

THE WHITEMAN'S SEMINOLE:

White Manhood, Indians and Slaves, and the Second Seminole War

by

FRANCIS E. MAHAN IV
B.A. Pennsylvania State University, 2005

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of History
in the College of Arts and Humanities
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2011

© 2011 Francis E. Mahan IV

ABSTRACT

This study demonstrates that both government officials' and the settlers' perceptions of the Seminoles and Black Seminoles in Florida were highly influenced by their paternalistic and Jeffersonian world views. These perceptions also informed their policies concerning the Seminoles and Black Seminoles. The study is separated into three sections. The first chapter covers the years of 1820-1823. This section argues that until 1823, most settlers and government officials viewed the Seminoles as noble savages that were dependent on the U.S. Furthermore, most of these individuals saw the Black Seminoles as being secure among the Seminole Indians and as no threat to white authority. The second chapter covers the years of 1823-1828 and demonstrates that during this time most settlers began to view Seminoles outside of the reservation as threats to the frontier in Florida. This reflected the Jeffersonian world view of the settlers. Government officials, on the contrary, continued to believe that the Seminole Indians were noble savages that were no threat to the frontier because of their paternal world view. Both groups by 1828 wanted the Seminoles and Black Seminoles separated. The final chapter covers the years of 1829-1836. It argues that by 1835 both settlers and government officials believed that the Seminoles and Black Seminoles were clear threats to the frontier because of the fear of a slave revolt and the beginning of Seminole resistance to removal. Most of the shifts in the perception of the Seminoles and Black Seminoles by government officials and the settlers were the result of their white gender and racial world views that then in turn affected their policies towards the Seminoles and Black Seminoles.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been completed if it were not for the help of several integral individuals. First, I would like to thank my thesis committee: Dr. Robert Cassanello, Dr. Connie Lester, and Dr. Ezekiel Walker for all their guidance, and encouragement though out the process of writing this study. Your advice and guidance truly made this study better. Also, I would like to thank David Dinocola for all of his help with travel plans, revisions, formatting, and for being a great friend. Last but not least, I would like to thank my wife Sara for her understanding and loving support throughout the entire process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: THE AFTERMATH OF THE FIRST SEMNOLE WAR 1820-1823.....	11
CHAPTER 2: CHANGING IMAGES 1823-1828	37
CHAPTER 3: SLAVERY AND REMOVAL 1829-1836.....	70
CONCLUSION.....	102
REFERENCES	107
Primary Sources	107
Secondary Sources	110

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this study is to track the white American male view of the Seminole Indians and Black Seminole from 1820 to 1836. This will demonstrate that American men viewed these groups through cultural lenses of race and gender. To date, most historians have not illustrated how American policy makers, soldiers, and settlers were highly influenced by their racial and gender world views, which caused them to treat the Seminoles, and Native Americans in general, like dependents, and justified American efforts to take their lands. Some ethnohistorians such as Theda Perdue and Claudio Saunt have asked these questions about the Cherokee and the Creeks, but few have questioned this in regards to the Seminoles.¹ These white American ideals of race and gender also influenced American Indian Removal policy. At key points throughout this study similarities in the treatment of the Seminoles and other Indian tribes in the South will be mentioned to show that this phenomenon was not restricted to the Seminole Indians in Florida. This study will begin by analyzing the historiography of the Second Seminole War to demonstrate how most historians of the conflict do not account for race and gender. Furthermore, this analysis of the historiography will demonstrate how ethnohistorians who engaged race or gender during the time of Indian removal did not point out how white American racial and gender ideals of the era influenced the beliefs and actions of American policy makers.

Historians of the Second Seminole War have not engaged the concepts of race and gender. The historiography of the war is dominated by two major works that were written in the 1960s: John K. Mahon's, *History of the Second Seminole War 1835-1842* and Kenneth Porter's,

¹Theda Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society 154-1866* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1979).; Claudio Saunt, *A New Order of Things: Property, Power, and Transformation of the Creek Indians, 1733-1816* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

