

many who would flee to an unknown country, however beset with dangers, privations and sufferings, rather than be sentenced to spend six years in a Georgia prison for advising one of their neighbors not to betray his country. And there are others who could not think of living as outlaws in their native land, exposed to numberless vexations, and excluded from being parties or witnesses in a court of justice. It is incredible that Georgia should ever have enacted the oppressive laws to which reference is here made, unless she had supposed that something extremely terrific in its character was necessary, in order to make the Cherokees willing to remove. We are not willing to remove; and if we could be brought to this extremity, it would be, not by argument; not because our judgment was satisfied; not because our condition will be improved—but only because we cannot endure to be deprived of our national and individual rights, and subjected to a process of intolerable oppression.

We wish to remain on the land of our fathers. We have a perfect and original right to claim this, without interruption or molestation. The treaties with us, and laws of the United States made in pursuance of treaties, guaranty our residence, and our privileges, and secure us against intruders. Our only request is, that these treaties may be fulfilled, and these laws executed. . . .

It is under a sense of the most pungent feelings that we make this, perhaps our last appeal to the good people of the United States. It cannot be that the community we are addressing, remarkable for its intelligence and religious sensibilities, and pre-eminent for its devotion to the rights of man, will lay aside this appeal, without considering that we stand in need of its sympathy and commiseration. We know that to the Christian and the philanthropist, the voice of our multiplied sorrows and fiery trials will not appear as an idle tale. In our own land, our own soil, and in our dwellings, which we reared for our wives and for our little ones, when there was peace on our mountains and in our valleys, we are encountering troubles which cannot but try our very souls. But shall we, on account of these troubles, forsake our beloved country? Shall we be compelled by a civilized and Christian people, with whom we have lived in perfect peace for the last forty years, and for whom we have willingly bled in war, to bid a final adieu to our homes, our farms, our streams, and our beautiful forests? No. We are still firm. We intend still to cling, with our wonted affection, to the land which gave us birth, and which, every day of our lives, brings to us new and stronger ties of attachment. We appeal to the Judge of all the earth, who will finally award us justice, and to the good sense of the American people, whether we are intruders upon the land of others. Our consciences bear us witness that we are the invaders of no man's rights—we have robbed no man of his territory—we have usurped no man's authority, nor have we deprived any one of his unalienable privileges.

How then shall we indirectly confess the right of another people to our land by leaving it forever? On the soil which contains the ashes of our beloved men, we wish to live, on this soil we wish to die. . . .

Source 16 from Theda Perdue, ed., *Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot*. Copyright © 1983 by The University of Tennessee Press. Reproduced by permission, pp. 175–179.

16. Elias Boudinot, “Resolutions,” October 2, 1832.

Whereas, a crisis of the utmost importance, in the affairs of the Cherokee people has arrived, requiring from every individual the most serious reflection and the expression of views as to the present condition and future prospects of the Nation; and whereas a portion of the Cherokees have entertained opinions which have been represented as hostile to the true interest and happiness of the people, merely because they have not agreed with the Chiefs and leading men; and as these opinions have not heretofore been properly made known, therefore.

Resolved, That it is our decided opinion, founded upon the melancholy experience of the Cherokees within the last two years, and upon facts which history has furnished us in regard to other Indian nations, that our people cannot exist amidst a white population, subject to laws which they have no hand in making, and which they do not understand; that the suppression of the Cherokee Government, which connected this people in a distinct community, will not only check their progress in improvement and advancement in knowledge, but, by means of numerous influences and temptations which this new state of things has created, will completely destroy every thing like civilization among them, and ultimately reduce them to poverty, misery, and wretchedness.

Resolved, That, considering the progress of the States authorities in this country, the distribution and settlement of the lands, the organization of counties, the erection of county seats and Courthouses, and other indications of a determined course on the part of the surrounding States, and considering, on the other hand, the repeated refusal of the President and Congress of the United States to interfere in our behalf, we have come to the conclusion that this nation cannot be reinstated in its present location, and that the question left to us and to every Cherokee, is, whether it is more desirable to remain here, with all the embarrassments with which we must

be surrounded, or to seek a country where we *may* enjoy our own laws, and live under our own vine and fig-tree.

