

#327

THE REMOVAL OF THE
CHEROKEE NATION

Manifest Destiny or National Dishonor?

PROBLEMS IN AMERICAN
CIVILIZATION

EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY
Louis Filler and Allen Guttman

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

17(62)
Problems (61)
Filler

CONTENTS

1	ULRICH BONNELL PHILLIPS <i>The Expulsion of the Cherokees</i>	1
2	ANDREW JACKSON <i>Condition and Ulterior Destiny of the Indian Tribes (December 8, 1829)</i>	14
3	<i>Land Policies and the Georgia Law of December 19, 1829</i>	18
4	SENATOR THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN <i>Speech Before the Senate (April 9, 1830)</i>	22
5	WILSON LUMPKIN <i>Speech Before Congress (May 17, 1830)</i>	31
6	DAVID CROCKETT <i>From Speech Before Congress (May 19, 1830)</i>	39
7	<i>Memorial of the Cherokee Nation (July 17, 1830)</i>	42
8	ANDREW JACKSON <i>Indian Removal and the General Good</i>	49
9	<i>Resolution and Statements of the Missionaries</i>	53
10	JOHN MARSHALL <i>The Cherokee Nation vs. The State of Georgia</i>	61
11	SMITH THOMPSON <i>The Cherokee Nation vs. The State of Georgia: Dissenting Opinion</i>	66
12	JOHN MARSHALL <i>Worcester vs. The State of Georgia</i>	69
13	GEORGE M. TROUP <i>The Sovereignty of the States</i>	79
14	WILSON LUMPKIN <i>Message to Georgia Legislature</i>	80
15	FRANCES M. TROLLOPE <i>The Tyrannical Arm of Brutal Power</i>	83
16	ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE <i>Present and Future Condition of the Indians</i>	85

INTRODUCTION

ON February 21, 1828, Elias Boudinot, a full-blooded Indian educated by Christian missionaries, published the first issue of *The Cherokee Phoenix*, a newspaper addressed to the Cherokee Nation. This first issue carried, in English and in the Cherokee alphabet invented by the celebrated Sequoyah, the text of a constitution adopted in July of the previous year. It seemed to the Rev. Samuel A. Worcester, the missionary who had suggested to Boudinot the name of the newspaper, that *The Cherokee Phoenix* was a symbol of the progress of the tribe. Under the protection of the United States, the Cherokees had adopted republican institutions and an agrarian way of life. Many of the Cherokees had been converted to Christianity. But most of the lands remaining to the Cherokee Nation lay within the boundaries of the State of Georgia, and the State of Georgia was determined to exercise its sovereignty. By January of 1832, Samuel Worcester was known to the world as one of the principals in *Worcester vs. The State of Georgia*, the Supreme Court case in which John Marshall attempted, unsuccessfully, to prevent the State from extending its laws throughout the Cherokee territory. During the fall and winter of 1838, the Cherokee Nation was gathered, under the guns of General Winfield Scott, and marched westward along paths that were to be known as "The Trail of Tears." The following years Elias Boudinot, who had counseled reluctant com-

pliance with Georgia's demands, was assassinated by his own embittered people.

The clash between the Cherokee Nation and the State of Georgia was one which dramatized the problems inherent in the relations between Indian and white man. The conflict was, in addition, one which led quickly to a complex struggle between the State of Georgia and a Federal Government that was itself rent by divisions and disagreements. The questions raised by the conflict were perplexing ones. Could the Georgians, equalitarian and individualistic as they were, disregard the Supreme Court's interpretation of laws and treaties and still be considered "democratic"? Could Andrew Jackson, who refused to enforce Marshall's decision, lead the people in pursuit of their "Manifest Destiny" without sacrificing the very ideals which justified aggressive expansionism? On the other hand, could anyone expect the state of Georgia to tolerate an autonomous nation within her borders? Were the Cherokees, themselves the owners of Negro slaves, worth defending at the risk of a civil war? Finally, could Indians and white people ever, to use a term popular today, coexist?

John Marshall realized the gravity of these problems: "The legislative power of a state, the controlling power of the Constitution and laws of the United States, the rights, if they have any, the political existence of a once numerous and powerful people, the personal liberty of a citizen, are all involved in the

COPYRIGHT © 1962 BY D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

No part of the material covered by this copyright may be reproduced in any form without written permission of the publisher.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PRINTED JANUARY 1967

subject now to be considered." Before attempting to decide *Worcester vs. The State of Georgia*, Marshall reviewed the events which had led to the case before him. This is, roughly, the method adopted in this collection of documents. Except for Ulrich Bonnell Phillips' "Expulsion of the Cherokees," which provides a concise historical framework, the readings are grouped so that the conflict develops chronologically along the lines drawn in the 1820's and 1830's by the participants in the conflict.

