more people saw firsthand the rich farmlands on the Grand Reserve, and the opportunities for businesses along the growing network of roads, the Wyandots and their control of the lands proved undesirable to white Ohioans. At different points in this period, pressure mounted in the state of Ohio to remove the Indians as expeditiously as possible. As John Johnston reported from his observations of the Ohio Legislature sessions of December 1825, Ohioans viewed the Indian lands as impediments to expansion and improvement, particularly the building of roads, canals, etc. to benefit the northwestern part of the state. The Sandusky Indians, in particular, were regularly discussed.\(^\text{33}\)

Johnston again offered this opinion a few years later, along with his opinion on the high value of Ohio Indian lands, some of which he speculated would “command $100 an acre.”\(^\text{34}\)

The Grand Reserve sat in a key position in the region, and many Ohioans were anxious to have access to its rich farmlands, situated on a major waterway
and convenient to numerous market towns. Politically, many argued that the reservation impeded the growth and progress of Crawford County, particularly the distance many had to travel to reach county offices and the lack of legal authority and control over the Wyandot lands.\footnote{35}

**Earning Money via the U.S. Government**

Aside from earning money through their own labors on their own lands, short-term economic benefits from association with governmental offices were also possible. While many of these instances were likely not documented (a few dollars for running an errand, some small goods during visits to government offices, etc.), some do crop up in the extant government documents. For instance in 1828, Sub-Agent Charles Cass asked his brother Lewis, the Governor of Michigan Territory, to “give the bearer the Little Chief something” for his carrying a letter to Detroit. In the same letter, he also appealed to Lewis to give “old Mrs. Crane the wife of Old Crane” something as well.\footnote{36} While it is unclear what sort of “something,” if any, Little Chief and the Crane’s widow received, such small-scale, casual payments accrued to hundreds of dollars a year in contingent expenses at many agencies.\footnote{37} In September 1829, Charles Cass wrote his brother a voucher to request that he give a young, industrious Wyandot man a plow if he had one on hand.\footnote{38} Later that year, Cass again called upon his brother, this time to give Francis Hicks some traveling money for a trip to and from Canada.\footnote{39} Even though such expenditures were considered necessary to appease the Wyandots, the War Department
attempted to curb such spending and ordered Agent John McElvain not to exceed his contingent budget.\textsuperscript{40}

The Wyandot Nation also occasionally called upon the U.S. Government to aid destitute or aged individuals. In December 1832, for instance, the National Council asked that the “liberality of the Government” be shown to Thomas Long, a warrior who had served the U.S. during the War of 1812, and Ronuness, the eldest Chief from Big Spring, who was old and frail. They also asked that the 320 acres granted to Ronuness in a recent 1832 treaty be patented to him, which would allow him to secure it for his descendants (they feared that the language of the treaty might allow the land to revert to the U.S. upon his death).\textsuperscript{41} While the War Department refused to aid Long or Ronuness on the grounds that there were no provisions in the law to do so, they did issue a patent for Roununess’ land.\textsuperscript{42}

Another obscure (in terms of specifically who benefitted or received which items), but costly, outlay of funds to Wyandot people came in the form of expenditures during the distribution of annual annuity payments. The costs of providing the provender, small goods such as tobacco, and other items could run to hundreds of dollars each year. The expense was so great that the War Department urged agents to “study economy” in issuing rations to Indians during the annuity season. The government also asked agents to curb costs by only having the head chief collect the annuity and distribute payments on his own time (and dime).\textsuperscript{43} The Wyandots and other Ohio Indians certainly came to expect such distributions as a regular influx of cash and goods, as new agent John McElvain revealed when he wrote the War Department to request how much was
customarily spent on the “custom to furnish provisions for the Indians at the time of payment and during their stay.”

In the frequent unsuccessful efforts to sign removal treaties in the 1830s, the Wyandots found another external source of cash and goods. James Gardiner, who had been selected to conduct treaty negotiations with the Wyandots and other Ohio peoples in 1831, wrote the War Department to request a larger contingent fund, which he deemed essential to conducting negotiations. Such funds were “indispensable” to his efforts and included such necessities as “the hire of guides; employment of extra interpreters; travelling expenses of the regular interpreters; victualling [sic] small parties of Indians; [and] occasional presents of tobacco.” Such expenditures continued through the negotiations of a removal treaty in 1842. Joel Walker served as a collector and examiner of the Wyandot debts. George I. Clark provided firewood and house repairs for Johnston during his stay at Upper Sandusky. George Garrett provided over $250 for provisions during the negotiations, while Matthew Walker provided corn meal. Such expenditures, documented or not, infused thousands of dollars into Wyandot hands in the decades before removal, providing jobs, cash, and goods to (at least) dozens of Wyandot people.

**Earning Money via White Ohioans**

Proximity to white settlers could also yield some short-term economic benefits. For example, some Wyandots sold rights to the timber on their lands to whites. While the agent complained that whites were deforesting some of the land, some Wyandots benefitted financially from usage of their resources. John McElvain feared that the best
timber would be gone before the land could be purchased by treaty, and alleged that many Wyandots likely sold the timber rights for small amounts of whisky.

Leasing lands also became a method by which Wyandots earned monies from outsiders. For example, in 1826 James B. Finley reported that Cherokee Boy wished to contract with James Whitaker, a trader and merchant, for use of part of his land in exchange for a variety of goods (mostly food), to last as long as Whitaker and his wife lived. Finley deemed the amount of goods too low for the land in question, but approved the deal in lieu of nearby whites continuing to cut the timber on Cherokee Boy’s land illegally. He further argued that allowing the older Wyandots to lease their lands might be useful both to ease their old age with an influx of cash and to discourage further land sales to raise funds. Lewis Cass thought the measure was a good idea, and promised to suggest it to the War Department. In 1829, Charles Cass informed his brother Lewis that Warpole and Peacock, two older leaders mentioned in previous chapters, would soon arrive at Detroit. He wanted Lewis to talk with Warpole about “the impropriety of leasing this Land he seems to be impressed with an idea that was the cause of its being surveyed.” A few months later, new agent John McElvain reported that a delegation of chiefs approached him to inform him that they wished to lease some of their lands, particularly for those who were too old to labor for themselves. Several years later, the idea of leasing to outsiders continued to be a source of income (and controversy). In 1833 John McElvain noted that, despite his best efforts, a number of Wyandots were leasing lands to white settlers, and he believed many more, including the chiefs, wished to do so in order to “obtain an easy living.”
1841, he found that “numerous renters and croppers under the authority of the chiefs” along with some squatters, had occupied significant tracts of land, “some of the finest land the sun ever shone upon.”

Losing Money via Outside Contact

Proximity to a growing number of whites also yielded several negative consequences. Close proximity to white settlements led to a mass amount of property loss suffered by Native Americans in Ohio. There are simply too many such instances to mention each one, but several examples will illustrate the broader difficulties sticky white fingers played in complicating the economic lives of the Sandusky Wyandots. For instance, Finley expended over 20 dollars from late 1824 to early 1826 to legally pursue charges against whites robbing Wyandots/stealing horses. John Johnston noted the theft of saddles and bridles from the Meeting House at Upper Sandusky in 1828, requiring the posting of a $50 reward. Johnston requested $1539.25 in March 1829 to compensate Ohio Indians for the various property losses they suffered at the hands of American citizens.

By the 1830s, Wyandot economic engagement with the surrounding white communities yielded not only an influx of goods, but also a growing body of claims against the Nation for debt obligations. For example, in 1832 the War Department asked Governor Porter of Michigan to investigate claims by a Joel Lee against the Wyandots, as well as denying claims by C. Stover and William Bosson due to lack of evidence. Such claims, when approved, would be deducted from annuity payments.
In Michigan a year later, Big Snake appealed to a Justice of the Peace to recover a horse he owned which was being held by a white man, which the officer agreed was Big Snake’s horse. John McElvain wrote to the War Department to follow up on an 1829 claim for a horse stolen from John Hicks, Jr. The War Department would not pay due to lack of concrete evidence. On at least one occasion, the culprits were not white Americans, but other Native Americans. Sharlow [also spelled Charloe] alleged that a party of Ottawas took three horses from him.

William Walker reported the theft of a pony from Silas Armstrong and a mare belonging to John M. Armstrong in early 1835 by “some vagabond, travelling along the road to the south.” Silas Armstrong, Major Lewis (a local white man), and Matthew Walker pursued the thieves, but were unable to catch them. Silas Armstrong went all the way to Zanesville to look for the thieves, where he apparently caught the thieves and recovered the horses. In the same letter, Walker referenced a theft from November 15, when Henry Jacquis and Silas Armstrong had horses stolen. Walker received word that a boy who would be travelling through Upper Sandusky who was with the men who committed the theft. Upon questioning by the Crawford County Sheriff, the boy gave up the names of the thieves, who were the brothers of a former tenant of Hicks, one of the leading men among the Wyandots. When they learned of the location of the men and stolen horses, Jacquis and three white men (one of whom was George Garrett) set off for Coshocton with the intention of traveling all night to avoid any word of their arrival reaching the thieves. They returned with the thieves in irons, and also arrested the former tenant of John Hicks, Sr., who admitted not only working with his relatives, but
also to stealing a calf from Hicks which was too wild to keep on the road and apparently returned to Hicks of its own volition. One of the thieves wished to turn state’s evidence and unveil the entire ring of thieves operating out of the Coshocton area who had been stealing from the Wyandots. George Garrett and Major Lewis had returned to Coshocton County to arrest two more suspected thieves. William Walker noted that they had to ask the Marion County jail to house the prisoners, as the nearest white jail (at Bucyrus, which Walker disparagingly called the “Buckrust Jail”) “will not hold a Boar Pig.” By 1841, agent John Bear reported that the Wyandots had increased slightly in number, but “the moral condition of the nation is on the decrease” due to being surrounded by whites “of the most degraded class.” This led to temptations like alcohol that had begun to sap the strength of the Nation.64

The Marker of a “Civilized” Culture: Economics and the Courts

A key example of the growing Wyandot economic engagement with white Americans was the increased involvement of Wyandot people in the American court system. While significant economic changes characterized the 1820s-1840s, the Wyandot people were not complete strangers to the American court system, particularly those adopted by the Nation. Adoptee Robert Armstrong, for instance, became embroiled in a number of suits in the first decades of the nineteenth century, due to his efforts to engage in various businesses designed to enhance his personal wealth. From the number and type of suits, it seems Armstrong never reached the economic solvency he craved.65
In 1825, James Finley reported that a white man who had performed labor on the Reserve filed a claim for monies owed against Elizabeth Wright, a “collard woman” who lived on the Reserve. The Chiefs heard the case and determined no money was owed. The man proceeded to take the claim to white authorities, who found in his favor for thirty dollars. He drove some of Wright’s cattle to his property with the intention of selling them for the debt. Finley was unsure if the Indians were subject to civil authority and requested guidance from Lewis Cass, who concurred with Finley in that the action was illegal.\(^{66}\) The War Department authorized Finley to engage the District Attorney of Ohio to prosecute the trespassing white man, as the Wyandots were not subject to state laws.\(^{67}\) John Johnston asked that either Finley or Isaac Walker explain the case to an attorney named Parish he had hired to handle the case.\(^{68}\)

With the founding of Crawford County in 1830, Wyandots appeared more frequently in American courts, typically as defendants in a variety of cases. In March 1832, James Whitaker sued Yan a Neah Teah, the widow of Cherokee Boy, to solidify his ownership rights to 160 acres of land, which was a quarter of the section of land reserved to Cherokee Boy by the Treaty of the Rapids of the Miami in 1817. As mentioned above, Whitaker and Cherokee Boy made the agreement in 1827, with approval by the President of the United States (required to allow Cherokee Boy to sell his land) in January 1828.\(^{69}\) The agreement required Whitaker to make an annual payment to Cherokee Boy, or his heirs in event of his death, of two barrels of flour, one barrel of pickled pork, fifty bushels of corn, and five dollars in cash. In the lag time between the agreement between the two men and the official permission of the President for the sale, Cherokee Boy died.
Cherokee Boy had no children, but his widow was entitled to the proceeds of the agreement. Whitaker had offered the payment each year since Cherokee Boy’s death, but Yan a Neah Teah consistently refused to accept the payment. While it is unclear why she refused, one can reasonably assume that she did not feel bound by the agreement, either desiring possession of the land or a more lucrative payment from Whitaker. Whitaker took the Presidential approval as a done deal and engaged in massive improvements to the land, including a house and store, which he valued at $1000. Whitaker (perhaps to solidify his claim that Cherokee Boy was a Wyandot and had the right to sell the land) explained that Cherokee Boy had been taken captive as a youth somewhere near the Mississippi River, had no knowledge of his birth community, and had lived nearly eighty years as a Wyandot, being adopted formally and even serving as a chief. Yan a Neah Teah never formally answered the summons or charges, which in the courts’ view essentially forfeited her right to challenge Whitaker’s ownership of the land. The court found in Whitaker’s favor, but also provided a lien against the property for Yan a Neah Teah, in the event that Whitaker failed to deliver on his end of the bargain. The court ordered him to deliver up the goods to Yan a Neah Teah on May 1 every year until her death and, if the goods were not delivered, provided that Yan a Neah Teah receive forty dollars in cash. Whitaker disliked these provisions and gave “notice of his intention to appeal to the supreme court.”

In 1837, William Walker, John Barnett, and Doctor Gray Eyes, acting on behalf of the nation as a whole, contracted with Henry St. John, a miller from Seneca County, to provide 100 barrels of flour, for which the Wyandots agreed to pay $700. The Wyandots
neither paid for nor took away the flour, leading to St. John to sue the chiefs. Walker and Gray Eyes (Barnett had died) employed lawyers to fight the case, arguing that St. John’s case did not have legal standing, and he was not owed the money. The court ruled in St. John’s favor, as he had sufficient evidence that he had prepared the flour and had it ready by the contracted date. However, since the Wyandots never claimed the flour, and he could therefore dispose of it other ways, the Wyandots did not owe the full amount. The Wyandots appealed the case to the Supreme Court, which in 1842 upheld the lower court ruling that the Wyandots owed Henry St. John $310.61.71

Due to their business engagements, the Walker family (and sometime associate George I. Clark) frequented the courts for unpaid purchases. In March 1839, the Clinton Bank of Columbus sued William Walker (along with associates Moses Kirby and Nathaniel Medbury [?]) for over four thousand dollars in monies owed. After repeated efforts to collect the money, including the defendants’ giving a bill of exchange to the Clinton Bank to collect from a bank in New York (said bank refused to pay the bill of exchange), the defendants were ordered to pay the debt, along with $865.10 in damages and $10.84 in court costs. 72

In 1839, the Crawford County Court ruled that George I. Clark, William Walker, and Joel Walker owed Leonard Valentine and Isaac Kirby $1482.52.73 Later that same year, the court ordered William and Joel Walker to pay Enoch B. Meriman $606.02 plus court costs. 74 By 1841, the Walker brothers found themselves the subject of a number of lawsuits in Crawford County. In July 1841, the court ruled in favor of three different plaintiffs (Rufus R. Skeel; Parsons, Lawrence, and Lawrence; Justice E. Earll) against the
Walker brothers for $343.66 (plus court costs), $291.13 (plus court costs), and $245.91 (plus court costs) respectively. Business was clearly expensive.

**Dividing Lands into “Private” Holdings**

By the late spring of 1825, the Wyandot Council had determined to divide the Grand Reserve lands into private landholdings (still regarded as held in severalty by the U.S. Government) in order to, in part, further their individual economic development. The survey commenced (similar to the fashion the U.S. employed in surveying and dividing townships and sections), but the Wyandots ran out of funds to complete the project. On their behalf, James Finley wrote to Lewis Cass asking that the federal government assist them financially to complete the project, arguing that it would only help to further the missionary cause and the economic adaptations underway on the Grand Reserve. Cass recommended that the U.S. government assist the Wyandots in dividing their lands to be held in severalty, which would encourage their adaptation. The War Department concurred that such a measure would serve to usher the Wyandots toward American civilization, but funds were not available to finance the survey. By March 1827, the War Department approved the funds necessary to survey and divide the Grand Reserve. While the decision to divide the lands (in terms of use) was not a division of the lands into privately held, titled properties, some observers, such as James B. Gardiner, argued that by virtue of the 1817 treaty which created the Grand Reserve, the Wyandots had already agreed to individual land ownership on equal terms. The results of this contention are discussed in a later section.
Wyandot Consumption: General Store Ledgers

One useful, though limited, resource to uncover some of the economic engagement of Wyandot peoples in the 19th century is the consumption of goods by Wyandot people in the form of purchases from general stores. By examining the extant data from these resources, one can begin to see some patterns of consumption at the community level, as well as making some modest assertions about factors such as cultural adaptation and especially gender-based consumption.

The core sources for this section are two general store ledgers. As Linda English has recently argued in her work on general stores in the Indian Territory and Texas in the 19th century, analysis of general store records yields substantial data about economic status, racial mores and buying patterns, and gender roles in small communities. The first ledger can reasonably be connected to a white-owned general store located on Tymochtee Creek just outside of the Wyandot Reservation. The original is held by the Wyandot (Ohio) County Historical Society, and was microfilmed in the 1990s by Bowling Green State University. The ledger covers the years 1824-1832 but is far from complete, with numerous spans of page numbers missing from the original ledger books. The store primarily serviced white clientele, according to the available records, but individuals from the Wyandot Reserve did purchase from the store, yielding some interesting consumer data.

The second, and far more intriguing ledger, has a more nebulous provenance. It was “discovered” in the 1970s in Oklahoma City, and eventually found its way to the
Based on an examination of the ledger, it is reasonable to attribute its origin to the store maintained by the Walker family. William Walker, Sr., an adopted former captive, likely generated the early entries in the ledger, which begin in 1819. Later entries may have been made by one of his sons, probably William Jr. (William, Sr. died in January 1824) or Isaac Walker. The ledger in its original form would likely have been a tremendous window into the consumption habits of a large number of Wyandot people in the early 1820s, as the principal clientele were the people on the Reserve itself. Unfortunately, the ledger’s historical value is significantly hampered in its current form. Subsequent owners of the ledger apparently deemed it of little worth. After all, it was a relic from a long-defunct general store in a region no longer populated by the Wyandot people. Consequently, many of the pages of the ledger were repurposed, mostly by pasting poems and clippings from newspapers over them. Efforts by the Oklahoma Historical Society to remove the overlays have been largely unsuccessful, leaving modern researchers with a frustratingly obfuscated partial glimpse into the data. Despite these drawbacks, what is left of the ledger (referred to as the Wyandot ledger below) does allow tantalizing glimpses into the day to day economic activities of some Wyandot people.

The Tymochtee store ledger requires a degree of caution when examining the data, principally because a large number of white Ohioans living near the mission comprised the greater part of the customer base. Additionally, many Wyandot families and individuals had fairly common EuroAmerican surnames, such as Walker, Wright, Williams, Hicks, etc., which sometimes makes parsing out the correct individuals
difficult. After isolating the identifiable Wyandot people, Wyandots and non-Wyandots married to Wyandots (and resident on the Reserve) account for over 130 individual transactions over an eight year timespan, including both debits for goods sold and credits for payments made by purchasers. I have chosen to include “affiliates” to the community in this count (missionaries, white men married to Wyandot women, nearby residents of the Negro town who were heavily intermarried with the Wyandot) since they were all intimately connected to the circulation of products in the community. It is important to keep in mind that a number of sections of the ledger are missing. Certainly, a number of purchases from this store in this period are omitted for this reason. In many ways, a cursory overview of the Tymochtee ledger conforms to what one might suspect. The primary reservation community contact with the store was through more acculturated individuals such as William Walker, Jr., Isaac Walker, George Wright, and Francis Driver, nearly all of whom are usually grouped with the more adaptive circles of the Wyandot community and leaders in the Methodist mission on the Reservation. Additionally, the Methodist missionaries appear several times in the ledger, with many of their purchases in sufficient volume to deduce that many of the products were for the use of the Mission, impacting the children housed in the mission school and perhaps adult converts who frequented the mission as well.