Resolved, That in expressing the opinion that this nation cannot be reinstated, we do it from a thorough conviction of its truth—that we never will encourage our confiding people with hopes that can never be realized, and with expectations that will assuredly be disappointed—that however unwelcome and painful the truth may be to them, and however unkindly it may be received from us, we cannot, as *patriots* and well-wishers of the Indian race, shrink from doing our duty in expressing our decided convictions. That we scorn the charge of selfishness and a want of patriotic feelings alleged against us by some of our countrymen, while we can appeal to our consciences and the searcher of all hearts for the rectitude of our motives and intentions.

Resolved, That, although *we love the land* of our fathers, and should leave the place of our nativity with as much regret as any of our citizens, we consider the lot of the *Exile* immeasurably more to be preferred than a submission to the laws of the States, and thus becoming witnesses of the ruin and degradation of the Cherokee people.

Resolved, That we are firmly of the opinion, that a large majority of the Cherokee people would prefer to remove, if the true state of their condition was properly made known to them.²⁸—We believe that if they were told that they had nothing to expect from further efforts to regain their rights as a *distinct community*, and that the only alternatives left to them is either to remain amidst a white population, subject to the white man's laws, or to remove to another country, where they may enjoy peace and happiness, they would unhesitatingly prefer the latter. . . .

Resolved, That we consider the policy pursued by the Red Clay Council,²⁹ in continuing a useless struggle from year to year, as destructive to the present peace and future happiness of the Cherokees, because it is evident to every observer that while this struggle is going on, their difficulties will be accumulating, until they are ruined in their property and character, and the only remedy that will then be proposed in their case will be, *submission to the laws of the States* by taking reservations.

28. Boudinot accused Principal Chief John Ross and the National Council of not telling the Cherokees "how seemingly hopeless their situation was." Perdue, *Cherokee Editor*, p. 228, n. 29.

29. "Red Clay Council:" the National Council.

◆ CHAPTER 7

Land, Growth,
and Justice: The
Removal of the
Cherokees

Source 17 from Gary E. Moulton, ed., *The Papers of Chief John Ross* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985).

17. John Ross³⁰ et al. to President Andrew Jackson, January 23, 1835.

It is known to your Excellency, that the history of the Cherokee Nation since the year 1829 up to the present, has been on its part, one of repeated, continued unavailing struggle against the cruel policy of Georgia; on the part of that State, it has been one, of unparalleled aggravated acts of oppression upon the Nation. Actuated by an unextinguishable love of country, confiding implicitly in the good faith of the American Govt. and believing that the Govt. priding itself, as it does upon its justice and humanity would, not only not, disregard its own plighted faith, but would eventually interpose to prevent it from being disregarded, and trampled into dust by the State of Georgia. Being fully convinced in their own judgement that they could not prosper as well any where else as upon their native land, the Cherokees have successively appealed to the Executive, Legislative and Judiciary Departments of this Govt. for redress of wrongs committed and security against injuries apprehended, but as yet those appeals have been unavailing; In defiance of Acts of Congress, decisions of the Supreme Court, and of solemn treaties, Georgia has gone on first, to despoil them of their laws & Govt. and impose upon them laws the most obnoxious, then to distribute their lands unbought, to her own citizens by lottery, and lastly she has put forth her hand under the last Act of her Legislature to expel them from their homes & firesides, to drive them out to hunger and perish in the wild forests—to accomplish this last cruel purpose, armed bands of her citizens are now parading thro' their Country. The Undersigned deeply affected with this deplorable, condition of their people would ask you, Dear Sir, to pity and save them. For, upon the exercise of your power alone, they are firmly persuaded the salvation of their people depend. Let the comforts and enjoyments of life which have been so profusely scattered around you, by a bountiful providence remind you, that hundreds of their people, many of whom are women and children, may now be homeless wanderers, suffering with cold & hunger, for no crime, but, because they did not love their Country less.

The crisis of the fate of the Cherokee people, seems to be rapidly approaching—and the time has come, when they must be relieved of their sufferings—They having fully determined against a removal to Arkansas. The undersigned

30. John Ross (1790–1866), the Principal Chief from 1828 to 1860, was one-eighth Cherokee, well-educated and became a wealthy landowner and businessman. In 1836, his property was appraised at \$23,665 (\$446,085 in 2001 dollars).

Delegation would therefore most respectfully and earnestly ask to be informed, upon what terms will the President negotiate for a final termination of those sufferings, that their people may repose in peace and comfort on the land of their nativity, under the enjoyment of such rights and privileges as belongs to freemen. And the Delegation would in conclusion beg leave to assure the President in great sincerity, that after a due deliberation on the terms which he may offer, should they be found to have been dictated in that spirit of liberality and justice, as in their best judgement would afford their people ample relief and satisfaction by adopting them; it may be done. With sentiments of great respect, they remain, yr. Excellency's most Hble. Servts.