Taking office in 1829, Andrew Jackson, himself a symbol of the American frontier and its new political importance, changed the emphases of the Indian policies of John Quincy Adams, his predecessor in office. Jackson's first Annual Message, from which "The Condition and Ulterior Destiny of the Indians" is taken, marked a new era. That Georgia realized this is clear from the next selection, the Georgia Law of December 19, 1829. Meanwhile, Wilson Lumpkin, Georgia's representative on the House of Representatives' Committee on Indian Affairs, went to work on legislation authorizing further Indian removal. The bill reported to the House (February 24, 1830) touched off an acrimonious debate in both houses of Congress. Senator Theodore Frelinghuysen—like Adams, of an old American family—made the most noted speech against removal, but Edward Everett and other New Englanders joined him in opposing Lumpkin's bill. In the House, Lumpkin himself pled Georgia's case. Born in Virginia, reared on the Georgia frontier, leader of the small-farmer or "Clarke" faction in state politics, Lumpkin seems to provide clear evidence respecting the attitudes toward Indians of some frontiersmen. The following selection, however, is from a speech by the man who

has rivaled Dan'l Boone for the title of American Frontiersman—the Honorable David Crockett of Tennessee. No one in America was further removed in character and in habits from the Everetts and Adamses and Frelinghuysens, and Crockett's remarks add a certain complexity to an already complex situation. Lumpkin's bill passed.

The Cherokee Indians speak for themselves; their "Memorial" to Congress indicates that they were well able to do so. In their appeals, they were supported by a number of missionaries, some of whom had spent a decade or more among the tribe. Through these missionaries and through *The Cherokee Phoenix*, the Indians were able to reach a wide audience.

The appeals of the Cherokees and of the missionaries were in vain. Jackson's second Annual Message was less conciliatory than his first had been. The Indians turned to the courts. John Marshall's decision in *The Cherokee Nation vs. Georgia* is printed as the next selection. The decision was a disappointment to the Indians, but it did not indicate that Marshall's Court approved of all that the Georgians had done, nor, as Justice Thompson's dissenting opinion makes clear, did all of "Marshall's" Court agree with the Chief Justice in his decision. The State of Georgia pressed forward its claims and demanded that all whites residing in Indian territory be licensed by the State. The Rev. Samuel Worcester, who had signed the "Memorial" and established himself as a leader of the missionaries, refused to secure such a license. He was arrested and, eventually, found guilty by Georgia courts. At this point, Marshall interposed and overruled the Georgia law and declared it void. Andrew Jackson is reported to have said,

"John Marshall has made his decision; now let him enforce it." Jackson's behavior attests to the symbolic if not to the actual truth of the anecdote. Ex-Governor George M. Troup, then serving as United States Senator, defied the Court in an open letter to the people of Georgia; the letter is printed after Marshall's decision in the Worcester case. Troup's stand was strongly seconded by Wilson Lumpkin, then governor of Georgia, in his message to the Georgia legislature. The State was triumphant. The Treaty of New Echota (1835) was imposed upon the Cherokees with the reluctant assent of a minority of the tribe. In 1838, the Indians were removed by General Winfield Scott.

The next selection is from a sharp-tongued foreign observer, Mrs. Frances M. Trollope. Her comments are representative of the general European response to American policy. Alexis de Tocqueville, the author of one of the most perceptive books ever written about the United States, delved beneath the immediate details and uncovered some of the implications which lay at the heart of the matter. His comments, taken from the last chapter of *Democracy in America*, follow Mrs. Trollope's.

Americans were not silent. Ralph Waldo Emerson, one of the most unpolitical of our philosophers, was moved, in 1838, to write an "Open Letter" to President Martin Van Buren. In 1881, Helen Hunt Jackson, formerly of Massachusetts, protested our state and federal Indian policies in *A Century of Dishonor*, the classic indictment. Such appeals were in vain. Americans pursued their "Manifest Destiny," and the Indian tribes were forced either to give up their lands by treaty or to lose them after armed resistance led to military defeat.