The most common household items in the ledger were basic foodstuffs (flour, coffee, tea, fish, etc.), tools and agricultural implements (screws, nails, plows, etc.), payment for housing/feeding animals, and alcohol. There is some indication of buyer wealth and status in these purchases. While few purchased luxury goods at the
Tymochtee store, Isaac Walker, in particular, occasionally bought items such as dinner plates, new knives and forks, a new saddle, and other goods. The volume of goods consumed also indicates some degree of economic disparity between the buyers. For example, wealthier Wyandots tended to buy quarts or even barrels of brandy and whisky, while less wealthy Wyandots often bought drams for six cents each. The two most active Wyandots at the Tymochtee store, by far, were Isaac Walker and his brother William Walker, Jr. While some of their purchases may have been used for resale on the Reservation (I will discuss the store maintained by the Walker family shortly), most of the purchases were of small volume and tended to be personal use items.\textsuperscript{85}

Isaac Walker was the most frequent Wyandot client in the Tymochtee store, with twenty-nine separate entries from November 1824 to December 1828 (he died in May 1829). Isaac Walker was arguably the most acculturated Wyandot of his day, and his story plays a large part in Chapter 5. In economic terms, by the 1820s, he had inherited a half share in the Wyandot store (called “Walker’s Place” on the Reservation) from his father. He also served as the government interpreter on the reservation, and was both fluent and literate in English. He frequently served as an interpreter for the Methodist mission, was a founding member of the Missionary Society in 1828, and became a full-fledged member of the church shortly before his death. Additionally, Isaac Walker consciously asserted rights typically reserved for white men, voting in newly-formed Crawford County from its creation in 1821 (he was the only Wyandot to do so) and serving as its first constable. Walker’s purchases at the Tymochtee store ran the gamut from basic household items (a butter tub, snuff, tea, and the like) to manufactured goods.
like gloves, shoes, and a new saddle. He also bought some relatively expensive luxury items, such as Nankin grapes for $6.50 (Nankin is a small town in northeast Ohio) and a pair of lambskin gloves for $2.50.86

Interestingly, the ledger only records two instances of Walker’s purchase of unfinished fabric of any kind, and one of those specifically notes that his mother, Catherine, made the purchase on his account. Walker married his wife Rebecca in 1822. She was a white woman from a nearby community. Cultural difference does not seem incredibly important here, as it is unlikely that his wife lacked the skills to make clothes (most women in frontier Ohio continued to make their own clothing in this era). One is tempted to speculate that perhaps the family demonstrated their affluence by buying manufactured clothes, or perhaps purchased clothes from a local tailor, though there is no concrete evidence to scaffold this assertion. Whatever the cause, Isaac Walker’s purchasing patterns are distinctly different from others in the Tymochtee ledger, even his own siblings, and may be indicative of the adaptive tendencies he demonstrated in other aspects of his life.87

A most revealing factor in examining these records is the role of women as purchasers and consumers/users of many of the goods. Looking at the data as a whole, women are listed as the purchaser ten times. Fully half of those instances were widows, including Rebecca Walker (who continued to be listed under her deceased husband’s account number after his death in 1829), Old Washington’s wife, and the widow of Armstrong, a white adoptee. Additionally, in six instances, specific reference is made in the ledger to the account holder’s wife making the purchases. On three occasions, twice
under George Wright’s account and once under Isaac Walker’s, the recorder indicated that their mothers were making the purchases. 88

While the collective number of purchases (19) made directly by women (at least as indicated in the written record) is modest, a closer look at the types of items Wyandot men were purchasing yields a glimpse into the purchasing power of women. When one considers the impact of divisions between acculturation and “tradition” in indigenous communities in this era, a common link between the two conceptual worlds was the principal role of women in both cooking and the production of clothing. Textiles and related items dominate the record of purchases in the ledger. The Tymochtee merchants noted a variety of fabric purchases, including shirting, linen, gingham, calico, and cambric (a dense, glossy fabric often used to make women’s apparel, as well as to do needlework), as well as related purchases such as thread and buttons. Twenty-three individual purchases included at least one of these items, with many of them including two or more distinct raw materials for the home production of clothing. Additionally, nearly twenty other transactions included the purchase of finished clothing such as hats, gloves, shoes and moccasins. Certainly, some of these items were destined for Wyandot women as well. Whether women accompanied their husbands to the Tymochtee store to select items is unclear, though it seems unlikely that men purchased bolts of gingham or calico solely of their own accord. Taken as a whole, the extant records reveal purchasing patterns predominated by goods whose consumption and usage was typically female gender-specific. 89
Turning attention to the Wyandot store ledger, the records are more scant, but also more rewarding in terms of determining Wyandot purchasing patterns. Most of the ledger records date to 1819-1820, with a few later entries in 1825 and 1826. This makes a direct chronological comparison to the Tymochtee ledger impossible. As mentioned above, this ledger is also hampered by the destruction of many of the pages. However, the records available here do encompass a broader swath of the Wyandot community. By virtue of being on the Reserve itself, the Wyandot store attracted far more Wyandot people, ranging from wealthier to poorer members of the society. The ledger contains thirty three distinct individuals, with separate ledger pages usually devoted to each person. Because of the condition of the ledger book, some of the entries are only partially visible. Many of the ledger entries are very general, referencing “balance due” from a previous (unavailable) ledger book, or charging consumers for “sundries,” which of course could be anything. However, women and men were buying many of the same goods that were circulating at the Tymochtee store a few years later, primarily cloth and related items, tobacco, tea, and manufactured items like handkerchiefs and gloves.90

The role of women in economic consumption is even more evident and obvious in the Wyandot ledger. Ten of the thirty three individuals with extant accounts in the ledger were women. Several are not mentioned by name; rather they are referred to through a male relative. From John Barnett’s mother to Punch’s sister, from Mrs. Armstrong [widow] to Hollow Scalp’s wife, women populate the Wyandot ledger. Two men, Mononcue and Two Names, also made purchases specifically noted to be for their wives. In fact, Two Names’ account entry even parses out the “sundry” cost by gender, with his
wife accounting for $109.62½, while Two Names himself only had a $2.12½ total. With such a large total (far larger than any others in the Wyandot ledger), one wonders if Two Names’ wife was buying materials and making clothing for other people on the Reservation. However, I have found no corroboration for this assertion in other records. Additionally, the same pattern noticeable in the Tymochtee ledger emerges for seemingly male dominated purchases, with men frequently buying the goods their wives would use to produce clothes, tablecloths, curtains, etc.91

Interestingly, though most of the individuals in the Wyandot ledger were still alive during at least part of the period covered in the Tymochtee ledger, only one individual (Armstrong’s widow) appears in both records. This lends credence to the notion that the Wyandot store reached a far more diverse body of Wyandot people. Additionally, while nearly every Wyandot (and Wyandot affiliated) person on the Tymochtee ledger had some affiliation with the Methodist mission, the Wyandot ledger contains a mixture of mission-affiliated and non-affiliated individuals. While the paucity of records prevents definitive assertions about consumer patterns based on perceived acculturation of the individuals, it does not appear that affiliation with the mission (the primary symbol of acculturation for many on the reservation) made much difference in the types of, or volume of, products purchased. Indeed, some of the most “traditional” members of the community were buying bolts of cloth of moderate/good quality, tobacco, handkerchiefs, and other items that the most acculturated in the community also purchased.
The differences between the two ledgers, particularly the much higher percentage of women making their own purchases in the Reservation journal, raise interesting questions. Were women more prone to journey to the Wyandot store themselves due to its proximity? Did the white merchants at Tymochtee simply record women under their husband’s accounts (this seems less likely considering that they did bother to note women in the ledger on numerous occasions)? Perhaps Wyandot women felt more comfortable (culturally, sexually, or otherwise) operating within a Wyandot-centered marketplace? Whatever the reason(s), it is clear in light of the limited evidence that Wyandot women exerted more direct control of their consumption on the Reservation. And even though the Tymochtee ledger is more male-dominated in terms of direct purchasers, many of the goods they acquired would certainly have been utilized mostly by women. Given that fact, it is very likely that Wyandot women were intimately involved in the selection of these goods, whether they physically went to the store and paid for them or not.92

The Wyandot General Store

By late 1826, the Wyandots (in consultation with Finley and the Mission) planned the opening of a National Store, designed to provide a steady supply of reasonably priced goods to Wyandot clientele. It seems that Brother Walker (it is unclear if this was William or Isaac, but likely Isaac) discussed the store idea with Thomas Mason while in New York in 1826. Mason wrote to James B. Finley indicating the “friends of the Mission” in New York “approve of the wisdom of the chiefs in establishing a store for the benefit of the nation.” Mason thought the store should be scrupulously managed, with
a thorough accounting of all transactions. The success of the enterprise would be vital, particularly when “so many are interested, and the character of a whole nation is at stake.”

In an undated document, likely from late 1826, Finley wrote a set of regulations for the management of the General Store, which the Chiefs agreed would be co-managed by Finley and Charles Cass, the Indian Agent. All goods would be properly marked with a selling price, and a clerk would keep a day book of all transactions. Each week, the clerk would pay the cash taken in to Cass. The money would be used to pay creditors or to purchase more items for the store, and for no other purpose. White people, even on the Reservation, would not be permitted a line of credit at the store unless they had collateral to put up. No Indians would be credited more money than their annuity share, or that of their family annuities. Additionally, if a Wyandot were in debt to Chaffee or Whitaker, local white merchants, the store would not extend credit in excess of half of their annuity until those debts were paid off. In order to buy on credit from the National Store, Wyandot individuals were required to officially give an order to the Chiefs that guaranteed any monies owed to the store would be payable from their annuity for the year in question, which the Chiefs would accept and pay at annuity time.

Charles Cass reported in April 1827 that the store was doing well, and that he was sending for an assortment of goods for the store the following week. James Gilruth told James Finley that Cass and Walker (seemingly William) had ordered more goods for the store, and William Walker was signing Finley’s name to the order for goods in his absence. Interestingly, any connections between the Mission and the store seem to have
been strained, as Gilruth complained that they never “inform me of any of their matters.”
Isaac Walker had also been appointed the director of the store.\(^\text{96}\) Isaac Walker’s economic and cultural legacy is discussed in Chapter 5.

**Assertions of Economic Failure as a Cause for Removal**

Despite a significant amount of evidence to the contrary, some American observers argued that the Wyandots were in decline by the mid-1830s, and could not remain in Ohio any longer.\(^\text{97}\) McElvain argued that they “are rapidly going to ruin, & no way as I can see, as long as they remain here, to prevent it.”\(^\text{98}\) Governor Lucas employed similar rhetoric during treaty negotiations in 1835, arguing that a once large and powerful people had sunk low, and all were “dropping away by disease and old age,” with their days of prosperity gone. If they did choose to remain in Ohio, Lucas argued, they would cease to be a Nation and would be swallowed by the white Ohioans.\(^\text{99}\)

Despite such assertions, even in the midst of removal negotiations many Wyandots continued to live their lives as if they would live in Ohio permanently. In June 1839, agent Purdy McElvain noted that the Wyandot Council owed a carpenter named John Hauck $525 for construction of a new council house which he had just completed. They also hired George Garrett to complete masonry work (building a chimney and plastering the walls) to the tune of $265. The outlay of such significant funds to rebuild the physical symbol of national leadership and governance stands as a clear indication that the Wyandot leadership intended to solidify its position on their homeland, regardless of the actions of government negotiators and (some) members of the Nation.\(^\text{100}\)
The Persistence of Traditional Economic Lifeways

Despite the many examples of changing economic norms noted thus far in the chapter, it is important to note that traditional economic patterns remained important, not simply to the “uncivilized” portions of the Nation, but to large groups of Wyandots. The importance of traditional economic activities emerged in the report of the Wyandot Exploring Party which examined proposed western relocation lands in 1831. They noted that there was only one spot in all the land they saw where there “was any thing like a collection of Sugar trees, and that was 30 trees on 10 acres.” Sugar-making remained an important economic activity to many Wyandots, and indications are that Wyandots from the full spectrum of the community participated. Interest in emigration seems to have been higher among those who were less interested in adaptation (see Chapter 5), so this statement may have been specifically intended for them. That is certainly true of the report on the lack of game animals necessary to sustain the “part of the Nation [who] procure a subsistance [sic] by the chase.” The report also derided the lack of good stands of timber which would be “sufficient for the purposes of a people that wish to pursue agriculture.” And while the party acknowledged the rich quality of the soil, the land was “so steep, broken and uneven” that when tilled the soil would erode down ravines and be lost quickly.¹⁰¹

Summonduwot, one of the chiefs, made an unceasingly interesting (and perplexing) assertion during 1835 treaty negotiations with Governor Lucas of Ohio to further support the notion that traditional lifestyles/economic activities remained critical to large numbers of the Wyandot people. He argued that one of the principal reasons that
many Wyandots opposed leaving their Ohio homeland for the west was that if they did move west, “they must necessarily become agriculturalists, that it was contrary to their usual modes and habits of life, that their condition as a people was not calculated for it.”

This statement seems inherently contradictory to notions that the Wyandots who wanted to continue “traditional” patterns of economics/lifestyles desired to move west, where game and isolation from white settlements would allow traditional methods to reign. It is unclear why Summonduwot made this statement, but might be an effort by an anti-removal leader to persuade those who hoped for a brighter traditionalist future in the west that the move would actually usher in further adaptation, not retard it.

Summonduwot did hunt annually, indicating an economic tie to traditional Wyandot patterns. At the same time, he also was one of the most forceful supporters of the Methodist Mission, indicating that assumptions of “acculturation” of Christian individuals must be examined carefully, and often do not hold up to scrutiny.

**Economic Development and National Identity: The Big Spring Saga**

One of the critical economic developments of the 1830s was the saga of the sale of the Big Spring Reservation. Big Spring was a small reservation west of the Grand Reserve, comprised of a few dozen Wyandot people. The connections between the two communities were fairly strong, as evinced by the missionary connections between them discussed in Chapter 3. However, the community managed its own political affairs, and had a council of chiefs of its own. With his failure to secure a treaty to the Grand Reserve in 1831, James Gardiner sought to make a deal for the Big Spring Reservation instead.
By early 1832, Gardiner had a deal in place, but the wrangling over the economic beneficiaries of the agreement was arduous. All parties agreed that any improvements made by individuals at the Big Spring would be paid individually to those who made them, or their heirs in case of death. However, a number of conflicting reports began to find their way to the War Department. Some, seemingly signed by the headmen of Big Spring, alleged that they had agreed to assign the benefits of the sale of the Big Spring lands to the chiefs at Upper Sandusky, to be shared by all of the Wyandots. In return, the Big Spring Wyandots would be admitted to the Grand Reserve and would be entitled to “a participation in all the advantages and privileges arising from the same.” Another document, attributed to the same headmen, made contradictory claims. Asserting that the Big Spring Wyandots were distinct and separate from the Upper Sandusky Wyandots, this letter states that the Big Spring Wyandots wanted all monies from land sales at Big Spring paid to them directly at McCutchenville for their use. Perhaps not surprisingly, local merchant Joseph McCutchen signed this agreement, with the Big Spring leaders mostly (9 of 11) marking an “X.” The battle over the proceeds from the Big Spring treaty continued into mid-1832, with Big Spring leaders again writing from McCutchenville to allege that any agreements to turn over the proceeds to Upper Sandusky were false, or being made by only “some men women and the greatest number boys and children.”

Nearly simultaneously, a large body of Wyandot leaders drafted a lengthy letter addressed to President Jackson, alleging that the Big Spring Reservation had been sold out from under the rightful owners by a small group of relatively recent émigrés from
Canada, who had no right to the land as outlined in the Treaty of St. Marys of 1818. These individuals had come to live among their relatives at the end of the war, and had no right to the soil. This document reiterated the allegation that the rightful owners would abide by the treaty only if the proceeds went to the tribal council at Upper Sandusky, where the Big Springs Wyandots would relocate. They argued that McCutchen had interfered for his own benefit, manipulating the Big Spring headmen and even forging three of the names in the February 1832 letter, including the two literate signatories (John D. Brown and Jacob Young) who had allegedly signed “X” on McCutchen’s letter. This letter recommitted the Big Spring leaders to turning the proceeds of the land sale over to the Upper Sandusky tribal council, other than monies for individual improvements. They would go and live “as ‘one family’” on the Grand Reserve, having no interest in removing to Canada.106

A few months later, white men from McCutchenville wrote to the War Department, this time alleging that a few deceitful men at Upper Sandusky were challenging the Big Spring treaty on the grounds that it was owned by all Wyandots collectively and had only been sold by Canadian Indians (who had been hostiles during the War of 1812) who would abscond with the proceeds and return to Canada, leaving the true beneficiaries with nothing. The signatories argued that this was false, and that “whites and half whites” living at Upper Sandusky, who were “supping [on] the fat of that Reservation,” wanted the money to go to the Chiefs at Upper Sandusky “so that they might get it in their hands.” Alleging that they only had the interests of the Big Spring Wyandots in mind, these white observers further alleged that “Maj. Long Wm. Walker
and some other whites and mixed bloded [sic] persons are doing all they can to cheat these poor ignorant Indians out of their money and trying to throw it in the hands of the cheafs [sic] of upper Sandusky as they controll [sic] the whole nation and are traders among them.”

In his investigation of this controversy, John McElvain found that the willingness to sell by the Big Spring Wyandots was genuine, but that the interference of Joseph McCutchen had served to sour relations between Big Spring and Upper Sandusky. McElvain argued that “a friendly arrangement” would have occurred between the two, particularly since the Big Spring Wyandots “do not wish to separate from the nation by removing to Canada or else where” and wished to settle on the Grand Reserve. Twenty Wyandots signed, including the Upper Sandusky council and a number (not all) of the headmen of the Big Spring community.

By August, the War Department asked Gardiner and McElvain to work together to determine the true intentions of the Big Spring Wyandots and resolve the situation. In September, McCutchen (now calling himself Sub-Agent to the Big Spring Wyandots) again wrote the Secretary of War, reiterating that the legitimate owners of Big Spring wished to receive the proceeds themselves. The petition to the President by those at Upper Sandusky, in McCutchen’s words, “was got up at Upper Sandusky by the mixturs [sic] and whites that are Living among the band of Wyandots there.” McCutchen, through his own auspices, had continued pursuing a treaty with the Wyandots, alleging that he had signatures of more than 100 at Upper Sandusky who were willing to remove, despite the efforts of whites living on the Grand Reserve who impeded his efforts.
McCutchen drafted a statement on behalf of these 100+ Wyandots, referring to them as the “Pagan party”, who were ready to depart Ohio. Interestingly, this letter alleges that “a Large number of the Christian party that will make a Treaty with us.” This combined body would, in all likelihood, encourage “all the Christian party” to treat with the U.S. This pro-treaty party also complained that “there is getting to be so many white men & women amongst [sic] us that it makes a great deal of disturbance in our nation, they are trying to take the Land in all manners.” William Walker challenged McCutchen’s assertion that over 100 Wyandots wished to emigrate. He argued no more than fifteen or twenty less reputable Wyandots were interested in selling, pocketing the money they would earn, and moving to live with Wyandots in either Michigan or Canada. Indeed, both James Gardiner and especially McCutchen had comported themselves poorly, leading to the Wyandots refusing to even speak to them. Also, the fact that McCutchen was a tavern keeper meant, according to Walker, that only the “drunken and rabble part of the Wyandotts” had anything to do with McCutchen.

In September, John McElvain reported that the results of he and Gardiner’s investigation into the matter were that the Big Spring would be viewed as a jointly owned National property, and that the proceeds of the sale of the land would go to the National Council to be distributed among all members of the Nation. The Big Spring Wyandots would relocate to the Grand Reserve, where they would have equal rights and privileges to those already living there. All improvements would be paid to those who made them, or those descendants. Interestingly, a few days earlier, McElvain and Gardiner submitted two different statements by the Big Spring leaders, one dated September 11,
1832, opposed giving the proceeds to Upper Sandusky. The other, dated July 21, 1832, affirmed the transfer of the proceeds to Upper Sandusky, with the Upper Sandusky council also signing this agreement. Two Big Spring chiefs (Ronuness and John McLean) signed both documents. Astoundingly, Joseph McCutchen signed as a witness to the latter, despite his efforts to ensure the former. McElvain favored the July arrangement, while Gardiner felt the September rejection of the arrangement was more valid. ¹¹⁶

The War Department opined that, according to the provisions of the treaty, the Big Spring headmen should be paid the $20,000 due by the treaty. However, Elbert Herring feared that should the individuals from Big Spring receive the money, with no secure homeland upon which to settle, they would soon lose the money and become landless. He urged John McElvain to make it known to the Big Spring headmen that the department hoped they would accept an arrangement with the Upper Sandusky Wyandots, where they “would be immediately provided among their own kinsmen with a comfortable and permanent home.”¹¹⁷ Finally, in December 1832, the Big Spring Wyandots, through McElvain and Rigdon, accepted the offer by the Grand Reserve leaders to subsume their rights to the proceeds of the Big Spring land sale to the Nation as a whole, becoming full citizens of the Grand Reserve in return, a move both parties agreed to “to keep the whole nation together.” The majority of the Big Spring headmen signed the agreement, though three (Bearskin, Alexander Clark, and Isaac Driver) had removed to Canada and were not available to say yeah or nay to the agreement.¹¹⁸ Interestingly, Thomas Rigdon, one of the mediators who helped strike the ultimate arrangement, noted in his report to Cass that some nearby white men (very likely
McCutchen and Aaron Welch) had attempted to discourage the arrangement for their own possible gains.¹¹⁹ Finally, in January 1833, the distribution of $19,200 proceeds from the Big Spring cession by the Wyandot Chiefs sealed the arrangement.¹²⁰ The saga of Big Spring reveals both the political intricacies of Wyandot life by the 1830s and the importance of money and the control of money for Wyandot people at this time. It also raises questions about the relationship between financial status and religious adherence. As Table 4.1 indicates, wealth in terms of material possessions at Big Spring had little direct correlation to religious identity. While some of the wealthier people were affiliated with the Methodists (Big River, John McLean, and others), there were also less well-off Methodists (James Findley, Isaac Driver). In fact, the wealthiest man at Big Spring (Bearskin) had no known connection to the mission at all. The Big Spring saga also raised questions of race and identity which are further explored in Chapter 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>House Valuation</th>
<th>Other Buildings</th>
<th>Acres Cleared/ Value</th>
<th>Fence Rails</th>
<th>Fruit Trees</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Clark</td>
<td>One house/$65</td>
<td>1/$5</td>
<td>5/$35</td>
<td>2200/$22</td>
<td></td>
<td>$127.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Solomon</td>
<td>One house/$65</td>
<td>3/$45</td>
<td>13/$91</td>
<td>2816/$22.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>$223.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Sharlow</td>
<td>1/$200</td>
<td>3/$30</td>
<td>20/$136</td>
<td>5830/$54.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>$420.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McLean</td>
<td>1/$105</td>
<td>1/$3</td>
<td>7/$45</td>
<td>4650/$40.37</td>
<td>40/$12</td>
<td>$205.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Baptist</td>
<td>1/$20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Findley</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3/$9</td>
<td>3000/$22.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$31.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Driver</td>
<td>1/$50</td>
<td>2/$10</td>
<td>8/$58</td>
<td>2250/$20.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>$138.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Driver</td>
<td>1/$12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10/$20</td>
<td>1450/$13.50</td>
<td>70/$11.20</td>
<td>$56.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel and John D. Brown</td>
<td>1/$75</td>
<td>2/$40</td>
<td>14/$46</td>
<td>3719/$33.34</td>
<td>59/$1.50</td>
<td>$195.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Williams</td>
<td>1/$40</td>
<td>2/$14</td>
<td>10/$64</td>
<td>4000/$40</td>
<td></td>
<td>$158.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Young</td>
<td>1/$90</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>29/$88</td>
<td>6700/$62</td>
<td>44/$11</td>
<td>$251.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson Solomon</td>
<td>1/$110</td>
<td>2/$50</td>
<td>5/$15</td>
<td>1500/$15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big River</td>
<td>1/$80</td>
<td>8/$77</td>
<td>20/$116</td>
<td>6622/$66.22</td>
<td>15/$3</td>
<td>$378.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearskin</td>
<td>1/$250</td>
<td>6/$42</td>
<td>20/$100</td>
<td>10452/$104.52</td>
<td>123/$46.70</td>
<td>$542.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Greyeyes</td>
<td>1/$55</td>
<td>1/$5</td>
<td>5/$23</td>
<td>700/$7</td>
<td></td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Young</td>
<td>1/$100</td>
<td>2/$26</td>
<td>9/$58</td>
<td>1600/$16</td>
<td>50 house logs/$3</td>
<td>$203.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist Missionary Society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Schoolhouse/Church/$50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Big Spring Individual Property Valuation, 1832
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Land Sales and Economic Livelihoods

In 1835, a number of the older chiefs who had received special allotments of land in the 1817 treaty requested permission to designate their lands from the Grand Reserve and receive patents in fee simple, which would enable them to sell sections of said land in order to provide necessary items for their survival in their old age. The chiefs, Warpole, John Hicks, Mononcue, George Punch, and Matthews, along with the heirs of Between-the-Logs (George Armstrong, his heir) and Duonquod (Kayroohoo, his son), asked President Jackson to issue their land patents. The old chiefs did receive their sections in 1836, when the Wyandots signed a treaty ceding a five mile strip of land on the eastern side of the Grand Reserve. The chiefs were given a section each of this ceded land, which would be sold with the rest. They would individually receive the proceeds of the sale for their sections, which ultimately amounted to several hundred dollars each. More generally, the sale of the strip of land in 1836 would serve dual purposes. It raised much needed cash to continue participation in the American market economy, while at the same time (hopefully) satisfying some of the persistent American demands for land. As Governor Lucas noted, the land in question “would be a great advantage to the county of Crawford, and would be highly gratifying to the people of that county.”