Source 18 from Edward Everett Dale and Gaston Litton, eds., *Cherokee Cavaliers: Forty Years of Cherokee History As told in the Correspondence of the Ridge-Watie-Boudinot Family*, (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939).

18. John Ridge³¹ to Major Ridge et al., March 10, 1835.

I have delayed this long in writing to you in the consequence of the hard struggles I had to make against John Ross & his party. At the outset they told Congress that our people had decided that they would choose to be citizens of the U. States [rather] than to remove. We contradicted this & he has failed to get an answer from Congress. From various indications we ascertained that he was going to act falsely to his people & sell the Nation either by getting Reservations of land or taking the whole in money on pretense of going out of the limits of the U. States. We protested against this & we have succeeded to get a treaty made to be sent home for the ratification of the people.³² It is very liberal in its terms—an equal measure is given to all. The poor Indian enjoys the same rights as the rich—there is no distinction. We are allowed to enjoy our own laws in the west. Subsistence for one year, \$25. for each soul for transportation, fair valuation for ferries & Improvements, \$150 for each individual, more than forty thousand dollars perpetual annuity in the west, & a large sum of money to pay for the losses of the Cherokees against the white people. In fact—we get four millions & a half in money to meet all expenses & large addition in land to that already possessed by our brethren in the west. John Ross and his party tried hard to treat & get the whole in money & go as they said out of the limits of the U. States, but they have failed.³³

31. John Ridge (Cherokee name Yellow Bird) was born in 1792, the son of Major Ridge and cousin of Elias Boudinot. He initially opposed Cherokee relocation but changed his mind after President Jackson's refusal to enforce the Supreme Court decision in *Worcester v. Georgia*.

32. The Treaty of New Echota.

33. Ridge's charge that Ross intended to steal the money appropriated for removal was not true.

♦ CHAPTER 7

Land, Growth,
and Justice: The
Removal of the
Cherokees

Jackson said that he would not trust them with the money of the people. The Indians here under his care wish that he would refer the whole to the people. Ross has failed before the Senate, before the Secretary of War, & before the President. He tried hard to cheat you & his people, but he has been prevented. In a day or two he goes home no doubt to tell lies. But we will bring all his papers & the people shall see him as he is. . . .

The Congress has allowed money enough to pay the expenses of our Councils while the people are signing this treaty if they approve it. We are all well. I shall go to the north & see my wife's parents & in great haste will return to you. Stand, stay. All will be right. The U. States will never have any thing more to do with John Ross. Thus it becomes of selfish men. . . .

Source 19 from Protest of the Cherokee Delegation, laid before the Senate and House of Representatives, June 21, 1836, (Washington, DC: s.n., 1836) in Southeastern Native American Documents 1790–1842, accessible through the Georgia Virtual Library, Galileo, www.galileo.usg.edu.

19. "Protest of the Cherokee Delegation," June 21, 1836.

To the honourable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of North America, in Congress assembled:

The undersigned representatives of the Cherokee nation, east of the river Mississippi, impelled by duty, would respectfully submit, for the consideration of your honourable body, the following statement: An instrument purporting to be a treaty with the Cherokee people, has recently been made public by the President of the United States, that will have such an operation, if carried into effect. This instrument, the delegation aver before the civilized world, and in the presence of Almighty God, is fraudulent, false upon its face, made by unauthorized individuals, without the sanction, and against the wishes, of the great body of the Cherokee people. Upwards of fifteen thousand of those people have protested against it, solemnly declaring they will never acquiesce. the delegation would respectfully call the attention of your honourable body to their memorial and protest, with the accompanying documents, submitted to the Senate of the United States, on the subject of the alleged treaty, which are herewith transmitted. . . .