The last two selections are from twen-

tieth-century historians. Frederick Jackson Turner's defense of Andrew Jackson is a reluctant one based on Turner's own belief in frontier democracy. E. Merton Coulter's defense is a more belligerent justification of Georgia's pursuit of her destiny.

Although this selection of readings ends with the statements of those who remain in possession of the field, the controversy over the "Indian Question" continues. The removal policy was, eventually, abandoned. The reservation policy, in its turn, was combined with a policy of assimilation. Should it succeed, the Indian will have ceased to be a problem.

Nevertheless, historians continue to dispute the relative merits of Cherokees and Georgians, and Edmund Wilson's recent *Apologies to the Iroquois* reminds us that some white people still feel a guilt or a doubt which practical arguments seem not to lessen. Was injustice done to the Cherokees? On what grounds can the decisions made by Chief Justice Marshall or by President Jackson or by Governor Lumpkin be justified? Moreover, the State of Georgia still differs with the Supreme Court over difficulties caused by ethnic difference and minority status, and warfare in Asia and Africa reminds us of the heritage of European imperialism. To what degree does a study of Indian removal aid us in resolving the problems of segregation in the South (and in the North)? What obligations have nations today toward aboriginal populations in colonial or semicolonial areas? Have we, the democratic societies of the "Atlantic Community," made adequate progress in our treatment of racial and other minority groups, or must these groups turn elsewhere for an answer to their appeals and resolutions and memorials?

MEMORIAL OF THE CHEROKEE NATION (JULY 17, 1830)

Appeals such as Representative Crockett's were in vain. On the 26th of May, 1830, Lumpkin's bill passed the House by a vote of 102 to 97. The Senate concurred with the House's amendments, and the bill was signed into law on the 28th of May. The enactment did not revoke the treaties then in force between the United States and the Cherokee nation, and the Cherokees appealed to the American people and urged them not to break the treaties. "We wish," wrote the assembled leaders of the nation, "to remain on the land of our fathers."

SOME months ago a delegation was appointed by the constituted authorities of the Cherokee nation to repair to the city of Washington, and in behalf of this nation, to lay before the government of the United States such representations as should seem most likely to secure to us, as a people, that protection, aid, and good neighborhood, which had been so often promised to us, and of which we stand in great need. Soon after their arrival in the city they presented to congress a petition from our national council, asking for the interposition of that body in our behalf, especially with reference to the laws of Georgia; which were suspended in a most terrifying manner over a large part of our population, and protesting in the most decided terms against the operation of these laws. In the course of the winter they presented petitions to congress, signed by more than four thousand of our citizens, including probably more than nineteen-twentieths, and for aught

we can tell, ninety-nine hundredths, of the adult males of the nation. . . , pleading with the assembled representatives of the American people, that the solemn engagements between their fathers and our fathers may be preserved, as they have been till recently, in full force and continued operation; asking, in a word, for protection against threatened usurpation and for a faithful execution for a guaranty which is perfectly plain in its meaning, has been repeatedly and rigidly endorsed in our favour, and has received the sanction of the government of the United States for nearly forty years.

More than a year ago we were officially given to understand by the secretary of war, that the president could not protect us against the laws of Georgia. This information was entirely unexpected; as it went upon the principle, that treaties made between the United States and the Cherokee nation have no power to withstand the legisla-

tion of separate states; and of course, that they have no efficacy whatever, but leave our people to the mercy of the neighboring whites, whose supposed interests would be promoted by our expulsion, or extermination. It would be impossible to describe the sorrow, which affected our minds on learning that the chief magistrate of the United States had come to this conclusion, that all his illustrious predecessors had held intercourse with us on principles which could not be sustained; that they had made promises of vital importance to us, which could not be fulfilled—promises made hundreds of times in almost every conceivable manner,—often in the form of solemn treaties, sometimes in letters written by the chief magistrate with his own hand, very often in letters written by the secretary of war under his direction, sometimes orally by the president and the secretary to our chiefs, and frequently and always, both orally and in writing by the agent of the United States residing among us, whose most important business it was, to see the guaranty of the United States faithfully executed.