The provision providing for the lands for the seven ex-Chiefs, however, seems to have caused a great deal of friction within the Nation. Agent Purdy McElvain reported that “considerable dissatisfaction” arose with the provision, in part because no two sections of land in the five mile strip were of the same value, which would make the division among the seven ex-Chiefs unequal. More importantly for the rest of the
Wyandots, who counted on the sale for an influx of much needed and desired cash, the Chiefs had the right to select the land for themselves, allowing them to cherry pick the choice spots. McElvain felt that the aggregate of the seven allotted lands could equal as much as ¼ the proceeds of the sale. Additionally, he noted, these ex-Chiefs and their families would also, by National law, receive their share of the sales of the rest of the land, allowing them to essentially double-dip financially. Ultimately, the Old Chiefs earned over $14,000 for their lands.

Fiscally, one of the most important provisions of the 1836 treaty was the right of the Council of Chiefs, at any point, to stop the land sales of the five mile strip should they deem the prices being offered too low. They did precisely that in May 1837, believing that the lands sold to that point were not yielding enough dollars per acre. The cessation of the sales greatly irritated the Land Office, but they had no power to force the sale to continue. The National Council asked the War Department to reopen the sale in October, believing that the market for land would be at its peak and the land would command higher prices. The Wyandots, by right, could establish a minimum per acre they were willing to accept, with the land office obligated to reject sales at lower prices.

Of the monies earned for the land sales, the Wyandots issued a number of vouchers for individuals to collect portions of the money, usually for goods sold or services rendered the Nation. For example, Alexander Long, late Receiver for the Marion Land Office, paid vouchers on the order of the Chiefs to George Garrett ($102.50 for a loan), William Walker ($66.50 for materials), George I. Clark (143.00 for services),
William Harrown ($24.00 for a house), Charles B. Garrett ($1699.75 for the mill), the Chiefs themselves ($975.00), and John McElvain ($600.00 for services), in May 1837. While the descriptions of the charges are quite vague, the land payments were certainly contributing to the economic obligations incurred by the Nation as they attempted to navigate the cash economy in which they had become participatory. By 1839, the Nation wished to gain full control over the remainder of monies from the land sale, including most of a $20,000 pot set aside for Wyandot public purposes. In full total, the 1836 treaty resulted in the sale of 39,121.55 acres of land, garnering $121,474.19.

It took an exceedingly long time for the U.S. Government to pay the Wyandots the monies owed them by the 1836 treaty. In the lurch, the Wyandots were forced to renew notes in the Bank at Columbus, all the while they had thousands of dollars in 1836 treaty monies sitting in the same back inaccessible to them. They were forced to pay interest on their notes, which was particularly irksome in light of the facts. The National Council lodged an angry complaint about the inaccessible funds, as they had to take out interest-bearing notes in order to pay for the repair of their mills and other expenses. The Wyandot Council also owed $1000 to the Bank of Sandusky and wished to use the monies held in Columbus to pay the debt.

**Wyandots and Modern Economics: The Accrual of Debts**

One of the more telling examples of the economic involvement (and indebtedness) of the Nation and its people came with the formalization of a removal treaty in 1842. As a provision of the treaty, the U.S. Government agreed to pay the debts
Wyandots had accrued with local whites such as traders, store merchants, skilled tradesmen, etc. Johnston solicited claims for these debts and believed that they would amount to no more than $19,000. In the process of investigating the claims of Wyandot debt, Johnston travelled extensively throughout central and western Ohio, including the cities of Burlington, Kenton, Lima, Winchester, Roundhead, Bellefontaine, Zanesfield, Middleburg, Dublin, Columbus, Delaware, Norton, Waldo, and Little Sandusky. Wyandots (and their financial affairs) had circulated throughout the entire region, accruing credits and (mostly, it seems) debits along the way. After his travels, Johnston adjusted his estimate to no more than $21,000 to cover the Wyandot debts.

A number of complaints about Johnston’s vetting of appropriate debts to pay caused consternation from a variety of quarters. John M. Armstrong, a Wyandot who had trained to be a lawyer, complained that Johnston refused to pay the debts of several mixed blood Wyandots (many were his relations), simply because they did not live on the Grand Reserve. They were, in Armstrong’s words, recognized members of the Nation, signatories to former treaties, and parties to the removal treaty. As such, their debts should be paid. Johnston also refused to pay any interest on the monies owed, which in many cases was equal to or more than the original debt. Armstrong argued that the President and U.S. Government should not quibble over a few “dollars and cents” as they had made a fortune off of Wyandot cessions in the past with little compensation for the Nation. Armstrong wrote again months later, renewing his complaint that several Wyandots living off the reservation in neighboring Logan County (his relatives) had legitimate debts to be paid that were not included in the ledgers. Armstrong did not wish
to bother the Chiefs to file a formal statement regarding his relatives and their just claims, but insisted that “they are willing and ready to do” so. At any rate, all but one of them (Duncan M. Reed) were identified in the treaty lists, and Duncan was a full brother of Ebenezer Z. Reed, who was listed.\footnote{A separate list of debts owed by the McCulloch brothers, other Wyandots living off the Grand Reserve, confirms the unwillingness of Johnston to consider these debts as valid Wyandot debt.} The creditors of Samuel McCulloch, Elliott McCulloch, Duncan M. Reed, E.Z. Reed, and J. Dawson, the aforementioned Wyandots living off the reservation, continued to press the government to cover their debts, which collectively amounted to over $2800.\footnote{For his part, Johnston told William Walker that the “debts by persons in Logan County are inadmissible upon any principle.” Johnston knew that some, particularly John M. Armstrong, complained of his refusal to include the aforementioned debts, but felt his position was correct.} For his part, Johnston told William Walker that the “debts by persons in Logan County are inadmissible upon any principle.” Johnston knew that some, particularly John M. Armstrong, complained of his refusal to include the aforementioned debts, but felt his position was correct.\footnote{Purdy McElvain also asserted that Johnston had perhaps been too stingy in approving claims. Johnston seemingly reduced claims by 25-50 percent for no discernible reason, and had denied claims that appeared valid to McElvain.} Ultimately, McElvain submitted claim ledgers, which included over 300 separate approved debt claims by a variety of white individuals, small businessmen, and trading companies. Very few of the claimants were Wyandots or closely affiliated with the Nation, though a great many of the claimants had been involved peripherally with the Wyandots for decades. One example was Joseph Chafee, a familiar figure in the extant records (see Chapter 5), who claimed two debts totaling $695.38, of which Johnston approved $376.43. The only Wyandot interest on the ledger was the trading company of William and Joel Walker,
who applied for $1340.25 in debts, with $807.63 approved. All told, the approved total amounted to $24,014.43 of $30,279.76 claimed by those approved to collect any debt. McElvain submitted an additional, separate ledger totaling $13,985.13 in unapproved claims as well.146

The question of debt obligation put some Wyandot men, William Walker being a prime example, in the awkward position of both a member of the debtor party and a creditor himself. Walker pondered the obligations for debt in a “Statement of the Case” he wrote in January 1841. Walker noted that all Wyandots were parties to the annuities, and received payments each year for said annuities. Many used their annuity payment as collateral to secure loans, purchase goods, and conduct other economic business, with creditors counting on the guaranteed annuities the Wyandots received each year as a safeguard to recouping their monies. Walker wondered if “death of a recipient of an annuity [would] debar his creditors of the benefit of their annuity debts?” Many Wyandots had died over the years, leaving numerous debts unpaid. Annuities due the deceased then reverted back to the Wyandot Nation. Walker wondered if the Nation should then pay the debts owed from these annuities, which several other Indian tribes/nations already were doing. Walker argued that the nation “feels, sees and is conscious of the wrong, but know not what step to take to obviate the difficulty.” Walker signed his musings on the issue as being “on behalf of the creditors,” indicating his position on this issue not as a member of the nation, but primarily as a creditor who had lost countless dollars when his clientele died over the years.147
Wyandot Material Possessions at the time of Removal

A final available measure of Wyandot economics in this period is the examination of individual Wyandot properties and their valuations during the process of removal in the early 1840s. When the Wyandots agreed to sell the Grand Reserve in 1842 (see Conclusion), John Johnston worried that in the lurch between the completion of the treaty and valuation of the Wyandot improvements, pesky whites surrounding the Grand Reserve would commit “mischief and waste”, taking removable items and causing damage which would devalue the “extensive and valuable” improvements which served not just to harm the Wyandots financially, but also the value of the lands when they would go up for sale.\(^{148}\) Robert Ware recommended that someone be paid a dollar per day to watch out for the property until the government appraised and sold it, recommending “a white man, not connected by blood or marriage, living at Upper Sandusky with his brother, (Mr. Garrett who married a Mrs. Walker ¼ blood) who might do this.”\(^{149}\) The War Department found the suggestion valid, but chose to bring back former agent Purdy McElvain to watch over the Grand Reserve until the removal and subsequent sale.\(^{150}\) For their parts, the Wyandots refused to prepare to remove or leave their homes until the appraisal took place.\(^{151}\) The Wyandot Council requested the right to nominate one of the appraisers, a John Walker (not related to the Wyandot Walkers).\(^{152}\) Despite this move, there were complaints that theft and destruction did occur.