It is the expressed wish of the Government of the United States to remove the Cherokees to a place west of the Mississippi. That wish is said to be founded in humanity to the Indians. to make their situation more comfortable,

and to preserve them as a distinct people. Let facts show how this *benevolent* design has been prosecuted, and how faithfully to the spirit and letter has the promise of the President of the United States to the Cherokees been fulfilled—that *“those who remain may be assured of our patronage; our aid, and good neighbourhood.”* The delegation are not deceived by empty professions, and fear that race is to be destroyed by the mercenary policy of the present day, and their lands wrested from them by physical force; as proof, they will refer to the preamble of an act of the General Assembly of Georgia, in reference to the Cherokees, passed the 2d of December, 1835, where it is said, *“from a knowledge of the Indian character, and from the present feelings of these Indians, it is confidently believed, that the right of occupancy of the lands in their possession should be withdrawn, that it would be a strong inducement to them to treat with the General Government, and consent to a removal to the west; and whereas, the present Legislature openly avow that their primary object in the measures intended to be pursued, are founded on real humanity to these Indians, and with a view, in a distant region, to perpetuate them with their old identity of character, under the paternal care of the Government of the United States; at the same time frankly disavowing any selfish or sinister motives towards them in their present legislation.”* This is the profession. Let us turn to the practice of *humanity*, to the Cherokees, by the State of Georgia. In violation of the treaties between the United States and the Cherokee nation, that State passed a law requiring all white men, residing in that part of the Cherokee country, in her limits, to take an oath of allegiance to the State of Georgia. For a violation of this law, some of the ministers of Christ, missionaries among the Cherokees, were tried, convicted, and sentenced to hard labor in the penitentiary. Their case may be seen by reference to the records of the Supreme court of the United States.

Valuable gold mines were discovered upon the Cherokee lands, within the chartered limits of Georgia, and the Cherokees commenced working them, and the Legislature of that State interfered by passing an act, making it penal for an Indian to dig for gold within Georgia, no doubt *“frankly disavowing any selfish or sinister motives towards them.”* Under this law many Cherokees were arrested, tried, imprisoned, and otherwise abused. Some were even shot in attempting to avoid an arrest; yet the Cherokee people used no violence, but humbly petitioned the Government of the United States for a fulfilment of treaty engagements, to protect them, which was not done, and the answer given that the United States could not interfere. Georgia discovered she was not to be obstructed in carrying out her measures, *“founded on real humanity to these Indians,”* she passed an act directing the Indian country to be surveyed into districts. This excited some alarm,

◆ CHAPTER 7

Land, Growth,
and Justice: The
Removal of the
Cherokees

but the Cherokees were quieted with the assurance it would do no harm to survey the country. Another act was shortly after passed, to lay off the country into lots. As yet there was no authority to take possession, but it was not long before a law was made, authorizing a lottery for the lands laid off into lots. In this act the Indians were secured in possession of all the lots touched by their improvements, and the balance of the country allowed to be occupied by white men. This was a direct violation of the 5th article of the treaty of the 27th of February, 1819. The Cherokees made no resistance, still petitioned the United States for protection, and received the same answer that the President could not interpose. After the country was parcelled out by lottery, a horde of speculators made their appearance, and purchased of the "fortunate drawers," lots touched by Indian improvements, at reduced prices, declaring it was uncertain when the Cherokees would surrender their rights, and that the lots were encumbered by their claims. The consequence of this speculation was that, at the next session of the Legislature, an act was passed limiting the Indian right of occupancy to the lot upon which he resided. . . .

[The memorial gives several examples of Cherokees who were cheated out of their lands or who lost them to white speculators or squatters.]

The delegation must repeat, the instrument entered into at New Echota, purporting to be a treaty, is deceptive to the world, and a fraud upon the Cherokee people. If a doubt exist as to the truth of their statement, a committee of investigation can learn the facts, and it may also learn that if the Cherokees are removed under that instrument, it will be by force.



Questions to Consider

One of the most important decisions a historian must make is *how to collect and arrange* the evidence. In this chapter, the evidence is bountiful both for whites and for Cherokees. The *arrangement* of the evidence, however, presents considerable problems. For significant reasons, we have decided to divide the 19 pieces of evidence into two parts: one part comprised the nine

pieces of evidence from whites and the other comprising the ten pieces of Cherokee evidence.

Why did we do this? To begin with, we wanted students to learn about and understand the arguments, debates, and alternatives that took place *among* whites, and then, understand the same conflicts that emerged *among* the Cherokees. Neither whites nor

Cherokees were united in their opinions regarding the future of the Native Americans.