Soon after the war of the revolution, as we have learned from our fathers, the Cherokees looked upon the promises of the whites with great distrust and suspicion; but the frank and magnanimous conduct of General Washington did much to allay these feelings. The perseverance of successive presidents, and especially of Mr. Jefferson, in the same course of policy, and in the constant assurance that our country should remain inviolate, except so far as we voluntarily ceded it, nearly banished anxiety in regard to encroachments from the whites. To this result the aid which we received from the United States in the attempts of our people to become civilized, and the kind efforts of benevo-

lent societies, have greatly contributed. Of late years, however, much solicitude was occasioned among our people by the claims of Georgia. This solicitude arose from the apprehension, that by extreme importunity, threats, and other undue influence, a treaty would be made, which should cede the territory, and thus compel the inhabitants to remove. But it never occurred to us for a moment, that without any new treaty, without any assent of our rulers and people, without even a pretended compact, and against our vehement and unanimous protestations, we should be delivered over to the discretion of those, who had declared by a legislative act, that they wanted the Cherokee lands and would have them.

Finding that relief could not be obtained from the chief magistrate, and not doubting that our claim to protection was just, we made our application to congress. During four long months our delegation waited, at the doors of the national legislature of the United States, and the people at home, in the most painful suspense, to learn in what manner our application would be answered; and, now that congress has adjourned, on the very day before the date fixed by Georgia for the extension of her oppressive laws over the greater part of our country, the distressing intelligence has been received that we have received no answer at all; and no department of the government has assured us, that we are to receive the desired protection. But just at the close of the session, an act was passed, by which an half a million of dollars was appropriated towards effecting a removal of Indians; and we have great reason to fear that the influence of this act will be brought to bear most injuriously upon us. The passage of this act was certainly understood by the representatives of Georgia as aban-

doing us to the oppressive and cruel measures of the state, and as sanctioning the opinion that treaties with Indians do not restrain state legislation. We are informed by those, who are competent to judge, that the recent act does not admit of such construction; but that the passage of it, under the actual circumstances of the controversy, will be considered as sanctioning the pretensions of Georgia, there is too much reason to fear.

Thus have we realized, with heavy hearts, that our supplication has not been heard; that the protection heretofore experienced is now to be withheld; that the guaranty, in consequence of which our fathers laid aside their arms and ceded the best portions of their country, means nothing; and that we must either emigrate to an unknown region and leave the pleasant land to which we have the strongest attachment, or submit to the legislation of a state, which has already made our people outlaws, and enacted that any Cherokee, who shall endeavor to prevent the selling of his country, shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary of Georgia not less than four years. To our countrymen this has been melancholy intelligence, and with the most bitter disappointment has it been received.

But in the midst of our sorrows, we do not forget our obligations to our friends and benefactors. It was with sensations of inexpressible joy that we have learned that the voice of thousands, in many parts of the United States, has been raised in our behalf, and numerous memorials offered in our favor, in both houses of congress. To those numerous friends, who have thus sympathized with us in our low estate, we tender our grateful acknowledgements. In pleading our cause, they have pleaded the cause of the poor and defenceless throughout

the world. Our special thanks are due, however, to those honorable men, who so ably and eloquently asserted our rights, in both branches of the national legislature. Their efforts will be appreciated wherever the merits of this question shall be known; and we cannot but think, that they have secured for themselves a permanent reputation among the disinterested advocates of humanity, equal rights, justice, and good faith. We even cherish the hope, that these efforts, seconded and followed by others of a similar character, will yet be available, so far as to mitigate our sufferings, if not to effect our entire deliverance.

Before we close this address, permit us to state what we conceive to be our relations with the United States. After the peace of 1783, the Cherokees were an independent people; absolutely so, as much as any people on earth. They had been allies to Great Britain, and as a faithful ally took a part in the colonial war on her side. They had placed themselves under her protection, and had they, without cause, declared hostility against their protector, and had the colonies been subdued, what might not have been their fate? But her power on this continent was broken. She acknowledged the independence of the United States, and made peace. The Cherokees therefore stood alone; and, in these circumstances, continued the war. They were then under no obligations to the United States any more than to Great Britain, France or Spain. The United States never subjugated the Cherokees; on the contrary, our fathers remained in possession of their country, and with arms in their hands.