As Table 4.2 indicates, Wyandot individuals had accumulated significant amounts of property and improvements to their lands by the time of removal, including cleared fields, homes, stables, orchards, fences, and a variety of other important agricultural
developments. Table 4.2 compiles the available information for each individual listed in a variety of U.S. governmental sources. An incredibly useful source for some of this information is a private publication by Lonny L. Honsberger, which includes both textual information and maps based on the textual sources. When available from the data located at the time of this writing, it also includes the amount paid in the late 1840s for said improvements by the U.S. Government as required in the removal provisions. Finally, the table notes if the individual listed is identifiable as a member of the Methodist church based on available information (discussed in chapters two and three). Exhaustive lists of church members are not available, but those who held leadership positions in the church or were members of the missionary society at any time in the two decades before removal are noted with an “x.” This is NOT an indication that they were active members of the church at the time of removal.
Table 4.2: Index of Wyandot landholders at the time of cession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Improved Land</th>
<th>Dwellings</th>
<th>Other Structures</th>
<th>Other Property</th>
<th>Total monies paid</th>
<th>Methodist?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Armstrong</td>
<td>About 70 acres, cleared and fenced, bottom land in oats and corn, a good improvement</td>
<td>Good frame house, good hewed log house</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Armstrong</td>
<td>About 15 acres improved, 9 of those in wheat</td>
<td>Good frame house, good hewed log house</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>$681.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Armstrong</td>
<td>About 14 acres improved</td>
<td>2 cabins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silas Armstrong</td>
<td>About 128 acres improved, 25 in wheat, 40 in corn, 20 in oaks, 36 acres meadow, good fence</td>
<td>Good brick house used as much as a tavern, hewed log house</td>
<td>Stable, barn</td>
<td>Good well, 8 acre orchard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Barnett</td>
<td>About 3 acres improved</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Barnett</td>
<td>About 6 acres improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>About 20 dwarf apple trees</td>
<td>$420.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Batuscw*</td>
<td>About 50 acres pretty well fenced ad improved</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$447.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Old) Bearskin</td>
<td>About 43 acres, good fence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John S. Bearskin</td>
<td>About 43 acres, good fence</td>
<td>Hewed log house, another pretty well improved log house, cabin</td>
<td>2 springs, small orchard and peach trees</td>
<td>2 springs, small orchard and peach trees</td>
<td>$645.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Big River*</td>
<td>About 5 acres improved.</td>
<td>2 old cabins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Big River</td>
<td>About 8 acres once improved, but overgrown with weeds.</td>
<td>2 old cabins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$39.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Sinew</td>
<td>About 8 acres improved</td>
<td>2 old cabins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bigtree</td>
<td>38.5 acres improved</td>
<td>Good hewed log house</td>
<td></td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>$645.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadrack Bostwick</td>
<td>Old cabin and some underbrushing, not worth much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Brewer*</td>
<td>About 4 acres improved</td>
<td>Log cabin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown*</td>
<td>About 195 acres fenced and cultivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$810.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull-Head (Old Beardy)</td>
<td>About 8 acres improved</td>
<td>2 old cabins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall Charles</td>
<td>About 12 acres improved</td>
<td>2 cabins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Improved Land</td>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>Other Structures</td>
<td>Other Property</td>
<td>Total monies paid</td>
<td>Methodist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Charloe</td>
<td>About 20 acres, 15 improved 5 meadow</td>
<td>Log cabin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Charloe</td>
<td>About 4 acres improved</td>
<td>Round log cabin not worth much</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 small apple trees. No spring or well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Cherokee (and wife)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chop-the-Log (Tall Solomon)</td>
<td>About 18 acres fenced and underbrushed.</td>
<td>Old cabin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Clarke</td>
<td>About 115 acres improved. 44 acres plowed, 15 acres meadow,</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td>Stable and pasture</td>
<td>Good well</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Coon</td>
<td>About 20 acres cleared, 10 of those cultivated, 10 with briars/bushes</td>
<td>Log cabin</td>
<td></td>
<td>First rate spring, best on all the Wyandot lands</td>
<td>$197.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaw Coon</td>
<td>About 12 acres</td>
<td>Hewed log house, old cabin</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Coon (aka John Lewis)</td>
<td>About 10.5 acres cleared, 10 of it fenced and broken</td>
<td>2 hewed log cabins, log cabin</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaw Coon*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Cub</td>
<td>About 14.5 acres improved</td>
<td>One cabin, another old cabin</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 apple and some peach trees</td>
<td>$184.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Doughtowson*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Driver</td>
<td>78 acres improved, plus 15 acres pasture, much meadowland, good fence, 6 acres in wheat</td>
<td>Good frame house, 2 round log houses</td>
<td>Smoke house</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac P. Driver</td>
<td>About 6 acres, improved</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$76.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James E. Driver*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$43.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Elliot*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall Fighter</td>
<td>About 5 acres improved.</td>
<td>2 old cabins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$87.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Sally Frost</td>
<td>About 15 acres improved, 3 under cultivation</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good spring, some apple trees</td>
<td>$427.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles B. Garrett</td>
<td>About 107 acres improved, meadow, pasture, plowed ground on river bottom.</td>
<td>Log house, dwelling house</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good sawmill now in operation, and a carding machine, all well fenced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gibson</td>
<td>About 22 acres well improved.</td>
<td>Hewed log house and cabin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Improved Land</td>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>Other Structures</td>
<td>Other Property</td>
<td>Total monies paid</td>
<td>Methodist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor Gray Eyes</td>
<td>About 33 acres improved, good fences,</td>
<td>Very good hewed log house with 2</td>
<td>Stable not valuable, old stable, smoke</td>
<td>About 36 apple trees, good spring, another well fenced orchard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undefined (but large) good pasture, well fenced.</td>
<td>rooms and a porch</td>
<td>house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log cabin, house</td>
<td>2 stables</td>
<td>Well, spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squire Gray Eyes</td>
<td>About 13 acres improved, pretty good fence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gray Eyes</td>
<td>About 131 acres improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(aka Robert Robertail)</td>
<td>Good hewed log house, Cabin, 3 other log cabins</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Gray Eyes</td>
<td>About 6 acres cleared and fenced, additional undefined plot poorly fenced, pasture</td>
<td>Round log cabin</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(aka Matootook, aka Shicket)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curly Head</td>
<td>About 21 acres, 13 of them improved</td>
<td>Hewed log cabin, 2 other log cabins</td>
<td>2 good springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis A. Hicks</td>
<td>About 20 acres improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Hicks (Jacko)</td>
<td>About 11.5 acres.</td>
<td>Hewed log house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hicks Jr.</td>
<td>About 57 acres improved with pasture and meadow, 15 of the acres in corn</td>
<td>Good hewed log cabin, hewed log house, and 2 other log cabins</td>
<td>Good well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hicks Sr. (Old)</td>
<td>About 29 acres improved, good fence</td>
<td>2 good hewed log houses, one with a shingle roof</td>
<td>Well and about 15 apple trees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1129.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia Hicks (sometimes listed with wife)</td>
<td>About 30 acres, with 24 improved and 6 acres fenced and not of much value</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td>15 apple trees and spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Hicks (widow)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hill</td>
<td>About 6 acres improved</td>
<td>Hewed log cabin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$76.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Huky*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Jaques</td>
<td>About 13.5 acres improved, about 4 acres fenced but grown with weeds and bushes, small corn patch</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: William Jaques and Cathron Johnston</td>
<td>Improved Land</td>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>Other Structures</td>
<td>Other Property</td>
<td>Total monies paid</td>
<td>Methodist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathron Johnston*</td>
<td>About 4 acres improved</td>
<td>Round log house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half John*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$402.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Johnston*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Jonathan (Wyandot)</td>
<td>About 70 acres improved, meadow, plowed land, pretty good fencing and pasture. Another undefined (but large) pasture.</td>
<td>Hewed log house, shingle roof</td>
<td>Good stone well</td>
<td></td>
<td>$725.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kayrahoo</td>
<td>29.5 acres well improved, 4 acres fenced</td>
<td>Good hewed log house, 3 log cabins</td>
<td>Two good springs and several apple trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Kayrahoo</td>
<td>About 7 acres, 4 improved</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td>Good spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Chief*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Long (Alexander Long)</td>
<td>About 69 acres, some in corn, meadow, and pasture</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td>Good spring and a dozen apple trees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$981.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Long</td>
<td>143 acres improved and cultivated, fenced, 35 of the acres in corn</td>
<td>Good hewed log house used as a tavern, 2 old cabins</td>
<td>Smoke house</td>
<td>Good stoned well, several orchards</td>
<td>$438.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Lumpy</td>
<td>About 56 acres improved, meadow</td>
<td>Good hewed log house</td>
<td>Smoke house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph McDonald</td>
<td>About 20 acres fenced, most in wheat and corn. Poor fence</td>
<td>Two poor log cabins</td>
<td>Good spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McLean Widow</td>
<td>About 3 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mononcue</td>
<td>About 9 acres improved</td>
<td>Some old cabins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Mononcue</td>
<td>About 4 acres improved</td>
<td>Old cabin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Monture</td>
<td>About 5 acres improved</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Mosetine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Mudeater</td>
<td>About 20 acres, good fences</td>
<td>Good hewed log house with shingle roof</td>
<td>Hewed log stable, crib</td>
<td>Stone well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nofat*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Improved Land</td>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>Other Structures</td>
<td>Other Property</td>
<td>Total monies paid</td>
<td>Methodist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Parker (John Peter)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Round log cabin (not valuable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Peacock</td>
<td>About 4 acres improved.</td>
<td>Old cabin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Peacock (Old)</td>
<td>About 57 acres fenced, 4 of those in corn, more in wheat. Improved woods and pasture</td>
<td>Round log house with clapboard roof and 2 hewed log houses, one with shingle roof, a poor building, another round log house with clapboard roof, but in poor shape.</td>
<td>Two good springs</td>
<td>$1094.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Peacock</td>
<td>About 8 acres improved</td>
<td>Log cabin</td>
<td>8 apple trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Peacock*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacock’s oldest son</td>
<td>3 lots.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacock (unsure which individual)</td>
<td>About 30 acres improved, fenced.</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacock Mill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Pelham Widow*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Pointer</td>
<td>About 17 acres improved.</td>
<td>Old hewed log house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Porcupine</td>
<td>About 1 acre improved</td>
<td>Old log cabin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Providence</td>
<td>About 4 acres, 2 cleared</td>
<td>Round log cabin not very valuable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$73.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Punch (unclear which plots are Sr. or Jr., both combined here)</td>
<td>121 acres, 84 of those cultivated, partially fenced. Another undefined plot of land with wheat and chopping.</td>
<td>Log cabin not worth much, old log cabin, another log cabin</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>$632.00 (George Jr.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Punch Sr.</td>
<td>About 8 acres improved, in wheat.</td>
<td>Hewed log house, cabin</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>$141.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Punch*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punch (unsure which person)</td>
<td>About 5 acres not very valuable, fencing, pasture, very overgrown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George and Thomas Punch</td>
<td>About 14 acres improved, but grown with bushes</td>
<td>Double hewed log house with shingle roof, porch</td>
<td>Good spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Improved Land</td>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>Other Structures</td>
<td>Other Property</td>
<td>Total monies paid</td>
<td>Methodist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quindindee*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good hewed log house, 2 cabins, 2 round log houses</td>
<td>Good spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rankin</td>
<td>About 69 acres, improved (plus an undefined improved lot), fencing,</td>
<td>Good hewed log house, 4 log cabins</td>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including wheat field with good fence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Peter (Lame)</td>
<td>About 60 acres, meadow and plowed ground, another undefined lot plowed.</td>
<td>Double hewed log house, 4 log cabins</td>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarrahass</td>
<td>About 45 acres in rich bottomland, fenced. Additional 4 lots of undefined</td>
<td>Double log cabin, house</td>
<td>First rate spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acreage, one with a garden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Sheep*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shu Coon*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Solomon (Big)</td>
<td>20.5 acres, much improved and fenced</td>
<td>Hewed log cabin</td>
<td>Old cabins of no value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Solomon (aka widow Hicks)</td>
<td>About 9 acres</td>
<td>Good hewed log house, another not so good</td>
<td>Spring and 27 apple trees</td>
<td>$259.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Solomon*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Split the Log (Split Log)</td>
<td>About 40 acres fenced and improved</td>
<td>Hewed log cabin not worth much, 2 other log cabins</td>
<td>Good well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Spybuck (Tuharehtahs)</td>
<td>About one acre improved, fence in ruins</td>
<td>Round log cabin, old cabin in ruins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squeendehtee</td>
<td>About 73 acres,</td>
<td>Round log cabin, round log house, old cabin</td>
<td>Good stone well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fenced, about 421 acres of that improved, 6 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Squeendehtee*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Standingstone</td>
<td>Round log cabin (not valuable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John P. Standingstone</td>
<td>Hewed log cabin (not valuable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Standingstone*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Improved Land</td>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>Other Structures</td>
<td>Other Property</td>
<td>Total monies paid</td>
<td>Methodist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Stand-in-the-Water*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$96.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Stookey</td>
<td>About 19 acres improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$409.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Summundewat</td>
<td>About 2 acres fenced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauromeet</td>
<td>About 3 acres cleared but poorly fenced</td>
<td>Log cabin</td>
<td>Stable, smoke house</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayskoomeh*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph L. Tennery</td>
<td>About 40.5 acres in corn and oats, 12 acres cleared around house, pasture, good fences</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John VanMeter</td>
<td>About 48 acres, fencing</td>
<td>Hewed log house, 2 cabins</td>
<td>Good well, spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>$219.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah Walker</td>
<td>About 20 acres plowed land, About 40 acres improved and woods, fence decayed</td>
<td>Plank house weatherboarded and shingle roofed</td>
<td>Wooden curb house</td>
<td>2 wells, not very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Walker*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William R. Walker</td>
<td>About 13 acres improved. One undefined lot: fencing only. Another undefined lot: chopping only no fence.</td>
<td>Hewed log house (good house)</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>20 plus apple trees, good spring.</td>
<td>Yes (expelled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Walker Jr.</td>
<td>About 22 acres improved, 13 of which meadow.</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Well with brackish water</td>
<td>Yes (expelled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Joel Walker (joint)</td>
<td>About 14 acres improved, plowed and meadow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warpole</td>
<td>About 6 acres improved</td>
<td>Hewed log house</td>
<td>Good spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Warpole*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Washington</td>
<td>About 4 acres improved</td>
<td>Hewed log house, shingle roof</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Washington and Old Peacock</td>
<td>About 10 acres improved, fenced and tilled. Also Matthew Peacock (Bill Washington on the land), 6 acres plowed and fenced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Improved Land</td>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>Other Structures</td>
<td>Other Property</td>
<td>Total monies paid</td>
<td>Methodist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Zane</td>
<td>About 232 acres improved and fenced, 9 acres in wheat</td>
<td>Good frame house well finished, 3 good hewed log houses, 4 log cabins (one not very good)</td>
<td>Saw mill with dam out of repair.</td>
<td>Well, spring, and small orchard, some peach trees</td>
<td>$338.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Zane Jr.</td>
<td>About 232 acres improved and fenced, 9 acres in wheat</td>
<td>Good frame house well finished, 3 good hewed log houses, 4 log cabins (one not very good)</td>
<td>Saw mill with dam out of repair.</td>
<td>Well, spring, and small orchard, some peach trees</td>
<td>$338.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>About 232 acres improved and fenced, 9 acres in wheat</td>
<td>Good frame house well finished, 3 good hewed log houses, 4 log cabins (one not very good)</td>
<td>Saw mill with dam out of repair.</td>
<td>Well, spring, and small orchard, some peach trees</td>
<td>$338.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Zane</td>
<td>About 35 acres improved, 2 gardens, tolerable fence</td>
<td>3 log cabins, one round log cabin, one hewed log house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah E. Zane</td>
<td>About 15 acres improved, brush and pasture</td>
<td>Round log cabin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist Mission</td>
<td>110 acres well improved</td>
<td>Mission house, 2 dwelling houses, school house</td>
<td>barn</td>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td>$3023.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting records (not listed in any of the totals above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Wright or Tall Charles</td>
<td>7.75 acres improved. Fencing and meadow.</td>
<td>Log house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis A. Hicks or Mrs. Big River</td>
<td>About 12 acres improved</td>
<td>Mission house, 2 dwelling houses, school house</td>
<td>Mission house, 2 dwelling houses, school house</td>
<td>Mission house, 2 dwelling houses, school house</td>
<td>Mission house, 2 dwelling houses, school house</td>
<td>Mission house, 2 dwelling houses, school house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>About 4 acres improved</td>
<td>Mission house, 2 dwelling houses, school house</td>
<td>Mission house, 2 dwelling houses, school house</td>
<td>Mission house, 2 dwelling houses, school house</td>
<td>Mission house, 2 dwelling houses, school house</td>
<td>Mission house, 2 dwelling houses, school house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals receiving payment for improvements, but not appearing/identifiable on the survey lists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Bowyer</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>$184.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coonghaw (female)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$184.00</td>
<td>$142.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$184.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Graham</td>
<td>$142.00</td>
<td>$142.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$142.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William McKendree</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>$403.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nofat</td>
<td>$403.00</td>
<td>$403.00</td>
<td>$1049.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$403.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Ququa</td>
<td>$1049.00</td>
<td>$1049.00</td>
<td>$447.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1049.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow Seneca</td>
<td>$447.00</td>
<td>$447.00</td>
<td>$73.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$447.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Standingstone Sr.</td>
<td>$73.00</td>
<td>$73.00</td>
<td>$82.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$73.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Trager</td>
<td>$82.00</td>
<td>$82.00</td>
<td>$82.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$82.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What emerges from an examination of these available data is a sense of the material wealth of the Wyandot people at the time of removal, as well as some (very tentative) evaluation of the connections between religious adherence and economic status. In terms of property/material possessions, it is clear that definitive assertions based on church membership/non-membership cannot be made. While many identifiable Methodists were quite well off, others seem to have had modest material wealth. It is also important to note that anyone appearing on the lists of adult Methodists (see the tables in chapter three) is counted, even if they may have moved away from the faith in the years between the compilation of the available lists and removal (the reverse can be said for those not on the available lists who may have joined the church before removal). When looking at non-Methodists, the same arguments can be made. While many non-members were at the lower end of the material scale, some were well off, with a few (members of the Zane family, the Bearskin family) who were quite wealthy. The Zane family, both of mixed white ancestry and notable wealth, only had two members listed in the available records. Ebenezer Zane had joined (but withdrawn from) the Wyandot Missionary Society in 1828, while a woman listed as “Widow Zanes” joined in 1829. No males in the family held any offices in the Methodist leadership or the Missionary Society. Nor do either (Old) Bearskin or John Bearskin, both of whom had substantial properties at the time of removal. While one may be tempted to argue that better off Wyandots tended to be Methodists, the data available does not allow for much correlation between material wealth and religious identity.
Conclusion

The information examined in this chapter reveals a community in the midst of significant economic and cultural changes by the 1820s and 1830s. When examining issues such as economic engagement on and off the reservation, employment, consumption patterns, or material possessions, a complex story of Wyandot economic life emerges. Importantly, while certain connections can be tentatively argued between individual religious identity, economic status, and race (examined more in the final chapter), such connections are, at best, dubious and require nuanced scrutiny. Regardless of religious adherence, personal “racial” identity, political status, or other factors, the range of Wyandot economic success and engagement in “American” economic activities was both quite extensive and not tethered to particular subsets of the community. Indeed, the picture which materializes is of a complex web of different peoples making their lives and economic livings in a variety of ways.
“I refer to old Warpole. He says that Garret’s, Walkers, Armstrongs, &c., have no right here.” – John M. Armstrong, 1838

**Introduction**

Along with the religious and economic adaptations on the Grand Reserve in the last decades before removal, a final important aspect of the Wyandot cultural story examined in this dissertation is the evolution of personal and community identities. In part, such changes resulted from alterations in views on race and its growing importance both in Wyandot and American society in this period. The fact that a large percentage of the Wyandots were of mixed ancestry further complicated the discussions of race and identity. This chapter considers questions of race and identity from a variety of perspectives, both internally on the Grand Reserve and through outside observations of the importance of race and identity among the Wyandots. Several individuals, including Isaac Walker, John M. Armstrong, and Joseph Barnett, merit particular consideration throughout the chapter. This chapter also considers the possible relevance of race and identity in terms of religious identity and economic status among the Wyandot people of the early 19th century. As with the issue of economics discussed in chapter four, race and identity does not always mesh directly with religious identity or economic pursuits, revealing a complex picture of personal and community identities in the process.
Identity, Race, and Economics: Isaac Walker

One of the most important, and interesting, stories of identity on the Grand Reserve involves the most prolifically documented (if not most important) family on the Grand Reserve. A dominant trope in the literature regarding Native American history, particularly in the Early Republican period, is the story of the intercultural broker. These brokers, often either of mixed racial ancestry or individuals predominately raised by or educated by “the other,” are regarded as the cultural go-betweens who could exist (perhaps not always comfortably) in the world of the frontier, traveling both physically and mentally from the villages and hunting camps of indigenous peoples to the trading posts, settlements, and cities of EuroAmerica. Despite this ability to move from culture to culture, scholars such as James Merrell have posited in a convincing manner that such cultural interlocutors, “even old hands, who bragged of their talents, never really wanted—and never were permitted—to unravel… the ‘mystery’ of Indian ways.” He makes a similar argument about Indian brokers and their inability to “become” Euro-American. Often prominent in the records kept by traders, missionaries, and government officials, the stories of the cultural brokers are typically the best known and oft-retold by scholars who have considered indigenous-white interaction since. One individual who seems to fit within this idiom was Isaac Walker. Walker played a brief but notable role in the history of the Wyandot community along the Sandusky in the first few decades of the 19th century. While on the surface, Walker seems an archetype of the cultural broker, I argue here that Walker, if anything, fashioned his own identity, both “Wyandot” and “white,” but also not either. Rather than being torn between two worlds, he worked within the
existing structure to forge his own world, one that required no real movement on his part. In essence, from the known scattered bits of his story emerges an individual who was comfortable being his own man, living as someone made possible in the unique genetic and cultural stew of the early 19th century trans-Appalachian west.

As has been noted briefly in prior chapters, Walker’s family held a notable place in the social workings of the Wyandot community. His father, William, was a captive from a large Virginia family whom the nation had adopted. William, Sr. had taken various positions on the government payroll, serving for a time as an agent, interpreter, and postmaster. Isaac’s mother, Catherine, was the daughter of Isaac Rankin, a British trader affiliated with the Hudson’s Bay Company, and Catherine Montour, a member of a prominent Iroquoian family. Isaac Walker was born near Detroit in 1794, growing up largely on his father’s land near Brownstown and in the Wyandot communities straddling the international boundary. During the War of 1812, Isaac, along with his father, older brother, and uncle, escaped capture by the British and joined the Americans at Detroit, while the British destroyed his father’s property. Documented details of his education are sketchy, but Isaac definitely attended Joseph Badger’s school at the nascent Lower Sandusky mission established by the Presbyterians from 1809-1811, when the school closed as the war loomed. Though Isaac Walker, according to the nascent blood quantum standards of his day, was likely no more than 1/8 Wyandot, he and his siblings successfully asserted that they were ¼ Wyandot, a contention that gained greater import among the Wyandots in the 1820s and 1830s, when blood percentages began to matter to both Wyandots and whites (as seen later in this chapter). Regardless of these future
complications, their mother’s membership in the Nation (and Big Turtle clan identity, which she passed on to her children), and the acceptance of their father as an adoptee, made Isaac and his siblings members of the Nation and recognized as such by the Wyandot people.

Walker’s life as a member of the Wyandot Nation reveals the complicated nature of his personal identity and his economic viability. Walker made a substantial part of his living by working for the United States government, usually as an interpreter. Walker, along with his father William, brother William, and a small handful of other men, held distinct advantages in a community where very few spoke English with any level of fluency. Isaac and his father, in particular, seem to have attained the greatest favor of the United States by the latter 1810s, especially since they not only were bilingual, but literate as well. The Walker’s also seem to have been preferred interlocutors by the Wyandot leadership, who put great trust and reliance in the two men. Isaac was particularly vital to the efforts to complete the 1817 Treaty at the Foot of the Rapids of the Miami which extinguished tribal claims to the lands secured by the Treaty of Greenville, excluding small reservations (such as the Grand Reserve) scattered throughout northwest Ohio. Isaac Walker and his father played a significant role in negotiating the treaty and in the bargaining that took place regarding the size and location of the reserved lands. Some observers criticized the Walkers for inhibiting the treaty and encouraging the Wyandot leaders to reject the treaty, but the family emerged from the negotiations, if anything, with a stronger position in the community and with the United States government. To formally conclude the treaty, Isaac conducted a party of signatory
chiefs from the Wyandot, Seneca, and Delaware nations to Washington in 1817, demonstrating the young man’s important role in fostering the cooperation necessary to enact the diplomatic agreement.  

No matter the turnover in chiefs, Indian agents, or federal administrations, Isaac Walker and his kin remained important players in the local-level operations of the U.S. government on the Grand Reserve, making their livings in significant ways through the American colonial apparatus. They had the specialized knowledge, business connections, and historical precedent necessary to both the Wyandot leaders and the government agents assigned to the Reserve. Throughout the 1820s, Isaac was consistently employed as an interpreter for various councils and whenever his father was unavailable. Following the death of William Walker, Sr. in 1823, Isaac seemed poised to take his place as the full-time government interpreter. However, the agent at Upper Sandusky chose to split the interpreter’s pay and duties between Isaac Walker and Robert Armstrong, another sometime government interpreter of white ancestry, in an effort to appease both prominent men (and their large and powerful families) who actively sought the appointment. Isaac Walker complained repeatedly about the arrangement, citing the lack of a living wage (he made $240 in 1824, for example, while most full-time interpreters made $350-$500) and the fact that his proximity to the agency, several miles closer than Armstrong, caused him to bear the bulk of the interpreting duties. Despite their rivalry for the office, Walker and Armstrong both contributed in valuable ways to both the functions of the agency and to the ethnographic research ongoing among the Wyandots in the early 19th century. Both men provided information about the Wyandot language to the
American Philosophical Society, in their efforts to catalog indigenous languages in 1819. The APS was particularly interested in asking Walker and Armstrong to evaluate Sagard’s Huron dictionary, in which “amidst its numerous errors and mistakes, which they easily discovered and pointed out, they gladly recognised the language of their nation.” Walker therefore exerted a political and intellectual force on the Reserve.

In addition to his duties with the agency, Walker also co-owned and operated the family store at the southern edge of the Grand Reserve, a business discussed in the previous chapter. Isaac’s father had built the store, called the “Walker Place,” with the approval of the Wyandot council. The store served as a primary source of American consumer goods on the Reserve. Upon his death, William Walker, Sr. left the store to his widow and Isaac, his eldest child living in Ohio. Isaac devoted significant time and money to improving both the business and surrounding farmland throughout the 1820s. He built an addition onto the house to accommodate his family and more customers, while also enclosing a significant amount of land. I have found no hard numbers about the volume of business or amount of cash coming into Isaac’s hands, but the profit must have been enough to offset the deficiency of his interpreter’s pay, as well as to provide the support of his family, his mother, and youngest brother. Additionally, the symbolic importance of Walker as a conduit of American economic consumerism on the Reserve cannot be ignored. In place of the defunct government trading houses, the stores operated by men like Isaac Walker served as major source of manufactured goods and an outlet for indigenous cash acquired from annuities and off-reservation economic engagement.
Along with their political and economic role and standing in the community, the Walker’s became intimately involved with the various cultural and social activities on the Reserve, particularly the various missionaries who visited the Wyandots in the early 19th century. In his youth at the Lower Sandusky mission, Isaac appears to have served as an interpreter as well as a student. He made note in those early years that Christianity had a marked effect on the few Wyandots who attended, particularly Barnet, the mission’s most pious member, though he does not seem to have devoted himself to Christianity. After the War of 1812 Walker’s mother, Catherine, was one of the first and most devout adherents to the Methodist mission by the early 1820s, and Isaac, though apparently skeptical of the motives of the Methodists at first, became a stalwart interpreter, adherent, and a founding member of the Methodist Missionary Society formed in 1828. By that time, most of the Wyandot leaders, as well as a significant percentage of the general population, affiliated with the Methodist mission, and Walker took a leading role as an interpreter for the Methodist preachers. In summing up Isaac’s relationship with the Methodists, James B. Finley wrote in Isaac’s obituary that he was “often employed in interpreting the Gospel to the wanderers of his own nation, when his own heart became filled with its important truths.” Additional evidence of his religious interpretation and skill also comes from Mononcue, a chief on the tribal council and an early convert to Methodism, who asserted that after receiving a Bible from a Methodist minister, he “took [it] to Br. Isaac Walker, and got him to read it to me.” Though active in the church, he was not a full member until ten days before his death, when he “obtained the pardon of his sins; after which he manifested an unshaken confidence in God to the last moment.”
While Walker was a strong presence in a variety of ways on the Wyandot Reserve, he also bridged the gap to the surrounding white world in personal and political ways. On June 28, 1822, Isaac Walker married Rebecca Hamlin, a white widow with two young daughters from her first marriage. The marriage was solemnized by a Methodist minister, and legalized by filing in Crawford County, a growing trend among some Wyandots in the 1820s. The couple had one son, Isaiah, born in July 1826, whose later economic interests and identity became a major focus of the lawsuits surrounding Isaac’s property rights. Walker’s marriage outside of the tribe was not unique, as many of the progeny of adoptees chose to marry spouses from the local white community, and there seems to have been little overt stigma against such marriages, either from the Wyandots or the white Ohioans. In a very personal way, Walker’s marriage reflects the permeable, in some ways unimportant, distinctions between Indian and white worlds drawn by successive generations of scholars.

Perhaps there is no greater evidence of Walker’s assertion of a new kind of identity than his exercise of the franchise, which was of course reserved to propertied white men at the time. In 1820, the State of Ohio created Crawford County, which included, at least nominally, the territory encompassed by the Grand Reserve. In 1821, all 13 eligible men in Crawford Township, Crawford County, assembled to hold the first election for local offices. Among them was Isaac Walker, the only member of the Walker family (including his father), indeed the only member of the Wyandot nation, to vote in the election. Due to the exceedingly small number of voters, every one of the 13 voters was able to hold an elected office. Isaac became the constable. He participated in all
subsequent elections held in the township until his death. Though I have found little
detail of the elections themselves or the subsequent exercise of his elected duties, there is
no evidence that either local whites or the Wyandot Nation challenged or questioned
Walker’s political duality at the time. He was both an important figure in the Wyandot
community and one in the local white political world, a unique position only he occupied
at this time. Isaac Walker died of an unknown illness in May 1829. He was 34 years old.