Remember that your task in this chapter is a dual one. First, you must analyze the nine sources by whites (including pertinent legislation in sources 1 and 8) concerning how to deal with Native Americans east of the Mississippi River, noting the strengths and weaknesses of each position. Having done that, then you must repeat the process for the ten sources by Cherokees³⁴ on the best course for the Cherokee nation to pursue. As you read and make lists of first, the white and then the Cherokee sources, determine what both whites and Cherokees saw as their alternatives. The white and Cherokee sources clearly demonstrate that neither whites nor Cherokees were in agreement as to the Cherokees' future. Indeed, both demonstrated serious internal divisions. Make a chart as you go along, to clarify the positions of all the sources.

Beginning with the white sources, it would be extremely helpful to take President Jackson's message out of chronological order and closely examine it first. This is because Jackson's message to Congress contained the four principal reasons why pro-removal whites believed that Cherokees could not remain east of the Mississippi River. What were those points? Jackson strongly maintained that any such emigration "should be voluntary," but, in his view, what would be the fate of the Cherokees if they refused to move? Why couldn't the President of the United States sim-

ply intervene to help the Cherokees remain where they were?

Having examined the President's message, you now can analyze the other white sources. What is the importance of Section IV of the 1790 Intercourse Act (Source 1)? What is the significance of that law?

In Source 2, Thomas Jefferson has generally been viewed as a friend of Native Americans. His 1803 letter to Indian agent Benjamin Hawkins, however, may shed new light on that image. Read this letter with extreme care. Could he be viewed as an ally or opponent of Jackson (Jefferson died four years after Jackson's message)?

Sources 4, 5, 6, and 7 all are written or delivered by opponents of Cherokee removal. What points did they make to counter Jackson's arguments? Source 8 was the Removal Act that was much-debated in 1829 and 1830. Are there problems or flaws in this Legislation? What was the *significance* of the close vote?

Finally, Georgia Governor Wilson Lumpkin offered Georgia's justification for the state's behavior regarding Cherokees' remaining or leaving. How does his thinking compare with that of President Jackson's?³⁵

Now complete your chart. What was the nature of the removal issue among whites? What were the strengths and

34. On authorship of source 15, see footnote number 27.

35. Lumpkin's opinion of Native Americans coincided with Jackson's. In his Fifth Annual Message to Congress (1833), the President stated that the Cherokees "have neither the intelligence, the industry, the moral habits, nor the desire of improvement . . . in their condition." James D. Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents* (New York: Bureau of National Literature, 1897), vol. 3, p. 1252.

◆ CHAPTER 7

Land, Growth,
and Justice: The
Removal of the
Cherokees

weaknesses of the arguments on all sides?

Now repeat the process for the ten Cherokee sources (Sources 10 through 19). They reveal deep divisions over how—or whether—to oppose their removal. What were the arguments in the Cherokees' letter to President Washington (Source 10)? What were the similar arguments in Source 11?

John Ridge appears twice in the evidence, once in 1826 (Source 12) and the other in 1835 (Source 18). What was the major difference in Ridge's position in the two sources? What was his major point in Source 12? How would that relate to his opinion in 1826 regarding removal in Source 18?

Elias Boudinot (Source 13) was the editor of the *Cherokee Phoenix* who argued in 1828 that "our people cannot exist amidst a white population." But he feared that a mass migration would destroy the Cherokee, and, therefore, should be opposed.

It is not clear that Speckled Snake (Source 14) actually was a Cherokee (sometimes he was identified as a Creek). But his forceful reply to Jackson's message rang through the Indian nations. What did he urge? What was his reasoning? How did he oppose Jackson?

According to the Cherokee leaders' address in 1830 (Source 15), why were

some Cherokees abandoning lands in Georgia and moving west? In their opinion, who were the real "intruders" in Georgia? How would you describe their appeal?

As you can see by comparing Sources 13 and 16, editor and Cherokee leader Elias Boudinot had changed his mind dramatically. What influences did the re-election of President Jackson, the Supreme Court's decision in *Worcester v. Georgia* and Jackson's reaction have on Boudinot's thinking? How did he support voluntary removal? Why did he claim that most of his fellow Cherokees still opposed relocation? How did Cherokee leader John Ross (Source 17) attempt to counter Boudinot's arguments? What was Cherokee leader John Ridge's opinion? How did he differ from Boudinot and Ross?

Source 19 was called by Cherokee opponents of removal as their "last appeal." How did their arguments counter those of Jackson and Lumpkin?

Now that you have examined both the white and Cherokee sources, meld them together chronologically to see how the two groups interacted with one another. How did some members of one group successfully change the positions of members of the other group? What were the principal arguments offered by each side?