The people of the United States sought a peace; and, in 1785, the treaty of Hopewell was formed, by which the Cherokees came under the protection of

the United States, and submitted to such limitations of sovereignty as are mentioned in that instrument. None of these limitations, however, affected, in the slightest degree, their rights of self-government and inviolate territory. The citizens of the United States had no right of passage through the Cherokee country till the year 1791, and then only in one direction, and by an express treaty stipulation. When the federal constitution was adopted, the treaty of Hopewell was confirmed, with all other treaties, as the supreme law of the land. In 1791, the treaty of Holston was made, by which the sovereignty of the Cherokees was qualified as follows: The Cherokees acknowledged themselves to be under the protection of the United States, and of no other sovereign.—They engaged that they would not hold any treaty with a foreign power, with any separate state of the union, or with individuals. They agreed that the United States should have the exclusive right of regulating their trade; that the citizens of the United States should have a right of way in one direction through the Cherokee country; and that if an Indian should do injury to a citizen of the United States he should be delivered up to be tried and punished. A cession of lands was also made to the United States. On the other hand, the United States paid a sum of money; offered protection; engaged to punish citizens of the United States who should do any injury to the Cherokees; abandoned white settlers on Cherokee lands to the discretion of the Cherokees; stipulated that white men should not hunt on these lands, nor even enter the country without a passport; and gave a solemn guaranty of all Cherokee lands not ceded. This treaty is the basis of all subsequent compacts; and in none of

them are the relations of the parties at all changed.

The Cherokees have always fulfilled their engagements. They have never reclaimed those portions of sovereignty which they surrendered by the treaties of Hopewell and Holston. These portions were surrendered for the purpose of obtaining the guaranty which was recommended to them as the great equivalent. Had they refused to comply with their engagements, there is no doubt the United States would have enforced a compliance. Is the duty of fulfilling engagements on the other side less binding than it would be, if the Cherokees had the power of enforcing their just claims?

The people of the United States will have the fairness to reflect, that all the treaties between them and the Cherokees were made, at the solicitation, and for the benefit, of the whites; that valuable considerations were given for every stipulation, on the part of the United States; that it is impossible to reinstate the parties in their former situation, that there are now hundreds of thousands of citizens of the United States residing upon lands ceded by the Cherokees in these very treaties; and that our people have trusted their country to the guaranty of the United States. If this guaranty fails them, in what can they trust, and where can they look for protection?

We are aware, that some persons suppose it will be for our advantage to remove beyond the Mississippi. We think otherwise. Our people universally think otherwise. Thinking that it would be fatal to their interests, they have almost to a man sent their memorial to congress, deprecating the necessity of a removal. This question was distinctly before their minds when they signed their memorial. Not an adult person can be found, who

has not an opinion on the subject, and if the people were to understand distinctly, that they could be protected against the laws of the neighboring states, there is probably not an adult person in the nation, who would think it best to remove; though possibly a few might emigrate individually. There are doubtless 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 remain 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.

But if we are compelled to leave our country, we see nothing but ruin before

us. The country west of the Arkansas territory is unknown to us. From what we can learn of it, we have no prepossessions in its favor. All the inviting parts of it, as we believe, are preoccupied by various Indian nations, to which it has been assigned. They would regard us as intruders, and look upon us with an evil eye. The far greater part of that region is, beyond all controversy, badly supplied with wood and water; and no Indian tribe can live as agriculturists without these articles. All our neighbors, in case of our removal, though crowded into our near vicinity, would speak a language totally different from ours, and practice different customs. The original possessors of that region are now wandering savages lurking for prey in the neighborhood. They have always been at war, and would be easily tempted to turn their arms against peaceful emigrants. Were the country to which we are urged much better than it is represented to be, and were it free from the objections which we have made to it, still it is not the land of our birth, nor of our affections. It contains neither the scenes of our childhood, nor the graves of our fathers.

The removal of families to a new country, even under the most favorable auspices, and when the spirits are sustained by pleasing visions of the future, is attended with much depression of mind and sinking of heart. This is the case, when the removal is a matter of decided preference, and when the persons concerned are in early youth or vigorous manhood. Judge, then, what must be the circumstances of a removal, when a whole community, embracing persons of all classes and every description, from the infant to the man of extreme old age, the sick, the blind, the lame, the improvident, the reckless, the desperate,

as well as the prudent, the considerate, the industrious, are compelled to remove by odious and intolerable vexations and persecutions, brought upon them in the forms of law, when all will agree only in this, that they have been cruelly robbed of their country, in violation of the most solemn compacts, which it is possible for communities to form with each other; and that, if they should make themselves comfortable in their new residence, they have nothing to expect hereafter but to be the victims of a future legalized robbery!