With his death, of course, the story of Isaac Walker’s life might seem to be over. However, the story of Isaac Walker’s identity had only really begun. By the fall of 1829, his widow sought some resolution of her property rights from Isaac’s estate, appealing to Indian Agent John McElvain to inquire with the Office of Indian Affairs about the matter. McElvain asked the War Department to determine whether she had a valid claim, “she having no Indian blood in her.” McElvain asked if she was entitled to a portion of the land should the Walker’s decide to divide one for her, and whether she had the power to sell the land to a white man, and whether said white man “would be permitted to live on the Indian reservation without leave from the proper authority.” Most importantly, as the case turned out, McElvain asked whether, in the event Rebecca Walker should remarry, her husband would be permitted to live on the property with her. A month later, McElvain again asked for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to render assistance, as Joseph Chaffee, the new husband of Rebecca Walker, and his family had moved to the Grand Reserve. The Wyandot chiefs asked McElvain to remove Chaffee, a man who McElvain argued “is that kind of a man, that will take no advice.” The War Department refused to take any side in the dispute between the Walkers and Rebecca (and Joseph
Chaffee, by extension), as it was “a case of individual right” that must be settled by legal means.

It is important to note that Isaac had left a last will, to be executed by John Carey of Crawford County. An examination of the will (two extant copies, one a rough draft and one an official copy) provides an interesting insight into Isaac’s life and, to some extent, his identity. Other than order of information, the draft will differs little from the final copy. Walker wished that his debts be paid from his estate as soon as convenient. The bulk of his personal property (furniture, carriage, traveling trunk, etc.) was to go to his widow, aside from a few items each given to his younger brothers Matthew and Joel, and his sister Nancy Garrett. His share of the improved farm land on the reservation was to be divided equally between two entities: 1. his mother Catherine and two minor brothers Matthew and Joel, and 2. his widow Rebecca and minor son Isaiah. In the event of a sale of the Grand Reserve, the proceeds he would be entitled to should be divided accordingly. He did include the provision that his wife “continue to reside here [in the Walker family household].” Despite this proviso, Isaac Walker seems to have prepared for the event that either Rebecca or his family (or both perhaps) would wish to sever their cohabitation by authorizing the executor of the will to appropriate enough money to buy two eighty acre lots to be the property of Rebecca forever. He also asked the executor to locate one section of land on the Reservation, due Isaac by the 1817 treaty, with the consent of the chiefs, for the use of his son Isaiah. Finally, as a codicil to the will, Isaac asked the executor to set aside $700 to be used by his wife at any time she chose, and to take the remainder of his money and put it in an interest-yielding bank account, the
interest to be used by Rebecca. Technically, according to the will, all other property, and the actual balance of the account aforementioned, would be for the use of his son Isaiah.\textsuperscript{24}

By 1833, the Wyandot Council interceded in the Isaac Walker affair directly. Noting provisions in the treaties signed in 1817 and 1818, they gave John Carey permission to locate a 640 acre section of land for the use and possession of Isaiah Walker, the only child of Isaac. It is important to note that this land was specifically for ISAIAH’S use and possession, not Chaffee’s.\textsuperscript{25} Chaffee wrote the War Department in his capacity as Isaiah Walker’s guardian to clarify whether the aforementioned land would be deeded to Isaiah, upon which Chaffee would enter the land and improve it “for the benefit of the heir.” Chaffee also asked the department whether on not leases agreed to by the chiefs for long terms (ten or twenty years) would be binding, even if the Wyandots removed.\textsuperscript{26} The Office of Indian Affairs informed Chaffee that Isaac Walker’s name was not on the 1817 treaty, nor did the Wyandots have the legal ability to lease lands to citizens, which would therefore not entitle such illegal leaseholders to keep the leased land in the case of removal.\textsuperscript{27} In the years following Isaac’s death, relations between the Walker family and Joseph Chaffee seem to have soured further. William Walker told James B. Finley that the Walker family had engaged in lawsuits against both John Carey and Chaffee regarding Isaac’s property.\textsuperscript{28} Another example is an 1831 newspaper announcement filed by George Garrett, who had apparently given Chaffee a “note of hand” for $190 on November 18, 1829. Garrett warned readers that, should Chaffee attempt to sell the note to a local white, Garrett refused to pay “unless compelled by law.”\textsuperscript{29} However, the single most important document for reconstructing Isaac Walker’s
story was actually written five years after his death. By 1834, a lawsuit initiated in Crawford County had wound its way to the Ohio Supreme Court, where Walker’s complicated identity had to be hashed out in court. While the lawsuit was ostensibly about a lease agreement, the crux of the matter was the identity of Isaac Walker. By standard American law, Chaffee had acquired Rebecca’s property, which included a half interest in the Walker place, by virtue of their marriage. He chose to lease the property for a year’s term, but the lessee, an adopted Wyandot, failed to pay on the grounds that the land was Wyandot land and not subject to Chaffee’s control or ownership. Chaffee sought to define his rights in court.30

The heart of the argument about the case was whether Isaac Walker had the ability to will property to his wife, and whether that property was transferable to her non-Wyandot husband. Chaffee’s lawyer, relying on standard American property rights, rested his claim on the argument that “Isaac claimed to be a citizen of the United States, and exercised the privilege of voting at elections, though he also received his dividend of the annuities secured by the treaties, to be paid to the Wyandot nation of Indians, as one of the nation.” Isaac had expended “a large sum of money in improving” his inherited land, and the plaintiff claimed that his widow and young son (and Chaffee by extension) had a right to that property and the improvements thereon.31

The defense, conversely, argued that while under normal statutes the plaintiff should win, the fact that Walker lived as a Wyandot, on Wyandot land, precluded the white plaintiff from winning the case. Based on the existing federal laws, particularly the Indian Intercourse Act of 1802, non-Indians could not possess, rent, lease, or use
indigenous lands without federal approval by treaty. The defense ultimately argued that “assuming that Isaac Walker was one of the Wyandot tribe, subject to the usages and laws of the Indians, we conclude that his last will must be carried into effect according to the laws and usages of the sovereign power, whose citizen and subject he was.” Walker’s will, therefore, was only enforceable by the Wyandot government. According to this logic, Walker was subject to the power of his sovereign nation, the Wyandot Nation, who of course did not allow non-citizens to possess or control land on the Grand Reserve. The judgment of the state Supreme Court concurred with the defense, arguing that Walker inherited his property rights from his father, a member of the Wyandot tribe, and that the plaintiff, not being a member of the tribe in line of succession, did not possess title to the land. Though the court did not decide whether Isaac Walker was legally a Wyandot or a white man, his proprietary rights, if they existed at all, were based on his status as a Wyandot citizen.32

Despite the finding against his rights in the court case, Chaffee continued to press both his claim and the question of Isaiah’s lands. Again writing as Isaiah’s guardian, Chaffee wrote the War Department to assure them that Isaac Walker was indeed listed on the 1817 treaty, but by his Wyandot name, not his English name. He enclosed a certificate from the Wyandot chiefs clarifying that Isaac was indeed listed on the treaty. Chaffee wished for the President to approve a deed to Isaiah (which Chaffee would of course control until Isaiah reached adulthood).33 The War Department asked Purdy McElvain to investigate the claims and determine their validity.34 The Wyandot Council did indeed confirm that Isaac Walker, listed by his Wyandot name, was on the 1817
treaty lists, and that they approved the land selected by John Carey on Isaiah’s behalf. The Chiefs, William Walker, and Joseph Chaffee all signed the communication.\textsuperscript{35} Despite the assertions and actions of the Wyandot Council, the Walker family, and Chaffee, however, the War Department determined that the chiefs had no power to grant Isaiah Walker land. According to the treaty of 1817, the entire Grand Reserve had been granted to the chiefs by patent in fee simple “for the use of the persons mentioned in the Schedule annexed to the treaty of whom Isaac Walker was one.” This meant that chiefs held a “trust grant,” which meant the lands were “for the equal and common use of the persons named in the Schedule.” Not only did Isaiah Walker (through his father) not have a right to individual land ownership, none of the Wyandots did. The only entity the Wyandots could convey land to would be the United States.\textsuperscript{36}

While the War Department’s findings dashed Chaffee’s hopes of access to lands through Isaiah, he refused to allow the Ohio Supreme Court decision to deter his claims for compensation. He again contacted the War Department for “a debt due me (in wright [sic] of my wife)” for the improvements Isaac Walker made between 1823-1829. He bitterly complained that upon marriage to Rebecca, he pressed his claims to Catherine Walker, who “refused to give them up, or to pay rent for them” by “shielding herself” under the federal laws regarding Indian affairs. He acknowledged that the Court in Bank decision went against him for want of jurisdiction, so he chose to appeal to the War Department for restitution. Chaffee sought compensation through the 1842 treaty of removal, which provided for federal payment of approved debts Wyandots owed to whites. Chaffee presented his claims to John Johnston and later Purdy McElvain, who
both, he claimed, deemed the debts just, but not payable without federal approval. The Walkers, for their part, argued that they owed him nothing, and he had no ability to press them for claims because of the treaty provision for paying debts. Chaffee claimed the rights to $3600 in improvements Isaac Walker made.\(^{37}\)

As for Isaac Walker’s property rights, the Wyandot tribal council, seemingly at the urging on Isaac’s brother William, passed a resolution in the 1830s that secured title to his buildings, physical property, and land rights to his young son, as well as recognizing his son as a Wyandot citizen. Isaac Walker’s descendants continued to exercise their Wyandot identities after removal to Kansas and later Oklahoma, where his kin became leading figures within and without the Wyandot community.

**American Perspectives on the Influence of “Whites” and “Half Breeds”**

One recurring example of the racialized nature of observations about the Wyandot community came from James Finley. While compiling a list of facts about the Wyandots to convince the War Department both of the worthy nature of the people and to argue that they should not be removed, Finley used racial mixture with whites as a defining feature. He noted that “about the half of this nation that are the Descendants of american [sic] citizens, and Many of them mixed with the French + English.” Upon his examination of the racial history of the tribe, Finley conveyed a sense of astonishment that “there is not [sic] three full Blooded Indian families amongst this tribe.” Finley then listed those families descended in part from Americans, including the Walker, Zane, Armstrong, Williams, Barnett, Stookey, and Coon families, all descended from male American
adoptees. Finley also noted several families descended from white American women, such as a white woman “called the Curly headed white woman + two more that I know no name for”, along with the Brown family and Honness (an important leader among the Michigan Wyandots). When adding in families descended from French and English intermarriage, such as the Peacock, Grayeyes, Scionto, Washington, Wasp, Jacco (and his sisters), Rhonyanas (and his sisters) families, Finley argued that eight in ten Wyandots were “well mixed with the white blood.” As such, they would not be inclined to move away from the white communities to which they had deep ties (including kin ties). The most prominent families such as the Walker, Hicks, Zane, and McCulloch families, also well knew the value of their lands and would not part with them under conditions favorable to the United States.38

Due to these perceived white influences, a number of government officials ascribed the reluctance of the Wyandots (and other Native Americans elsewhere) to remove to the west to “intelligent and lettered Indians” who, many believed, exerted an extreme amount of influence over their unlettered brethren. These educated Indians (typically mixed race to the point of being practically white, in the reckoning of many government observers), it was believed, benefitted financially on existing eastern reservations, using their education and connections to enrich themselves often at the expense of the welfare of the majority of “true” Indians.39

In organizing the 1831 Wyandot Exploring Party to examine proposed Kansas lands, James Gardiner indicated that the Wyandots had selected a conductor for the party. Gardiner referred to William Walker, who would serve in the roles of conductor,
interpreter, and delegate from the Wyandot Nation itself. Gardiner opined that: “the white man, too, whom they would choose as their conductor, is a merchant, engaged in a profitable business; but as he is one of the nation, and speaks the language, there cannot be a more suitable person. They design to send four of their principal men, and their white friend.” Gardiner’s language here captures the complicated, confused observations many white Americans made about the mixed ancestry Wyandots, calling Walker both a white man and one of the nation at the same time.

In addition to those Wyandots of mixed ancestry, intermarried white men also drew the attention (and ire) of many observers. Agent John McElvain complained extensively about the presence of intermarried white men on the Grand Reserve. Many had “married to quarter blood Wyandot women,” which gave them access to reservation lands. Many of them had extensive farms and frequently made use of the public blacksmith, consuming a great deal of the iron allotted to the Wyandots by treaty. McElvain felt that this “unworthy class” (who he interestingly refers to as “Indians”) opposed the efforts of the government to remove or improve the Wyandots, enjoyed all perks of being on the Grand Reserve, and also avoided any duties/obligations due of other white Americans, such as paying taxes for the public roads, military duty, etc.

McElvain wished for permission to do something about removing or restricting the rights of the intermarried whites on the Grand Reserve, but the reply from Secretary of War Elbert Herring informed him that if the Wyandots regarded such men as members of the tribe entitled to national privileges, nothing could be done.
As the U.S. Government pondered different ways to conclude a successful removal treaty, some officials began to consider whether the land was held through the Council of Chiefs, or collectively by those listed in the 1817 treaty. A major reason for asking this question were allegations made by white observers who favored removal that alleged:

a certain set of designing Indians, of mixed blood, who have no interest in the land under the treaties, but who have continued nevertheless to enjoy the proceeds of it to the prejudice of the rightful owners, have changed the chieftainship, and elected or chosen in lieu of the old hereditary chiefs, instruments of their own and participate in the products of the land, who, because of this their advantage, are opposed to the extinguishment of the title and emigration, both of which are favoured [sic] by the persons who, by a treaty are entitled to the land.\(^{45}\)

The Wyandots had indeed adopted a new National governmental system, electing chiefs in lieu of the old method of Wyandot clans selecting chiefs to represent each clan in council, but it is important to note that a majority of the Wyandots had voted to adopt this system.

The outsider perception of the power of race, intellect, and influence on the Grand Reserve also emerges from the actions of William Hunter, the agent working to sign a removal treaty in 1839. During negotiations, Hunter asserted that “the whites and mixed breeds” opposed his efforts. More disturbingly, from his point of view, “some of the members of the mission stationed here” were working to prevent removal. He attended service, presided over by Rezin Sapp (the missionary Mr. Allen, being absent), who proceeded to pray that the Wyandots would remain on their lands, and be protected from evils such as the U.S. Government cheating them out of their lands.\(^{46}\) T. Hartley Crawford asked Hunter to determine Sapp’s denomination in order to formally complain about his behavior.\(^{47}\)
During Hunter’s negotiating efforts, he was unable to secure approval and funding to form another exploring party to head west. He did decide personally to take Joel Walker with him on a visit to the Delawares and Shawnees in Kansas. Walker, the younger brother of William Walker, was already an up and coming man in the eyes of Hunter, and he wanted to examine the western lands for himself. Intelligent, literate, and bilingual, Joel Walker represented that portion of the community that Hunter, and others, argued wielded the real power. To win the removal argument, one must have the support of such families. Joel Walker was, in Hunter’s words, “a member of a very influential family of the Wyandots” which “had hitherto been opposed but are now inclined to favour [sic] the views of the Govt.”

Local white merchants and leaders Joseph McCutchen and Henry Brish, men with a great deal of interest in the future of the Wyandot lands, consistently argued that the majority of Wyandots, which included the “real indian [sic] hunter,” wished to remove quickly to the west due to the decline in game and the early frosts in the area, which would kill any corn crops they might wish to grow. Those who continually blocked treaties were “made up of half breeds, who have intermarried with white women, or white men who have married half breed women, together with the missionary influence.”

McCutchen furthered his points in a subsequent letter, referring to the divisions on the reservation between those of the “pagan party” and those of the “white or Christian party.” McCutchen argued that the second group “conform in all respects to the habits of the white population of the Country.”
By 1841 John Johnston, the longtime agent, received the charge to negotiate a removal treaty. Like his predecessors, he presented a highly racialized picture of the Wyandot community. He argued that since he was removed from his position of Indian Agent in 1829, “a great number of half breeds; quadroons and even some more remotely related to the Wyandots, have gathered into the Reserve from every part of the adjacent Country where previously scattered, and already constitute a considerable body of the whole people, as well as exercise no little influence in the national council.” Included in their number was a “quadroon” lawyer, admitted to the courts of Ohio. The lawyer, John M. Armstrong, had, in Johnston’s opinion, “just legal knowledge enough to be troublesome.” From his point of view, Johnston argued that such men reaped the benefits of the reservation while avoiding any obligations to the surrounding white community, to whom he thought these intermixed people really belonged.\(^{52}\)

During negotiations, Johnston found the Wyandots shrewd negotiators, including Head Chief Francis Hicks, an “educated, well informed and intelligent” quarter-blooded man. He also argued that had to contend with fully half the nation being “half breeds, quadroons and of different degrees mixed blood,” many of whom opposed removal. Johnston saw these people as the power on the reservation, leaving “the pure Indian…abandoned and degraded.”\(^{53}\) The validity of such claims must be weighed carefully in light of the information known about this community, and is tempered by other observations discussed below. By the end of 1841, Johnston was once again complaining that the first claims he faced when discussing a removal treaty were “claims for land on the part of white men intermarried into the Walker family [certainly
relishing the Garrett family]" who were looking to increase their wealth. Johnston lamented the recent practice in Michigan and Indiana of securing private fortunes by treaty to men who were not members of Indian nations; men he believed had no legal rights to such economic increase.54

**Outsider Perspectives: Converging, Conflicting Identities**

One of the most common connections made between religious conversion, racial identity, and economic/social lifestyle were assertions by outside observers that serious divisions predicated along these lines fractured the Wyandot community. Some quoted observers in the previous section linked racial identities, economic interests, and religious adherence to argue that the typical obstacle to their efforts were an agglomeration of well-to-do, mostly white Methodists. A typical example of this is captured in a letter from James B. Gardiner, the negotiator in charge of efforts to remove the Wyandots in 1831-2. Gardiner attributed his failure to strike a removal bargain to his perception that “the whites, half breeds and the ‘Christian party,’ so called will be against treating on any reasonable terms.” In contrast, he was “confident that the ‘pagan’ or ‘savage party,’ (composing full half the nation) will be willing to treat.” Gardiner’s statement can be read to indicate a direct correlation between race (whites and mixed-race interests within the community) and religious conversion (Christians), leading to a reluctance to surrender their lands and business interests at any reasonable (i.e. negotiable under his charge) terms. Those in the “pagan” (non-Christian) or “savage” (less adapted) camp were more willing to cede land, with most agents and government officials assuming that they
preferred a more isolated, game-rich environment where “traditional” subsistence practices could continue.\textsuperscript{55}

Several aspects of Gardiner’s statement merit more careful attention. One is the fact that he lists whites, mixed-race peoples, AND Christians separately, indicating that he recognized at least some distinctions between them. In fact, as discussed in Chapter 3, various observers defined a significant number of identifiable Wyandot Christians as racially “full-blood” (or, at the very least, phenotypically indigenous). Connecting racial identity and conversion in any sort of causal relationship is, at the very least, problematic, if not completely untenable. Another important consideration is that Gardiner’s reputation (and continued paycheck) rode on his ability to liquidate Wyandot lands. Asserting that half of the population was NOT “civilized,” and would be amenable (perhaps manipulated) to treat, could prolong his mission. The assertion also rests on a fallacy: by mentioning mixed bloods with the first group, Gardiner indirectly indicates that those in the second party were comprised of full-bloods (in racial terms). According to everything known about the Sandusky Wyandot “racial” makeup at this time, a large percentage (nearly all sources assert a majority, while some argue all or practically all) of the Wyandots by the 19\textsuperscript{th} century were of mixed ancestry. As such, racial admixture seems to have had little to do with one’s position regarding removal.\textsuperscript{56} The War Department remained unconvinced at any rate, telling Gardiner that unless the “pagan” or “savage” party could be proven to be a clear majority of the nation, any effort to treat with them would be futile.\textsuperscript{57}
Gardiner continued his racialized complaints in the report submitted by the Exploring Party. He told Lewis Cass that the Wyandots had been disingenuous in their willingness to explore the western territory, and was simply “filching from the Government the money” to take the trip west. He asserted that tribal leaders had only agreed to the trip to persuade those interested in removal, and to assure those who did not wish to remove, that the government was offering them unsuitable lands. From Gardiner’s perspective, forces on the Grand Reserve worked to “settle them down into a state of false security and complete subserviency [sic] to the few, (whites and partly whites) who are the only gainers by their continued residence in Ohio.”

Keeping Gardiner’s clearly biased position as removal negotiator in mind, it is also important to consider whether a small party of mixed-race (or intermarried white) Methodists had the power to manipulate the masses of Wyandots to their point of view. All adult males had voting rights in open council, and from what we know about such meetings in this era, all felt comfortable expressing their individual views. It seems far more likely that Gardiner was imposing the racialized notions of his day onto this situation. In a time and place where racial ideology was becoming codified, and prevailing beliefs imparted real intellectual (and personal character) significance to racial heritage, Gardiner may well have believed that by virtue of their biological descent, men of mixed ancestry inherited superiority, allowing them to exert undue influence over those who lacked such ancestry. Of course, as discussed previously in this chapter, the majority of Wyandots (both pro and anti-removal) were of mixed ancestry. Gardiner may also, of course, be indicating
that those of mixed and white ancestry were better educated and therefore shrewder negotiators, but his language indicates a more racial way of thinking.