◆ Epilogue

The war between the older immigrants and the new arrivals to Indian territory went on for seven years, until peace

between the two factions of Cherokees finally was made in 1846. During that period, some Cherokees reversed their

trek and returned to North Carolina. When the Civil War broke out in 1861, factionalism once again emerged, with some Cherokees supporting the Confederacy and others backing the Union. Fighting between these factions (a "mini-Civil War") claimed the lives of as much as 25 percent of the Cherokee population.

In 1868, Congress recognized the obvious fact that the Cherokees who remained in the East had become a distinct group, named the Eastern Band of the Cherokees (as opposed to the migrating group, which was called the Cherokee Nation).³⁶ In 1875, the federal government began to acquire land in North Carolina for a reservation, named the Qualla Boundary, which ultimately contained around 56,000 acres. In 1889, the Eastern Band received a charter from North Carolina granting the Cherokees what amounted to home rule in the Qualla Boundary. Then the federal government began an intensive program to "civilize" the Eastern Cherokees, an effort that was ultimately unsuccessful. Cherokees clung stubbornly to their own language and traditions, and by 1900, less than one-fourth of the population could speak English—approximately half of them young people in white-administered boarding schools. Because they consistently voted Republican, after 1900 the Democratic majority in North Carolina disfranchised both the African

Americans and the Cherokees by passing a law requiring literacy tests prior to voting.

Meanwhile the Cherokee Nation (in the West) was experiencing its own difficulties. In spite of the fact that the 1830 Indian Removal Act guaranteed that Native Americans would always hold the land onto which they were placed, land grants to railroad companies and a territorial land rush stripped a good deal of land away from the Cherokees. In 1891, the Cherokee Nation owned 19.5 million acres. By 1971, it owned but 146,498.

In North Carolina, the creation of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in 1934 offered the Eastern Band a way out of its economic quagmire. In November 1934, the council appropriated \$50,000 for tourist facilities, and in 1937, the first Cherokee-owned motel (Newfound Lodge) was opened for business. In 1939, an estimated 169,000 people visited the national park and purchased around \$30,000 worth of Cherokee crafts.

The development of tourism undoubtedly helped alleviate a severe economic crisis for the Eastern Band. In 1932, at the low point of the Great Depression, it was estimated that 200 of the 496 Cherokee families in North Carolina needed public assistance. The New Deal did provide some jobs, through the Indian Emergency Conservation Work Program, a separate version of the Civilian Conservation Corps. But tourism also presented the Eastern Band with the problem of whether Cherokees could retain their cultural identity while at the same time catering to the desires of visitors

36. Technically there is a third group of Cherokees, the United Keetoowah Band, composed mostly of "full-blooded" Old Settlers who were strictly traditionalists. They were recognized as a separate group by the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of 1936 and by an Act of Congress in 1950.

◆ CHAPTER 7

Land, Growth,
and Justice: The
Removal of the
Cherokees

with money.³⁷ In the 1990s, the Eastern Band turned to casino gambling to increase their revenues, although income from tourism and gambling is not evenly dispersed and many Cherokees still live extremely modestly.

By then, of course, the principal voices on both sides of the issue had long been stilled. In 1837 (one year before the beginning of the Trail of Tears), Andrew Jackson left the presidency to his hand-picked successor, Martin Van Buren, and retired to his plantation, the Hermitage, near Nashville, Tennessee. He died in 1845, still convinced that his advocacy of Cherokee removal was the most humane alternative for the Native Americans themselves.

For his part, before his death in 1826, Thomas Jefferson had abandoned his dream that whites and Native Americans could live side by side

and ultimately become one people. Frustrated over what he considered the slow progress Native Americans were making in adopting "civilization," the principal author of the Declaration of Independence came to believe that removal was, in his words, the "moral" alternative. Some recent historians, however, are convinced that Jefferson always thought that voluntary removal was best for both races.³⁸

The removal of most of the Cherokees in 1838–1839 (and in a second forced migration in 1841 to 1844) is an important, if tragic, chapter in the history of the United States that is important to know. It is also helpful to understand that there were many voices on both sides of the removal issue, thus making the subject of Cherokee removal not only a tragic one but an exceedingly complex one as well.

37. Because tourists expected to see Native Americans with ornate feathered headdresses (typical of Plains Indians but never worn by Cherokees), Cherokees accommodately wore them.

38. Bernard W. Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1973); Anthony F.C. Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1999), esp. pp. 225, 338.