Such we deem, and are absolutely certain, will be the feelings of the whole Cherokee people, if they are forcibly compelled, by the laws of Georgia, to remove; and with these feelings, how is it possible that we should pursue our present course of improvement, or avoid sinking into utter despondency? We have been called a poor, ignorant, and degraded people. We certainly are not rich; nor have we ever boasted of our knowledge, or our moral or intellectual elevation. But there is not a man within our limits so ignorant as not to know that he has a right to live on the land of his fathers, in the possession of his immemorial privileges, and that this right has been acknowledged and guaranteed by the United States; nor is there a man so degraded as not to feel a keen sense of injury, on being deprived of this right and driven into exile.

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 to the philanthropist the voice of our multiplied sorrows and fiery trials will not appear as an idle tale. In our own land, on our own soil, and in our own 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.

We intreat those to whom the foregoing paragraphs are addressed, to remember the great law of love. "Do to others as ye would that others should do to you"—Let them remember that of

all nations on the earth, they are under the greatest obligation to obey this law. We pray them to remember that, for the sake of principle, their forefathers were compelled to leave, therefore driven from the old world, and that the winds of persecution wafted them over the great waters and landed them on the shores of the new world, when the Indian was the sole lord and proprietor of these extensive domains—Let them remember in what way they were received by the savage of America, when power was in his hand, and his ferocity could not be restrained by any human arm. We urge them to bear in mind, that those who would now ask of them a cup of cold water, and a spot of earth, a portion of their own patrimonial possessions, on which to live and die in peace, are the descendants of those, whose origin, as inhabitants of North America, history and tradition are alike insufficient to reveal. Let them bring to remembrance all these facts, and they cannot, and we are sure, they will not

THE REMOVAL OF THE CHEROKEE NATION

fail to remember, and sympathize with us in these our trials and sufferings.

LEWIS ROSS, pres't committee.

James Daniel,	George Sanders,
Jos. Vann,	Daniel Griffin, jun.
David Vann,	James Hamilton,
Edward Gunter,	Alex. McDaniel,
Richard Taylor,	Thos. Foreman,
John Baldrige,	John Timson.
Samuel Ward,	

W. S. Coodey, clerk.

GOING SNAKE, speaker of the council.

James Bigbey,	J. R. Daniel,
Deer-in-the-water,	Slim Fellow,
Charles Reese,	Situake,
Sleeping Rabbit,	De-gah-le-lu-ge,
Chu-nu-gee,	Robbin,
Bark,	Tah-lah-doo,
Laugh-at-mush,	Nah-hoo-lah,
Chuleowah,	White Path,
Turtle,	Ne-gah-we.
Walking Stick,	Dah-ye-ske.
Moses Parris,	

John Ridge, clerk of the council.
New Echota, C.N. July 17, 1830.

Andrew Jackson:

INDIAN REMOVAL AND THE GENERAL GOOD

The memorial of the Cherokee nation did not sway President Jackson from his course. Resolutely, more explicitly than a year before, he outlined his determination to see the Indian tribes removed to the West. If anything, Jackson's second Annual Message (December 6, 1830) was less conciliatory than his first.

IT gives me pleasure to announce to Congress that the benevolent policy of the Government, steadily pursued for nearly thirty years, in relation to the removal of the Indians beyond the white settlements is approaching . . . a happy consummation. Two important tribes, [the Choctaws and the Chickasaws], have accepted the provision made for their removal at the last session of Congress, and it believed that their example will induce the remaining tribes also to seek the same obvious advantages.

The consequences of a speedy removal will be important to the United States, to individual States, and to the Indians themselves. The pecuniary advantages which it promises to the Government are the least of its recommendations. It puts an end to all possible danger of collision between the authorities of the General and State Governments on account of the Indians. It will place a dense and civilized population in large tracts of country now occupied by a few savage

hunters. By opening the whole territory between Tennessee on the north and Louisiana on the south to the settlement of the whites it will incalculably strengthen the southwestern frontier and render the adjacent States strong enough to repel future invasions without remote aid. It will relieve the whole State of Mississippi and the western part of Alabama of Indian occupancy, and enable those States to advance rapidly in population, wealth, and power. It will separate the Indians from immediate contact with settlements of whites; free them from the power of the States; enable them to pursue happiness in their own way and under their own rude institutions; will retard the progress of decay, which is lessening their numbers, and perhaps cause them gradually, under the protection of the Government and through the influence of good counsels, to cast off their savage habits and become an interesting, civilized, and Christian community. These consequences,