Gardiner continued to rail against the motives of the Exploring party, further employing racial notions along the way. As part of his investigation into their negative report about the western lands, Gardiner conducted a private interview with Silas Armstrong, one of the Exploring Party members and “an intelligent quarter blooded Wyandott, educated in English.” Gardiner suspected Armstrong as one of the conspirators who had predetermined the western lands would be unacceptable. Gardiner argues that Armstrong’s testimony contradicted the report of the Exploring Party on key points. Gardiner was unable to question the other three delegates, all less educated and not regarded by Gardiner as mixed-bloods, but none would agree to a private examination, since “the Indians acknowledged that Walker had warned them not to answer me!”

Gardiner’s emphasis on the word Indians is critical in considering the question of race observations about the Wyandot. He clearly believed that the “real” Indians had been silenced by the interposition of mixed-bloods like William Walker, who used their race (and education) to exert disproportionate influence over their indigenous counterparts. However, assumptions that a minority of mixed-ancestry, educated Methodists could manipulate the masses of “real” Indians is not supportable based on the evidence available, particularly the discussions of race and identity among these educated Wyandot men referenced later in this chapter.

Such perceived influence of mixed ancestry Wyandots on the Exploring Party almost did not come to be, however. Gardiner argued that before the expedition departed,
he “discovered much discontent among some of the mixed breed, relative to the incompetency of the persons chosen as Delegates.” Silas Armstrong, in particular, raised objections. As Armstrong was a man with “many respectable and influential connexions [sic],” Gardiner felt that he might cause disturbances because “he and his relatives had been overlooked.” Therefore, Gardiner appointed him a Delegate to represent the U.S. government, tasked by Gardiner with reporting directly to him, not to the tribal council. He had violated this agreement, with Gardiner alleging “he leagued with Walker in his scheme.”

Finding the Grand Reserve Wyandots unwilling to treat, Gardiner then attempted to strike a deal with the much smaller Wyandot group at Big Spring (discussed in chapter 4), which caused tension between the two Wyandot communities. Gardiner again employed racial notions (and the related goals of personal economic gain) in his explanation of the Grand Reserve Chiefs and their efforts to quash the Big Spring treaty. The Chiefs, “with their white and yellow auxiliaries” were profit-driven, devious, and self-interested, which led them to attempt to co-opt the Big Spring Wyandot community and take the proceeds of any treaty to which they agreed.

Gardiner was so upset with the entire affair that he collected depositions, sworn to Crawford County officials, given by several white observers who supported his assertions. He also secured the testimony of George Williams, a (mostly white by Gardiner’s standards) Wyandot man who lived on the Grand Reserve. Williams, who was fluent in Wyandot, swore that he had a conversation with Baptiste, one of the delegates, who admitted that the tribal council chose the delegates because they knew all of them
opposed a treaty, ensuring that the Exploring Party would reject the proposed lands.

Interestingly Baptiste told Williams, part of the racially mixed category Gardiner assumed were anti-removal, that he was not chosen as a delegate because Williams “was in favor of removal, if the country proved to be good.”

William Walker understandably had a much different perspective on Gardiner’s efforts at this time. He recognized Gardiner’s attempts to divide the Wyandots and treat with those willing to do so, which he attributed more generally to the devious nature of the Jacksonians and their ilk. According to Walker’s account, the Wyandot Chiefs, through John Hicks as orator, recounted the history of their relationship with the U.S. Government, the repeated promises that they would be left alone on the scraps of land they had retained, and the fact that they had no interest in a new treaty seeking to break old promises. Noting Hicks’ “somewhat severe” tone and employment of “bitter sarcasm,” an approach which both opponents and supporters of removal admired, Walker recalled that Gardiner remarked that he was sure that “the savage party was controlled by the Christian party”, and that he would treat directly with the “savage” Wyandots without the authority of the Council. Walker thought “bribes are in tow” and corruption would be Gardiner’s method. Walker did hear that the “savage party” were combining together to either cede the whole reservation, or at least their proportion of the land. However, he discounted those in favor of removal as a small minority of primarily derelict Wyandots who could not (or would not) make a living on the Grand Reserve. 63
Identity and Culture Change: Asserting Nationhood

Even the most vehemently pro-assimilation voices in the government, such as Thomas McKenney, believed that certain kinds of adaptations should be discouraged. McKenney thought it critical that Native Americans “ought not be encouraged in forming a Constitution and Government within a state of the Republic, to exist and operate independently of our laws.” Another marker (arguably) of political adaptation to American society came in the form of state lobbying. When informed that the state was considering extending Ohio laws to include the Grand Reserve, the Wyandot Chiefs grew uneasy and determined to go personally to Columbus and “play lobby_+ if possible_to prevent the passage of said bill.” Such an occurrence “will be something novel in our state” and marked a significantly higher direct degree of involvement with the state government than ever before. William Walker wrote to his brother Joel about the rumor, noting that “Our head Chief + Lump [aka Lump-on-the-Head, or Lumpy] + myself are going down next week to see about it and straiteh them up, and shew [sic] them a thing or two.” McElvain was unsure of what impact the chiefs had, but he did note that after they arrived in Columbus, the proposed legislation was abandoned for the time being. Perhaps such a direct (and novel) approach by the Wyandot leaders convinced those uncommitted to their removal to oppose the actions of those who were pushing a removal agenda.
Another source of changing identity on the Grand Reserve was the development of new governmental and legal structures. Under the provisions of the new National legal code, the Nation imprisoned two “chiefs” (Warpole and Porcupine) who were planning to sell their land. The negotiators working to sign a removal treaty with part of the Nation wrote angrily to the Office of Indian Affairs that the chiefs willing to sell were put in the Wyandot jail, where the negotiators were unsuccessful in gaining their release with a writ of habeas corpus from the county authorities. Before they could attempt other legal pressures, the Wyandots released the chiefs, but only after they went before the Council, who threatened them with further action. The negotiators wanted protections in writing for the chiefs, who represented “at least half of the real owners of the reservation,” while those who opposed them had no rights to the land at all.68

John M. Armstrong also discussed the arrest of the removal party which resulted from the new national laws in a letter to his fiancée.

Yesterday I was called upon by the sheriff of the realm to assist in apprehending some of the ringleaders of the selling party on a charge or assumption of an attempt to sell part of the reservation. They are now snugly juged [sic] in our jail, awaiting their trial. This is the consequence of doing business in an intriguing [sic] manner. The authorities have taken a decided stand and are determined to exert their power.69

In an interesting twist on the perceived sentiments of the “mixed-bloods,” Armstrong noted in this letter that the Walker family had said little about the arrests. In fact, according to his reckoning, “they act upon the nonconversial [sic] plan ready to turn either way Their private sentiments are ‘go to the west’ But they dare not come out.” If Armstrong’s assertions were accurate, it would indicate that the perceived relationships
between racial background and positions on removal were not as hard and fast as many observers believed.\textsuperscript{70}

The aforementioned biases of the local treaty negotiators against the “white Indians” are even more transparent in a subsequent letter about the arrests. After again railing against the white and part-white opponents to a treaty, they noted that “there is several Britsh [sic] subjects quarter breeds one of which [William Walker] is a merchant trading amongst the tribe that have considerable to say & do slyly against a treaty that same individual is the Jailer of the tribe.” McCutchen argued that these sorts were the most politically anti-Democrat in the county. To McCutchen, the Council (he could not attack many of them on racial grounds, as they were as “Wyandot” as those who wished to remove) “are mere Cyphers [sic] mere tools for thes[e] persons.”

McCutchen also mentioned a sticky detail of this whole ordeal. Warpole, one of the arrested men, was actually on the Council when they adopted the law forbidding unauthorized sales. McCutchen said that even if that was true, Warpole and other Wyandots did not understand the law. In his words, there was little talent among the “real Indians,” other than perhaps Warpole and a few others.\textsuperscript{71}

Sub-Agent McElvain completely refuted the claims of the treaty negotiators, even stating that they had “willfully and deliberately” misrepresented the standing of the two men as chiefs. Warpole had been a chief, but due to “some maladministration in the duties of his office was deposed by the nation.” The other arrested party was not and never had been a chief according to McElvain’s understanding. At any rate, both were
tried and acquitted under a law of the Wyandot Nation, one which the people had
“approved nearly unanimously” in 1832.\footnote{72}

From the perspective of William Walker, McCutchen and Brish were actively
employing a “divide and conquer” tactic to manipulate a few disaffected individuals to “a
hostility against the constituted authorities of the nation.” The only people interested in a
treaty were fifteen or twenty “of the improvident and vagabond class of our nation,” who
had no care or thought about the consequences of their actions for the Nation. He
defended the law by which the imprisonment occurred as a right secured by the 1802
Intercourse Act, particularly in cases where no citizen of a state were involved, as in this
case.\footnote{73} Walker also wrote to James Finley to complain bitterly about the commissioners,
calling them “detestable Vampyres [sic].” The Wyandot Council also asked the Secretary
of War to remove the commissioners, who had engaged in tactics of plying some
Wyandots with alcohol at McCutchen’s bar and signing them to the removal treaty.
Walker hoped the combined efforts of the Wyandots, Governor Vance, and Judge John
McLean would persuade the federal government to remove the commissioners.\footnote{74}

John M. Armstrong also lamented the conduct of the commissioners in a letter to
his fiancée, Lucy Bigelow. He noted that they were “two men as destitute of honourable
principle as ever were permitted to breathe.” They presented the treaty offer, and while
each of the chiefs and principle men “was fully determined in his own mind” they
obtained the sentiments of the Nation, who overwhelmingly voted against removal. The
commissioners, though, continued to ply “some worthless vagabonds” and “offscourings
[sic] of the nation” with promises and alcohol. Armstrong alleged that they even signed
up “individuals who have been dead these ten years.” He argued that, essentially, the Nation would protect these misguided souls, and that “if they would stop here, and let us alone we could well spare these classes of our nation.” However, the “selling party” had formed the plan of signing as many as possible, then going to Washington to sell either all or part of the Grand Reserve. Armstrong thought that, given the “corrupt state of the present administration,” the government might remove everyone, even with such a scant representation (as was happening to the Cherokee). To counter these efforts, the Wyandots planned to send an official delegation to Washington, with Armstrong suspecting that he would be sent.75

The Office of Indian Affairs believed that the law in question violated the rights of the arrested chiefs, who could sell with permission of the President. The War Department asked the District Attorney of the State of Ohio, N.H. Swayne, to go to Upper Sandusky and examine the laws to determine their legality.76 The Commissioner of Indian Affairs, C.A. Harris, argued that such laws violated the jurisdictional power the United States had “always…claimed and exercised over all Indian tribes within their borders. Its enforcement will not be tolerated.”77 When Swayne investigated the case, he opined that William Walker was “the master spirit among them,” using his education and (presumably) racial makeup to exercise great powers over the Wyandot leadership. Swayne found the law to be in direct conflict with a provision in the 1818 treaty, making it invalid. He also echoed the sentiments of other white observers, stating that the whites, educated Indians, and those affiliated with the mission were most set against a removal treaty.78
Swayne based much of his legal interpretation on that of Judge John McLean, a Methodist and longtime supporter of the mission, who ruled in a U.S. Circuit Court case that state laws extended to Indian reservations located inside of existing states. The case, which involved the U.S. government suing a white man for the theft of a horse owned by Henry Jacko, a Wyandot man, related directly to the current situation of the Wyandot reservation. McLean noted that the citizens of Crawford County had to cross the Grand Reserve daily to conduct their business, and that the Grand Reserve was, in effect, integrated into the surround community in meaningful ways. As Indian land could not be understood to be foreign jurisdiction, Ohio laws had to extend to the Grand Reserve. McLean argued that Wyandots would be better served at any rate, as state laws would protect their property more than federal laws.79

Race, the Law, and the Removal Argument II

After Swayne’s investigation, McCutchen and Brish continued to seek more signatures to the treaty from “the real owners of the soil,” acknowledging that “the white Indians” wanted nothing to do with him.80 McCutchen specifically identified the Walker, Garrett, and Armstrong families as those who opposed his treaty-making. In his opinion, the Walkers were the “most talented persons on the Reserve.” The Garrett brothers (three of them, two married to Walker women) were among the most vociferous in opposing a treaty. The Armstrong family, while opposed to the treaty, were in McCutchen’s view the most “respectable” family, refusing to use the “low” tactics of the former two families. He accused all of them of opposing the Democratic Party and voting in elections against
their candidates, which he certainly assumed would anger the Democratic War Department and Van Buren administration. He was sure, though, that if his efforts yielded a treaty, the “white Wyandots” would go with them, as they “cannot live amongst the whites.” This is quite a perplexing statement on the surface, but McCutchen seems to have believed that while the “white” Wyandots were not “real” Indians, they also were not “real” white people either. They seemed to occupy, in his view, an in-between status which would not allow them to live as white people in a post-removal Ohio. Swayne disagreed, alleging that more than half of the people, including one of the Walkers, wished to emigrate, while those who would not (no more than 1/6 of the people) “are desirous to get their share of the lands in severalty and to become citizens of the state.” From his perspective, these “white Wyandots” wished to integrate into American society, indicating some belief on their parts that they could (and wanted to) integrate.

Eventually, three leaders of those in favor of emigration (Warpole, Porcupine, and Washington) traveled to Washington D.C. with the former Seneca interpreter to make their own separate treaty with the United States, which prompted the Wyandot Council to write the War Department to vigorously argue that they had no authority to do so. When the men (McCutchen began referring to them as “war chiefs”) returned to deliver the news of their journey to the Council, McCutchen argued that “a mob of ruffians of the opposition [sic] party connected with the Wyandots” arrested them and put them in the Wyandot jail. Notice that McCutchen refers to the ruffians as “connected with the Wyandots,” indicating his continued assertion that they were racially not “real” Indians. McCutchen’s version of the incident differs from Purdy McElvain’s, though, who
reported that the Wyandots arrested Warpole because he became agitated during discussion with the Council and “drew a knife and defied the nation,” which led to his arrest. McElvain scolded the chiefs for being too rash (likely also reminding them of the findings of Swayne regarding the status of their laws), and they released the arrested parties.  

A Maturing Legal Code

As mentioned previously, the new legal codes of the Wyandot, while not strictly “racial” in nature, do indicate a changing avenue of group identity and adaptation. Along with the provisions discussed above pertaining to the removal question, the new national laws also codified national control of meting out punishment in Wyandot-on-Wyandot crimes in a westernized legal sense. In 1830, for example, Mononcue wrote James B. Finley to report the death of John Barnet’s half-brother by Black Chief’s son. According to the new laws, he was tried by all the men over twenty-one, who decided 112-12 that he should be executed. Six men shot him military-style. In acknowledgement of the religious differences in the community, Mononcue noted that three of the executioners were Christian, three were not. In the fall of 1837, William Walker reported that “one of the young Solomons” stabbed James B. Finley Driver, named after the former missionary. His recovery was in doubt, but should he perish Walker was certain the tribe would put young Solomon to death “as he is an old offender.” In September 1840, another Wyandot man murdered a fellow Wyandot man near Upper Sandusky, also during a drunken melee. The man, subject to National law, was arrested and pending trial.
Another pertinent example is the case of Thomas Long. In accordance with the Wyandot legal code, the Wyandots executed Thomas Long, Jr. in October 1840 for the first degree murder of Henry Johnston, aka Tahooharehtoh. Long beat Johnston to death with a club, as well as threatening to do the same to Seneca John, who tried to intercede to prevent the crime and eventually became the key witness in the case. Based on the laws of the Nation and the incontrovertible evidence of Long’s guilt, “the almost unanimous voice of the nation” sentenced him to die by firing squad. In the decree to the Citizens of the Nation explaining the sentence, William Walker, the Marshal of the Day, noted that Long’s execution “shall not only prove a warning to all, but to convince their people that the laws of the nation are not to be violated and trampled upon with impunity.”

Identity, Adaptation, Literacy, and Language

Along with factors such as racial assertions, economic development, land ownership, and codifying property legally, another key marker of changing identity was literacy. Clues, scattered throughout the extant materials available, give some insight into literacy, one of the “racial” adaptations Wyandots were or were not making. One such locale is in the signatures of various official documents. English literacy, while not the sole marker of adaptation to American society, does reveal certain patterns of cultural behavior. Reliance on others to conduct written affairs, especially in terms of treaty-making and trade arrangements, had long been a bane to indigenous peoples. In an 1831 document indicating the receipt of $1000 for the Exploring Party, for example, the entire
council of chiefs (Warpole, John Hicks, Peacock, Summonduwot, Sarrahess, and Jacquis) signed with an “X”, while Wyandot witnesses such as William Walker (then U.S. Interpreter), George I Clark, James Rankin, and the intermarried Charles B. Garrett wrote their own names.91 In the report of the Exploring Party later that year, three of the delegates (James Washington, John Gould, and John Baptiste) signed with an “X”, while William Walker and Silas Armstrong provided their own.92 In documents submitted by leaders of the Big Spring Reservation and the Wyandot National Council in early 1832, most signatories (even men intimately involved in the Methodist mission like Squire Gray Eyes and Peacock) continued to mark “X.” Of the twenty-two total signatories to these two documents, only three (William Walker, Alex Clarke, and John D. Brown) were able to sign their own names.93

Another avenue of consideration is the level of English language proficiency in the community. According to the War Department by 1832, they believed that there were so many Wyandots who spoke English, it was no longer necessary to constantly employ an interpreter at Upper Sandusky.94 John McElvain, however, argued that an interpreter was desperately needed. He stated that the Chiefs would not remove until a large majority of the people were for it, which required himself and any future negotiators to reach common Wyandots in their own homes, and very few spoke English.95 McElvain continued to argue that interpreters were essential, especially to negotiate the growing disputes between Wyandots and their white neighbors. McElvain promised that “there is not more than a half Dozen of Indians in this tribe that can speak the english [sic] language sufficient to transact any kind of business-not even to describe a horse that
happens to stray or be stolen.” If McElvain’s assertion is believed, this indicates that the racial makeup of the Sandusky Wyandots had not resulted in correspondingly high attachment to mastering the English language. In terms of the Methodist mission, McElvain’s words imply that while many children had spent years in the Methodist schools over the preceding fifteen years, there was little to show for it in terms of English proficiency. While McElvain might have understated the number, or might have had a much higher standard of proficiency than others, it does raise the question of how much the Wyandots had really changed as a group by the mid-1830s.

**Wyandot Views of “the Other”: Ignorant Whites**

Another possible avenue of inquiry is the perspective Wyandots had on white Americans. One notable example is that of John Bear (not a Native American, despite the name), briefly the sub-agent at Upper Sandusky in the early 1840s. If one attaches connections between education and level of civilization, as many observers did at this time, then Bear presented a problem for the interests of the federal government. John Johnston found him a very rough, poorly educated man, which made him a poor fit to conduct the business of the agency. Moreso, Johnston argued that his lack of education “disparages and underneates [sic] him in the eyes of the half breeds.” Johnston discussed the matter with William Walker, indicating his willingness to remove Bear if he proved an impediment to his efforts to forge a removal treaty. John M. Armstrong, himself an educated Wyandot of mixed heritage, wrote to the War Department to inform them that while he had heard rumor that complaints about Bear had been made, in his
view of the situation the Wyandots were satisfied with his performance. Joel Walker, however, wrote to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to support Johnston’s worries. Walker noted that Bear was “notoriously incompetent to discharge the duties of this, or any other, Ind. Agency.” He alleged that Bear was constantly involved in litigation with local whites, who engaged him in these battles in order to have “some sport out of him.” According to Walker, the Nation was dissatisfied with Bear and wished him gone. A short time later, Walker again complained about Bear, arguing that his boastful and bragging nature simply brought more problems to the reservation than would otherwise exist, as whites continually challenged his authority. At that moment, Bear was botching efforts to recover a horse stolen from the Reserve.

A Land Office official who traveled to Upper Sandusky to pay Wyandot monies due from land sales wrote the Secretary of War with another negative report. Arguing that “the Indians derive much of the respect they have for the Government” from their agents, Bear provided a poor example. While the Wyandots “call Mr. Bear their father…it was always accompanied with a laugh of-perhaps disrespect.” Johnston was of the opinion that Bear was colluding with John M. Armstrong, “the half breed attorney,” to cause the Wyandots to ask for an untenable annuity, which would destroy his treaty negotiations. Soon after, Francis A. Hicks, the (literate) Head Chief, wrote to the Secretary of War to inform him that the Wyandots were satisfied with Bear’s performance and would not like to see him removed. These contradictory positions, some written by the Wyandots themselves, others by whites giving their perception of
Wyandot attitudes towards Bear, indicate a complex discussion of not only Bear’s personal attributes, but also the connections between identity and intellect.

In the wake of Bear’s removal from his position, the Wyandot Council took the opportunity to suggest a man of their own choosing to be their agent in their new western home. The Council opined that agents had been appointed to the Wyandots who “were inferior to many of our own people in intelligence, business habits, responsibility and moral standing.” With such poor selections, these men “could command no influence either in our nation nor with the white people.” They wished to secure the services of Dr. George A. Heitich of Crawford County, a man of high intelligence and professional standing, to be their new agent. Clearly, the Wyandot leadership preferred to deal directly with a white American they deemed intellectually competent, judging such men by standards of intellect at least partially borrowed from American standards of intelligence.

**Identity Politics: John M. Armstrong**

A recurring figure in this chapter is John M. Armstrong, the son of a white adoptee and a Wyandot mother. Armstrong was just coming into his own in the years prior to Wyandot removal. He would become an important voice in the years following removal, both in political terms and as a champion of a continued attachment to the Methodist church. Armstrong’s story, like Isaac Walker’s a decade earlier, reveals a complex layering of identity, neither completely Wyandot nor white, both and neither at the same time. In his personal life, Armstrong demonstrated both his attachment to white
Americans and the Methodist church by courting and eventually marrying Lucy Bigelow, daughter of former missionary Russell Bigelow. Much of their early correspondence focused on their courtship, which was complicated by Armstrong’s belief that Lucy still loved a previous (white) suitor. They eventually married, with Lucy Armstrong becoming an important figure in Wyandot society in Kansas in later years.\textsuperscript{107}

Despite his relative youth and inexperience, Armstrong did attempt to assert an active role in the discussions of removal in the 1840s. In a letter he sent to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, he argued that John Johnston and, by extension, the U.S. Government, were low-balling the amount offered for the Grand Reserve, which was particularly outrageous in light of his belief that the U.S. had already bilked the Wyandots out of land very cheaply in previous treaties. Armstrong asserted that the lands of the Grand Reserve were quite valuable, with numerous waterways, existing roads, and public improvements. He also thought it important to note the wartime service of the Wyandots, which should be honored by the government with a better offer for removal. Armstrong concluded his letter by arguing that his motives were not for his personal gain, rather “from an honest conviction of what they ought to have.”\textsuperscript{108} It is interesting to note the detached nature of this statement. Armstrong mentions what “they ought to have,” rather than including himself as part of the group. This detachment would appear several more times in his written correspondence, indicative of an identity that was not quite part of the Wyandot group.

Armstrong also wrote directly to Johnston, who had previously recommended him for a clerkship with Thomas Ewing, which had led to Armstrong’s training in the law.
Armstrong’s words in this letter present another interesting view of his own racial identity. He hoped Johnston did not blame him for working to get the Wyandots the best deal possible for removal, with the excuse that “I have been raised among them and identified with them in every way.” He felt he would be a turncoat if he did not “lend them my little aid in a matter of such moment.” While Armstrong felt himself to be a Wyandot, it is interesting that he discusses the Wyandots as a different group (the word “them” appears several times), which might further indicate a feeling of some disconnect and difference. Armstrong argued that the government should agree to a high price per acre (he recommended $4/acre), and that the money should then be given to the Wyandots to do with what they would. Armstrong recognized that the government would not leave them alone until they removed, and he was “heartily tired of living upon these uncertainties.” Should removal occur, he hoped that the Nation would hold the lands “by a different tenure” than they had in Ohio, likely referring to some system of individualized ownership (perhaps within an overarching national land tenure, or perhaps not). At the end of the letter, Johnston added his own words before sending it to the War Department, wishing them to know “the kind of mind I have to contend with in conducting the negotiation.”

Even in his private correspondence with Lucy Bigelow, this sense of detachment emerges at times. For example, he told his fiancée in 1837 that “I do not think there is much danger of me going to the west, or even these people.” Again, the failure to include himself as part of the Wyandot people provides interesting clues about Armstrong’s self-identity. Certainly, Armstrong often mentions his Wyandot identity, and
his active participation in both the Methodist Missionary Society and Wyandot
government indicates as much. However, the fact that these words implying his distance
from the Wyandot people appear repeatedly also allude to a man who was not quite sure
where he fit in (or out of) this community.

**Elite Family Rivalry**

A final key aspect of John M. Armstrong’s Wyandot life was the rivalry between
his family and the Walker family, arguably the two most powerful acculturated families
on the Grand Reserve. Both the Armstrong’s and Walker’s often mentioned this rivalry in
their correspondence. For example, when Alexander Long, the supervisor of the Big
Spring land sale, died, the Wyandot Council nominated John M. Armstrong to replace
him. William Walker immediately wrote the Secretary of War, noting that while he
had to sign the recommendation as a member of the council, he did not agree with the
decision. Armstrong had “no business habits, is not judge of money…and…utterly
incompetent.” At any rate, he thought it unwise to appoint a member of the Nation to the
position.111

William Walker also reported to his brother Joel that the “Bear tribe” (particularly
the Armstrong family) were having difficulties. Henry Jacquis told Walker that George
Armstrong declared that his brother John M. Armstrong was “‘a poor sap head, not
possessing half the good sense of S.A. [Silas Armstrong]’.” Walker listed several
instances where John M. Armstrong had refused to do as the Council asked, including
refusal to go west as a delegate when selected to do so, refusal to travel to Allen County,
Ohio, to examine the case of a murder committed by Schterness on his wife, and refusal to go to Henry County about the murders of Summonduwot’s party. More generally, his indolence, want of energy, incapacity, and irresponsibility meant that the Chiefs would not support him for any important duties.  

Further evidence of the family rivalries between the mixed-ancestry families emerges from another letter by William Walker. He mentioned to his brother Joel that “the Quadroon portion of the Bear tribe” were agitated that Joel Walker was on his way to Kansas to secure “the three military sections to our family.” Walker chalked it up to jealousy and imaginations full of “plots, counterplots and conspiracies.”

For their part, the Armstrong family held similar feelings. Lucy Bigelow wrote to John M. from Norwalk to say that Mrs. Walker (unclear which, but likely Catherine) had recently come to Norwalk to take Martha Walker home from the Norwalk Seminary. Lucy noted that “Mrs. W…r was as good as sugar. I suppose she will like me for a neighbour right well. Whu [sic]!! Don’t say any thing [sic].”

During the interrupted sales of the Big Spring cession in 1837, Armstrong accused the Walker family of fighting against the efforts to stop the sale, costing the Nation thousands of dollars.

It is estimated that the nation lost about ten thousand dollars in consequence of the sales not being stoped [sic] sooner. Nothwithstanding this source of the Walker fraternity did all in their power to have the sales continue and appeared to be very sory, just ‘for the season that they wished to purchase a certain tract which would have [?] in market. For then they could sacrifice thousands for the nation. I speak of Garret in particular their brother in law. They as[sume?] all governed by the same principle__

The differences between these prominent families continued after removal, as evinced by two letters from Silas Armstrong to his brother John M. in March 1846. He mentioned
that “the Walker Tribe seme [sic] to be on nettles about Something,” particularly James Rankin, brother of Catherine Walker, who had opposed the treaty purchasing land from the Delaware in Kansas and who was working against John M. Armstrong’s current efforts, with the Walkers backing their uncle.¹¹⁶ Such rivalries, while not unexpected from powerful families in small communities, further illustrate the complexities of identity and community among the Wyandot people.

**Identity and Cultural Divides: The Pro-Removal Party**

It is important to note that not all Wyandots were amenable to remaining in Ohio. The so-called “removal party,” referred to in previous sections, merits further attention. When he assumed treaty negotiations in late 1838, William Hunter continued to echo many of the same racialized notions as his predecessors. He stated that the Wyandot Reserve “is settled by white persons, some half breeds, and Indians from other tribes, as well as the native and original members of the nation. The last I am inclined to think are anxious to emigrate and will follow their hereditary chiefs at any time.”¹¹⁷ Along with his own report, Hunter provided two lists of those wishing to emigrate, and the number of members in their family (see Figure 5.1).
Table 5.1: List of Signatories in Favor of Removal, 1838-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Number of family members represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rontondee (Warpole) [also Chief]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcupine [also Chief]</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullhead [also Chief]</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Warpole [also War Chief]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vanmeter [also War Chief]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Wing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Stewart</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ton tar ragh nah</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma ye rah or George</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Buck</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Vanmeter</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Spicer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Neezer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Us toch chee</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Jonathan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[illegible] or John Boyer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Chief</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Cherokee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doct. Williams</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarett Lewis [by John Vanmeter]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Crow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Coon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Solomon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow Shra She [by Warpool]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re wun de us tah [by Warpool]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An examination of this list of potential émigrés does indicate some connection between the desire to remove and lack of adherence to the Methodist mission. Few of the individuals on the list had any ongoing relationship with the mission. Nor do most of them appear to be among the more economically successful based on the available information in chapter 4. While not in any way definitive evidence, there are some cursory arguments that could be made of the connections between religion, economics, and identity among those in favor of removal.

It is important to note that the list of émigrés Hunter assembled included the signatures of Henry Brish and Joseph McCutchen, the same men accused of manipulating the lists earlier in 1838. The Wyandot Council complained that these men had plied Wyandots with alcohol to induce them to sign, along with allowing individuals to sign for numerous others who had no knowledge of their actions. They also refused to hold councils on the reservation, opting for meetings at McCutchenville (at Joseph McCutchen’s tavern) and the Negro Town close to the Grand Reserve. District Attorney N.H. Swayne once again investigated the complaints, and his report provides a detailed view of the local struggles over removal exacerbated by the actions of outsiders like McCutchen. Swayne ultimately decided that most of the allegations of wrongdoing were not strictly true, but fueled by a mutual dislike between the Wyandot Council and McCutchen. The richest data gleaned by Swayne came in the form of depositions provided by Wyandots pertaining to the efforts to compile removal lists. Mary Cook, persuaded by Cherokee (likely Bob Cherokee listed in Figure 5.1) that she would be given a horse, new house, and cow by the U.S. for signing the treaty, signed up her
family (including son-in-law) of six. After becoming sober, she and her son-in-law wished to be removed from the removal list. Silas Armstrong further attested that Cherokee could not converse in or understand English (verbal or written), as he had tested his abilities many times, casting doubt on his understanding of what he was asking others to sign.120

Mrs. Half John swore that someone else signed her name to the proposed treaty. She was a Delaware, and had no interest in the reservation other than through her husband, who was absent at the time of the treaty signings. Tall Charles swore that another woman had indeed given Mrs. Half John’s name to the treaty negotiators, and that White Crow (a Seneca) had interpreted and given the name to the commissioners. He also later testified that he had supported the treaty, but upon finding out the details of its contents “he believed they had been cheated.” George Williams swore that he witnessed Henry Warpole and George Solomon sign while drunk. John Johnston, another Delaware, found out that his name appeared on the treaty from Jonathan Pointer, the African-American interpreter. He protested its appearance on the document, particularly since it was signed with an “X” and Johnston could write his own name. Thomas Punch stated that he was repeatedly pressured by McCutchen to sign, even though he never expressed any interest in removing. James Washington gave eyewitness testimony that a drunk young man named Tas Coo met (at Warpole’s urging) signed for he and his family, even though many cautioned him to wait until he was sober to decide. Joseph Coon, whose sister was married to the aforementioned young man, swore to him that she did not want
to be on the treaty, and that the young man had asked to be removed from it, to no avail.\textsuperscript{121}

John M. Armstrong witnessed Enoch George, a Wyandot man, asking McCutchen to take his name off the treaty, which McCutchen refused to do. Sarrah Hess signed with the understanding that he was ceding his interests alone, and keeping ¼ section of his land reserved for his use. He noted that the commissioners refused to let the chiefs see the names on the treaty, which he found peculiar. Sarrah Hess suggested that McCutchen come to Upper Sandusky to formally reach an arrangement with the chiefs, which McCutchen refused to do. Margaret Sarrah Hess claimed to have never been to a treaty council and did not wish to be on the list of names, but someone placed her name there because she at one time contemplated moving west. John D. Brown reported that McCutchen offered to make him the interpreter for the treaty negotiations, but Brown thought himself unqualified. He suggested several others, including Silas Armstrong and William Walker, but McCutchen was not interested in them since they opposed removal. Brown confirmed several of the previous depositions, such as Warpole and Solomon signing while drunk, Black Sheep’s wife approving the signing of his name while he was drunk, and Enoch George, who had expressed to Brown his “hostility + opposition to the Emigrating policy”, signing while drunk. Brown also discussed the many rumors about the treaty commissioners: that they promised protection to those who defied the Council; that they had nothing to fear in terms of legal reprisal, as the chiefs had no authority to do anything in this matter; and generally that the laws of the Wyandots “were too arbitrary and ought to be disobeyed.” James Summondewat attended one of the councils at
Negrotown, witnessing mass drunkenness and the refusal of the commissioners to let John M. Armstrong read the entire treaty (only excerpts) to the assembled crowd. He also was angered that the treaty commissioners refused to submit any resulting treaty to the Wyandot Council, proposing to send it directly to Washington instead. He insisted that White Crow know so little English that he could not be a reliable interpreter as well.\textsuperscript{122}

Finally, James Summonduwat testified that as young educated Wyandots like Matthew Walker and John M. Armstrong read the details of the treaty proposal for all to hear, it became clear that the commissioners had misled the signers on several grounds, one being that it covered the entire reservation, not simply individual sections. Russia Hicks, one of the chiefs on the Council in 1837, asked the Commissioners to delay the proceedings until after corn planting season, which the commissioners promised to do, but they did not follow through. Henry St. John, a white observer, noted that when Matthew Walker and John M. Armstrong wanted to read the whole treaty, McCutchen refused them on the grounds that they were not sworn interpreters, and that they were construing the treaty differently from its intentions. St. John concurred with McCutchen, feeling that Walker and Armstrong were honest men, but were not interpreting the treaty in the proper way.\textsuperscript{123}

Another white observer, George Steiner, claimed to witness Thomas Hicks “by menases [sic]” force Warpole to sit while giving a speech in favor of the removal treaty, as well as drunken behavior by Squindecktee, an anti-removal member of the council. Henry Warpole reported that he was indeed drunk when he went to sign the treaty, but had sobered enough that he signed of his own free will (it is notable that his father,
Warpole, urged him to sign despite the first refusal to allow him to sign. Warpole (the elder) then provided a long testimony in favor of the proceedings and the commissioners’ actions therein. He also intimated that the Council and anti-removal Wyandots threatened those that persisted in the removal movement with being “knocked on the head.” Warpole also, by virtue of being the hereditary war chief of the Wyandots, continued to use the sobriquet despite the transition of the Wyandots to the constitutionally-based elected government mentioned previously. In fact, he asserted that those in favor of emigration had their own council of chiefs and “consider themselves now an Independent band.”

Despite this fact, Warpole admitted that he himself had used the new judicial system to take a case before the Council, and felt they had “generally done him justice.” He did object to some of the new rules and regulations, particularly his belief that the law against individuals ceding their rights to land passed when he was on the council had been changed without his knowledge. Finally, Swayne allowed the chiefs to examine the list of names collected by McCutchen and Brish for anyone not entitled to a stake in the Grand Reserve. They argued that Samuel Neezer, Blacksheep’s wife, Half John’s wife (Nando-loser), Tobias Armstrong, Robert Armstrong, and John Johnston did not have rights to the reservation, while a minor aged 7 or 8 (Endersarah) could not legally sign the proposal. Mr. Swayne noted that John Johnston and Robert Armstrong, who were both Delaware, had Wyandot wives. Johnston, however, had already testified that he did not sign his name to the treaty.

The depositions Swayne collected in 1838 provide insight not only into the removal issue, but also into identity politics on the Grand Reserve. Many of those
who appeared on the pro-removal roll were among the least educated, least adapted, and least economically wealthy Wyandots on the Grand Reserve, again indicating some connection between these identity factors and removal. Few had much connection to the Methodist mission. However, in terms of racial identity, there is no firm pattern of identity on the list, or in the subsequent depositions. Several (Coon, Spicer, Vanmeter) were from known mixed-ancestry families. Of course, as discussed in this chapter, genealogy was not an indicator of personal identity. One could be “full-blood” and be highly adaptive, while one could be of lower blood quantum and identify as a traditionalist. However, according to the assertions of the negotiators, blood was important in this equation, so it is interesting that a fair number of the signatories were of clear mixed ancestry. It is also clear from the depositions that many people were unsure of their position on the issue of removal, and that identities and interests became complex questions when the issue of removal became prevalent on the Grand Reserve.

**Identity and American Law**

As Wyandot people came into close contact with Americans, many Wyandots also began to feel the weight of American law. As mentioned in chapter four, many cases involved issues of economic importance, such as debts owed and contracts for goods and services. Additional entanglements in the legal system related more directly to issues of personal disagreements and violence. As part of their changing identities, many Wyandots found themselves embroiled in personal and legal disputes with white Americans. For example, a man named Old Shawnee got into a drunken fight with Dr.
Thomas Coke, resulting in Coke’s death from four stab wounds. Old Shawnee received a sentence of four months imprisonment and a $50 fine. The sentence was so light because it appeared that Old Shawnee stabbed Dr. Coke in self-defense.\textsuperscript{126} Purdy McElvain referenced a trial involving a Wyandot man facing murder charges in the Court of Common Pleas of Van Wert. The court convicted him of manslaughter, sentencing him to five years in the Ohio Penitentiary.\textsuperscript{127} The man reportedly killed his brother while drunk, returning to the Grand Reserve afterward. The Van Wert County authorities demanded that the killer be delivered to them, to which the Wyandot Council agreed.\textsuperscript{128}

While Wyandots often found themselves defendants in such cases, in others they had to resort to American courts to seek justice, such as an incident in 1839 recorded by Purdy McElvain. After noting the frequent depredations committed against Wyandot property by whites, he noted that the Wyandot Chiefs were party to a case in the Crawford County Court of Common Pleas. A white man was “attempting to practice a fraud upon them”, and the Wyandots appealed to the state of Ohio for justice in court.\textsuperscript{129}

Perhaps the most disturbing of these cases occurred in Henry County, where the Wyandots pursued justice against two white men who murdered three Wyandots. They included former Chief Summonduwot, his brother-in-law, and his brother-in-law’s wife. Summonduwot, as mentioned previously, was not simply a former chief, but an important figure in the Methodist mission. While he was, in a religious sense, highly adaptive, he also continued to live a largely traditional lifestyle. Recall that he made the interesting complaint that removal would force the Wyandots to become less traditional in economic terms, which he opposed. He was hunting in Williams County, Ohio, where he usually
went into winter camp, and while sleeping in his camp three white men murdered three of
his party with axes, stealing their property. The murderers dragged the bodies some
distance and piled them near a log. Three days later, a young Wyandot from another
camp found the bodies and altered the authorities. Authorities quickly captured the
murderers, but they escaped under mysterious circumstances, likely with aid from one or
more of their jailers. The crime horrified John Johnston, who appealed to the War
Department for funds to pursue legal justice in the case. The Office of Indian Affairs,
however, refused to get involved, arguing that since the Grand Reserve was in an existing
state, and the crime happened off the reservation in Ohio, state authorities should (and
would have to) take responsibility for arresting the culprits and prosecuting them.
Squire Gray Eyes brought the bodies of Summonduwot, Little Nancy, and her husband to
Upper Sandusky for burial. In a notable glimpse into the continued relevance of clan
identities, even to highly adapted Wyandots, William Walker received Little Nancy’s
remains “to be buried by our tribe [clan].” William Walker informed his brother Joel by
letter that one of the parties in the murder had turned state’s evidence, giving the gory
details of the crime to the Ohio investigators. Walker thought the brutality of the crime
was “enough to chill the blood of a Hyena.” Quoting a letter from one of the attorneys
presiding over the trial, Walker noted that the witness accused the ringleader of the
murderers, a man named John Ellsworth, who told the witness and another man to “kill
those Indians, that it was no more harm to kill an Indian than his dog.” The motive was
very simple: they wished to rob the Wyandot party of all their goods and money (about
$300). The witness and the third man traveled to Summondewot’s camp, with the third
man killing Summonduwot and Nancy, while the witness killed Cowaaah.\textsuperscript{134} The case of Summonduwot’s party serves, in part, as a lesson about the racial attitudes of some white Ohioans towards the Wyandots, and Indians more generally. Their humanity was of lesser value, and their material possessions were there for the taking. Parallels to removal policies and the devaluation of Indian rights to their lands beg for the making.

**Wyandot Views of “the Other”: Race**

An important question to ask when considering racial/identity issues among the Sandusky Wyandots is what Wyandot people felt about “the other.” The views on race held by Wyandots themselves are hard to unearth, but what evidence does exist shows a growing race consciousness among (some) members of the community. In a letter attributed to some of the leaders of the more traditional Wyandots (actually written and witnessed by Joseph McCutchen), they note that “the white influence is considerable amongst us”, having a great impact on “some of the weak mided [sic] people.” Fictional threats “which originates from the whites and almost whites amongst[t] us makes some fears.”\textsuperscript{135} Of course, with McCutchen’s well-documented views on this issue, these words might be his rather than the Wyandots in question.

Of more direct relevance are the observations about race difference by those of mixed ancestry. A number of “traditionalists”, particularly those in favor of removal, worked to delineate Wyandot identity and rights based on racial notions. John M. Armstrong wrote his wife to tell her that a council would be called soon:
the object is to be ascertained who has, and who has not a right to this reservation. You will see at once the importance of my presence here on that day. Father’s name is o[n] the treaty without a doubt, but some have an itching towards us, and wish to make it, another individual who had the same name. I refer to old Warpole. He says that Garret’s, Walkers, Armstrongs, &c., have no right here. The old fellow has returned from Washington city without affecting any thing. This has make him wrathy.\textsuperscript{136}

William Walker alluded to these race differences in a letter to his brother Joel, discussing an upcoming national election (undated, but likely in 1842). He noted the candidates he and their political allies were backing, one of whom was Silas Armstrong. Beside Armstrong’s name, Walker parenthetically included the term “Quod.” Below the list of candidates, he wrote the following: “And should either Jas Washington or H[enry]. J[aquis]. be nominated to run against F[rancis]. A.H[icks] we true Quods will support either against the present incumbent.” Hicks would also fit this mixed-ancestry identity, and this sentence indicates the Walker viewed Hicks as not being a “true Quod.”\textsuperscript{137} Quod almost certainly alludes to the word quadroon, sometimes applied to those Wyandots with one Wyandot grandparent. The casual way in which Walker discusses this race identity with his brother suggests both an acceptance of this terminology and a recognition of some degree of group unity/identity among those who fit the description. His discussion of Francis A. Hicks, another “quod” by descent but not by the positions he took, appears to frame Hicks as a figure who was not in allegiance to the others of his racial background.

Only months after removal, William Walker noted the passing of Warpole in a letter to his mother. He reflected on the influential old man, long a staunch traditionalist who championed the interests of those Wyandots uninterested in Methodism. As Walker noted, Warpole also adopted a race-based notion of Wyandot identity. Despite Warpole’s
opposition to the mixed-blood Wyandots and their interests, Walker recalled that Warpole “truly was my friend; when he used to attack the mixed blood, he never would attack me, but on the contrary defend me. With all the old man’s foibles, he had many good qualities.”

Walker wrote to John M. Armstrong and Joel Walker, who had gone to Washington to fight efforts by some Wyandots (including the Head Chief) to essentially cut out “quadroons” from the benefits of the treaty. Walker met privately with Henry Jacquis to discuss the “grand conspiracy” to show him “the base and craven disposition of the man who now heads our nation [Hicks].” Jacquis discussed the issue with Gray Eyes (likely Doctor Gray Eyes) and Bigtree, examining the position each chief had taken in council on the issue and “furnished them with such arguments as he supposed would be most effectual with the ‘britch [sic] clout’ fellows.” Gray Eyes almost betrayed Frank (seemingly referring to Francis A. Hicks) who Walker wished he had pursued before the meeting, as exposing Frank would reveal his “contemptible duplicity” in the matter.

The suspense over news of the ratification of the treaty hung over the Grand Reserve for months, including the final provisions for those of mixed heritage. Joel Walker continued to remain in Washington, D.C., working to ensure the treaty remained unchanged, which would ensure the continued recognition of the mixed-ancestry Wyandots as full stakeholders in Wyandot lands, treaties, and future interests. William Walker wrote to Joel noting the anticipation among the Wyandots, who looked for mail from the south to arrive with word from Washington. Despite such challenges to their identity, mixed
ancestry Wyandots retained their identities as Wyandot people, and continued to be prominent players in the Wyandot story in Kansas and beyond.

Another consideration of Wyandot views on race is the perception they held about other Indians. Due to the perceived influence of race mixing among the Wyandots, many observers argued that they were reluctant to remove and dwell amongst other, less cultured (and less “white”) Indians. James Finley noted that “the old ones are much opposed to their children going back and mixing with wild Indians.”141 Another notable example of Wyandots distinguishing themselves in terms one might regard as “racial” from other Native Americans came from their exploration of possible western relocation lands. A condition frequently mentioned in the results of these expeditions was that the Wyandots did not wish to live anywhere but among the Shawnee and Delaware. While part of this demand was to position themselves among old friends and familiar faces, it also was meant to ensure that the Wyandots did not end up neighbors of Plains peoples. William Walker noted that the land “we explored is truly a land of savages. It is wild and romantic.” He further explained that the lands between the Rockies and Mississippi west to east, and between Arkansas and Missouri south to north, were “inhabited by the Osage, Sioux (pronounced Sooz) Pawnee, Comanches, Panches, Arrapohoes, Assinaboins, Riccarees, Yanktons, Omahaws, Black-feet, Ottoes, Crow Indians, Sacs, Foxes, and Iowas; all a wild, fierce and war-like people.”142 Years later, the Wyandots expressed “a strong aversion to a residence near the Osages”, a group they perceived as wild and uncultured.143
Another scant, but extant, perspective is that of Wyandot views on African-Americans. After all, the community had lived in close proximity to a Negro town for decades, and African-Americans such as John Stewart, Jonathan Pointer, the Wright family, and others, played a key role in Wyandot history in the early 19th century. Some clues are available, and seem to indicate at least some absorption of broader American racial mores. In the 1831 Exploring Party report referenced previously, for example, one objection to relocation west of Missouri was the proximity of slaveholders to the lands in question. The exploring party (William Walker did the physical writing of their report) argued that slaveholding states had demonstrated their hatred of Indians in the past (the report references Georgia’s then-recent actions towards the Cherokee and Creek as an example), which was reason enough to dislike the proposed land. An additional concern with slavery, however, was that should the Wyandots relocate, their lands would become a haven for those seeking to escape Missouri jurisdiction. The new reservation would become a “sanctuary for runaway and vagrant negroes; for as soon as they cross the state line, they are without the limits of the United States, and we are sure we have enough of that class already amongst us.” Though limited and fleeting, such materials indicate a growing sense of racial sensitivity and relevance among the Wyandot in the years before their removal, perhaps indicative of the absorption of dominant American racial ideologies and sentiments.
Defining Identity: The Case of Joseph Barnett

As a final postscript to the considerations of race and identity in this chapter, it seems fitting to consider the case of Joseph Barnett. Barnett was the younger son of Barnet, one of the first Protestant converts among the Wyandots and a focal figure in chapter 1. Joseph Barnett also had an older brother, John Barnett, who had served as Head Chief of the Wyandots for a time in the 1830s. It is important to note in the story of Joseph Barnett, however, that Joseph and John were half-brothers. Joseph’s mother was a Shawnee woman, which played a key role in the arguments about his identity in the 1840s.

An interesting late claim for Wyandot debt payments came to the attention of the Office of Indian Affairs in the fall of 1842. Unlike the debts Johnston had collected (discussed in chapter four), John Elliot’s claim came through the United States Senate. Elliot held two notes for $1300 each owed by Joseph Barnett, who had already removed to the west with the Shawnees several years earlier. Elliot’s claims were not allowed when the Shawnees removed, so he re-submitted them under the premise that Joseph Barnett was “a Wyandott although living among the Shawnees.” The War Department requested a determination on the part of the Wyandot council as to Joseph Barnett’s status in the Nation. In the meantime, P.G. Goode of Sidney, Ohio, wrote to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in support of Elliot’s claims. He alleged that “Barnett is a Wyandott there is no doubt if the case be properly understood.” Goode had just returned from Upper Sandusky, where he discussed Barnett with “the Walkers + Armstrong who are the leading half bloods of the nation, and are very intelligent and well educated men.”
They confirmed that Joseph Barnett was indeed the son of “Old Barnett as they call him, who was a Wyandott.”

They were able to provide a sketch of Joseph’s story, particularly that fact that from a young age he went to live with Reverend Elisha McCurdy of Pittsburgh, as his older brother John had for a time. Unlike John, Joseph spent many of his formative years with McCurdy. He did not return to the Wyandotts until a teenager or young man. Joseph did not remain long with the Wyandot, opting to live with the Shawnee, his mother’s people, and marrying a Shawnee woman. Goode also learned that John Barnett had been a Chief of the Wyandot, which in his mind meant that “all doubt on that subject [Joseph’s status as a Wyandot] is removed.” However, the Walkers, in particular, were dissatisfied by the monies allotted to pay their debts, feeling them far short of the amount necessary. Should the amount they desired be authorized ($25,000), “they would have no objection to Elliots [sic] getting his money.” Goode argued that the Senate had already approved Elliot’s payment, and the Indian Office should simply pay what was due.

Despite Goode’s understanding of the matter, the Wyandot Council had other notions of Joseph Barnett’s identity, casting doubt on Elliot’s claim. Purdy McElvain laid the matter before the Wyandot Council. George Punch delivered the findings of the chiefs, with John Hicks affirming his words. McElvain considered both men “of truth and veracity”, making their findings reliable. George Punch stated that Joseph was indeed born among the Wyandot, at Lower Sandusky [modern Fremont, Ohio]. When his father died (Joseph was ten or twelve at the time), Joseph “was taken by the Rev. Mr. McCurdy to Pennsylvania to be educated.” His mother, a Shawnee, moved the rest of the family to
her own people at that time. Joseph did not return from Pittsburgh until grown, and upon returning “immediately went among the Shawneese [sic] and there married a Shawnee woman and has ever since resided with them.” Since that time, he never received any annuity payments from the Wyandot funds, nor had he ever “participated in the privileges enjoyed by the Wyandott nation.” While his late brother John had indeed been a Wyandot Head Chief, “the difference between the two is very plain. We considered and claimed John as a Wyandott from the fact that his mother was a Wyandott woman and he was raised and married among them, but Joseph’s mother was a Shawnee woman and he is claimed and identified with the Shawnee nation.”

John Hicks spoke briefly to confirm Punch’s words, but added an important addendum of clarification. Harkening to the traditions of a matrilineal people, he added that “it is a rule among the Indians that the mother has full control of the children in cases of separation of man and wife, for they are considered members of her tribe.” Therefore, according to ancient customs and systems STILL IN FORCE, Joseph Barnett was not Wyandot, but Shawnee. Even if such traditions had not still been in place, modern national agreements served the purpose of providing a second affirmation of Joseph’s identity. The Wyandots, Senecas, and Shawnees had recently adopted a new regulation governing political rights and identities. If “a Seneca or Shawnee married, or took up his residence among the Wyandotts, they would extend to him” all rights and privileges of the Nation. The reverse also held true. Taken together, therefore, two different (one traditional, one modern), but valid, factors shaped Joseph Barnett’s identity as a Shawnee man, not a Wyandot man. McElvain accepted the words of Punch and Hicks, telling the
Office of Indian Affairs that he could not “come to any other conclusion, than that Joseph Barnett is a Shawnee, and that the claim ought not to be paid.”

Conclusion

As this chapter reveals, issues of race and identity were complex. Racial admixture did not automatically result in one being more adaptive, wealthier, Christian, or more or less interested in removal, though some basic generalities might be argued. Assumptions one might make about interconnections between these aspects of Wyandot history in the first decades of the nineteenth century are, at best, tenuous, if not outright untenable. A person of mixed ancestry was (nearly) as likely to identify as a traditionalist as they were as a “progressive” or Methodist; was (nearly) as likely to be of low economic status as wealthy, or to be in favor of removal or not. This lack of definitive connections indicates a highly negotiable form of identity among the Sandusky Wyandot, one based as much on personal choice and tastes as any markers of religious, cultural, or racial identities. By the same token, the limited evidence does indicate a growing sense of racial/cultural identity in some ways not dissimilar to the growing sense of race and its importance among white Americans at this same moment in time.
CONCLUSION

Amalgamation with the civilized races had lessened the degree of Indian blood and they had become a civilized people. They were educated more or less, and were possessed of an innate refinement of thought and manner…With all that they had gained from civilization, they retained and cherished closely, many of their old manners and customs, adapting these to ever-changing times. –Hen-Toh (Bertrand N.O. Walker), 1919

This dissertation has striven to discuss Wyandot history in the early nineteenth century through the lenses of religion, economics, and identity, rather than the common lens of removal used by many previous scholars. Of course, the issue of removal was a recurring theme in previous chapters, and could not (and should not) be dismissed as an important aspect of Wyandot history. Indeed, the removal question was intimately connected to other aspects of Wyandot life throughout this era of their history. As mentioned in chapter 5, the Wyandot people did indeed agree to a removal treaty in 1842, leading to the movement of most Wyandots to Kansas in 1843. At that moment of removal, Joel Walker wrote to his future wife, noting that: “this is probably the last letter you will receive from me dated from this place [Upper Sandusky]. I arrived home yesterday morning, and found everything very dull and desolate, altogether beyond description…everybody that I met appeared to have a long face on, if not as long as my arm most certainly as long [as] yours, our once peaceful barbarian village wears rather a gloomy appearance.”

During the debates over the treaty, which some considered highly favorable to the Wyandot compared to other recent treaties, William Walker noted that the “whole tribe [was] distressed to hear that the Southerners oppose the treaty. The Locos at Tiffin
predict that the treaty will, on its final or third reading, be rejected, and they are chuckling quite merrily over what they call a defeat of the Wyandott Whig treaty.”  

The long removal crisis had worn down the Wyandot people, according to Walker, who stated that “even those who have, heretofore, been opposed to the treaty are truly desirous now that the matter might be closed and they relieved from this state of suspense. Let the result be for ‘weal or woe.’” Walker opined that the United States should never send another Commissioner to treat with the Wyandots again, 

for they will disdain to even to treat him with the common courtesies due to an officer of the general government, (as such)...I feel indignant at the vacillating and wavering-nay more, the inconsistent course of the Govt- especially where the ‘poor Indian’ is concerned!! We have never asked any favor of the Govt, but they have of us, and it may be that the Govt may have occasion to become the supplicant at some future period.

Despite the fears of some, the treaty was indeed ratified. Alas, the Wyandot also were not left alone in Kansas, as future treaties landed a portion of the nation in the Indian Territory, while some remained behind on allotments in Kansas. 

Removal has of course been a liminal moment in the history of the Wyandot people ever since. Despite the physical severing of the Wyandot people from their homeland, the historical trends and realities discussed in this dissertation continued to dominate Wyandot life in their new Kansas home. Whether one considers issues of religion, identity, or lifestyle, the Wyandot people remained a changing, adaptive people. 

Many Wyandots continued in their connections to the Methodist Church, including to their old friends and missionaries back in Ohio. Men like Squire Gray Eyes and John M. Armstrong continued to correspond with James B. Finley in the years after removal, informing him of the doings among the Wyandots and the state of religion in
their new western homes. Gray Eyes continued to act as a preacher and itinerant missionary to other Indians for the rest of his life, demonstrating in the most direct way his adherence to the missionary cause. Gray Eyes also noted that, by 1848, a large number of Wyandots continued in the church, along with over 100 Kickapoo, Delawares, and Shawnees. Many of the same individuals who had been leaders in the church in Ohio continued in leadership roles in the Kansas church, including John Hicks, James Bigtree, George I. Clark, Little Chief, Bateese Curly Head, David Young, John Solomon, George Spybuck, William Jackoo, John Vanmeter, White Crow, John Pipe, and John M. Armstrong. Other correspondents, such as Catherine and John Hicks, wrote to Finley to assure him of their continued adherence to their faith. Their new agent, Richard Hewitt, argued that “truth compels me to say that I have never witnessed better order in church, nor more devoted worshippers, than are to be found in a Wyandott meeting.”

When the Methodist Church divided into a northern and southern church over the issue of slavery, many Wyandot Methodists communicated through James Finley that they desired to remain under the leadership of the northern Methodists through the Ohio Conference. Squire Gray Eyes noted that the decision was not unanimous, but a firm majority wished to remain with the northern Methodists. A few months later, however, Gray Eyes and Armstrong reported that the pro-slavery missionaries among them had persuaded a number of Wyandot Methodists, including some of the leaders of the church, to defect and support attachment to the southern Methodists. The affair was contentious, and lasted for an extended period of time.
The evolution of perceptions of race and the importance of race also continued after removal to Kansas. John M. Armstrong reported in 1847, for example, that the Wright family (racially African-American) “have been cut off from all privileges except the base living on the lands of the Wyandotts, no annuity, nor privileges of the Blacksmith shop.” He also noted that some in the nation recently attempted to “cut off and drive away Isaac Zane’s widow” (a white woman) and her family. The racial lines of thought in the community continued to evolve in the years after removal, revealing a more race-based understanding of Wyandot identity.

Despite all of the changes Wyandots had gone through in Ohio, and in the long years after removal, the merging of old and new, of tradition and change, continued to shape Wyandot life. A prime example was Hen-Toh (Bertrand N.O. Walker), son of Isaiah Walker (the son of Isaac Walker who was at the center of the court case discussed in chapter 5). Hen-Toh worked for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for much of his life in eastern Oklahoma, and in the early twentieth century collected and published many traditional stories of the Wyandot people. Hen-Toh, a product of American educational systems, American-based employment, and (mostly) “racially white,” seems a fitting descendant of the Wyandot subgroups I have discussed in this dissertation. Despite such evidence of his adaptation (some might argue assimilation), Hen-Toh was also a product of Wyandot traditions reaching back before contact with Americans or Christianity. Hen-Toh felt connections to both the present of his day and the past of his people through stories, clan identity (Big Turtle Clan), and historical memory. The tales he collected reflected not just the “dying traditions” of a people, but the living importance of such
tales and traditions for twentieth century Wyandots, even those as seemingly acculturated as Hen-Toh.\textsuperscript{12}

Although the Wyandot Nation was gone, the consideration of their historical legacies in northwest Ohio had only begun. An early example came in the late 1840s, when Ohioans considered a name change for the old Wyandot town of Lower Sandusky, since the word Sandusky was in use for other towns already (Sandusky, Upper Sandusky), as well as the Sandusky River and County. Future President of the United States Rutherford B. Hayes, then a young resident of Lower Sandusky, solicited the input of John Johnston for a suitable new name with Wyandot ties. Though Johnston had no particular suggestion, he did provide a list (and brief biographical sketch) of a number of possibilities. He included Warpole, Between-the-Logs, Duonquod, Skoutash, Standing Stone, and Cherokee Boy (along with their Wyandot names spelled phonetically). Along with the more obviously Wyandot names listed above, he also proposed a number of names of mixed ancestry families, such as Rankin, Armstrong, Zane, and Hicks. Johnston perhaps expressed the most enthusiasm for Whitaker, feeling that the fact that James and Elizabeth Whitaker, as the first Americans to settle Lower Sandusky, was an important legacy that should be remembered.\textsuperscript{13} Perhaps in a sign that white residents of the region were ready to move on from the town’s legacy as a Wyandot place, the name was eventually changed to one that had no local (or Native American) ties at all, Fremont, with John C. Fremont then a hero of the Mexican War.

While the Wyandot legacy in the region began to fade into memory, the physical presence of “last” Wyandots became part of that legacy of erasing the Wyandots from
modern memories. Reverend N.B.C. Love reported in 1859 that “there is but one family of Wyandott Indians residing at the present time in this part of the state. Their name is Spy-buck. A few evenings since I saw Mr. Spy Buck and his squaw (Lady).” Love noted that the Spybuck’s dressed in American fashion. He also stated that “there appeared about them a peculiar shyness I never saw manifested in whites, and also appeared perfectly indifferent to all about them.”

A later “last” Wyandot was Mother Solomon, who had moved back to Ohio from Kansas in the latter years of the nineteenth century to live the twilight of her life in the land of her birth. By the turn of the twentieth century, the living Wyandot presence in Ohio had ended, at least in the minds of most white Ohioans.

While the presence of Wyandot individuals faded from public memory, the physical emblem of the mission, the stone church and graveyard, served as a reminder of the mission and its history. The Wyandot Nation made provision for the church to continue as a Methodist institution at Upper Sandusky:

Whereas by the 17th Article of the late treaty made and concluded between the Wyandott Nation of Indians and the United States, there was reserved from sale one acre of ground near the Council House at Upper Sandusky, and also two acres near to and north of Upper Sandusky, to include the stone Meeting House, was done for securing the house and the place where we have buried friends from being desecrated by appropriating them to other purposes from which they were originally intended, [designed?] In order therefore that the object of the aforesaid reservation may be secured and carried out we request that the Methodist Episcopal Church take possession thereof, and appoint trustees over the same according to its own rules and regulations.

Despite the efforts of the Wyandots to secure their church as a center of Methodist activity after their departure, after a few scant years the church quickly fell into disrepair, disuse, and nearly destruction. It took decades of efforts to restore the church to its former state.
Though Wyandots had lost their Ohio home, their lives and works in the decades before their removal should never be forgotten. Nor should these efforts be viewed through the lenses of a “pathetic” or “futile” attempt to cling to their homelands as a Nation, or failed attempts to assimilate and “become” white. Instead, as I contend in this dissertation, what the Wyandot people were doing in the years between the Treaty of Greenville and removal should stand as an example of the changing, shifting identities and lifestyles of people in the midst of a moving historical stream. History is, after all, the study of change over time. The Wyandot people were indeed a changing people, but one changing for their own complex reasons, and changing on the ground in their own ways. They were not a failing people, or a people running out the clock until their inevitable removal occurred. Instead, they were a people living their lives, and forging their own futures, regardless of where they ended up on the map.
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See Piker, Okfuskee. For an important recent compilation on the utility of microhistorical approaches, see James F. Brooks, Christopher R.N. DeCorse, and John Walton, eds., Small Worlds: Method, Meaning, & Narrative in Microhistory (Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press, 2008).
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Sergei Kan, “Clan Mothers and Godmothers: Tlingit Women and Russian Orthodox Christianity, 1840-1940,” *Ethnohistory* 43, no. 4 (Fall 1996): 631. James Axtell, the leading North American ethnohistorical commentator on this topic, has stated concisely that: “I am persuaded by the evidence, and by the history of Christianity around the world, that many Indians—certainly not all of them—were receptive to the solutions offered by the new religion and were capable of taking the decisive step from their old religions to the new, without deceiving themselves, the missionaries, or us.” He further argues: “even though it [conversion] entailed wholesale cultural changes from the life they had known before contact, it preserved their ethnic identity as particular Indian groups on familiar pieces of land that carried their inner history.” While I disagree with the idea of “wholesale” changes, the motivations to convert were powerful for so-called remnant groups who were surrounded by white communities. For the first quote, see James Axtell, “Were Indian Conversions Bona Fide?,” in *After Columbus: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 100. For the second quote, see James Axtell, “Some Thoughts on the Ethnohistory of Missions,” *Ethnohistory* 29, no. 1 (Winter 1982): 37.
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Both the size and population estimates seem high compared to other extant counts of the number of Wyandots on the Sandusky in this period. The number may include nearby Iroquoian or Delaware peoples as well, or may simply be a generous estimate.
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