“*Negroes and the Seminole War, 1835-1842.*” Mahon wrote the standard military history of the war; while Porter emphasized the roles of Blacks during the Second Seminole War.² However, it is important to note these historians only engaged race in a limited way not understanding it as a constructed category because they were written before historians critically examined history through race and gender. Throughout the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and until today historians writing about the Second Seminole War have mostly added to the frameworks and narratives of the aforementioned works by Porter and Mahon. George Bunker, M. L. Brown, and James Denham do little more than Mahon.³ Furthermore, Daniel Littlefield, Alcione Amos, Thomas Senter, Kevin Mulroy, and Jeff Guinn add limited information to Porter’s findings concerning the roles of Blacks during the Second Seminole War.⁴ Also in 2009, Kevin Kokomoor challenged the idea that the Black Seminoles should be viewed as having “maroon identities, cultural autonomy, and an African tradition.”⁵ Overall, he turned the entire discourse on the Black Seminoles on its head by arguing that the Africans among the Seminoles should be viewed as the Black Seminoles not maroons because they were a product of Seminole culture.⁶ Regardless, the historiography has

²John K. Mahon, *History of the Second Seminole War 1835-1842*, Revised Edition (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1967); Kenneth Wiggins Porter, “*Negroes and the Seminole War, 1835-1842,*” *The Journal of Southern History* 30, no. 4 (Nov., 1964): 449-450.

³George E. Buker, *Swamp Sailors in the Second Seminole War* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1997), 6.; Brown, M.L. “Notes on U. S. Arsenals, Depots, and Martial Firearms of the Second Seminole War” *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 61 no.4 (April, 1983): 450.; Denham, James M. ““Some Prefer the Seminoles’: Violence and Disorder Among Soldiers and Settlers in the Second Seminole War, 1835-1842,” *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 70 no.1 (July, 1991): 48.

⁴Daniel F. Littlefield, Jr., *Africans and Seminoles From Removal To Emancipation*. (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1977); Kevin Mulroy, *Freedom on the Border: The Seminoles Maroons in Florida, The Indian Territory, Coahuila, and Texas* (Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 1993), 33.; Kenneth W. Porter. *The Black Seminoles: History of a Freedom-Seeking People. Revised and Edited by Alcione M. Amos and Thomas P. Senter*. (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1996).; Jeff Guinn. *Our Land Before We Die: The Proud Story of the Seminole Negro*. (New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam, 2002).

⁵Kevin Kokomoor, “A Re-assessment of Seminoles, Africans, and Slavery on the Florida Frontier,” *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 88, no. 2 (Fall, 2009), 211.

⁶*Ibid*, 234-236.

been dominated by a focus on American military history and the Black Seminoles. Most Second Seminole War historians have not interpreted the primary sources and integrated them in order to understand the Seminole Wars through the lens of race and gender.

The first historian to step away from Mahon's narrative was Patrick Riordan. In 1996, Riordan analyzed how Americans constructed a savage view of the Seminole Indians leading up to the Second Seminole War. He examined captivity narratives and analyzed how Americans used negative publicity of the Seminoles to justify taking their land and removing them.⁷

Riordan argued that "Seminole identity was constructed, in part, by the discourse of demonization that accompanied war and Manifest Destiny, Southern style."⁸ Riordan is that first historian to employ race while he addressed the Second Seminole War, however the element of gender was missed in his analysis.

Furthermore in 2009, Mikaela Adams added to Riordan's analysis by studying how Anglo-Americans viewed the Seminoles from 1865 to 1934. Her goal was to show how Anglo-Americans, "constructed an identity for these Natives (Florida Seminoles) in the Anglo-American imagination," and argued that "the imagined character of the Seminoles influenced American policy towards the Indians, ultimately helping to shape the future of the Florida Seminoles."⁹ Similar to Riordan, Adams engaged race, but she also engaged gender many places throughout her analysis.¹⁰ Overall, she highlighted that "in the years between the Civil War and the 1930s, the American public's perception of the Seminole Indians of Florida reflected their

⁷Patrick Riordan, "Seminole Genesis: Native Americans, African-Americans, and colonists on the southern frontier from prehistory through the colonial era" (Ph.D. diss., The Florida State University, 1996), 275.

⁸*Ibid*, 272-273.

⁹Mikaela M. Adams, "*Savage foes, Noble Warriors, and Frail Remnants: Florida Seminoles in the White Imagination, 1865-1934*," *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 87, no. 3 (Winter, 2009), 405.

¹⁰*Ibid*, 419.

own changing ideas about their dynamic society.”¹¹ Adams added gender to her analysis and demonstrates that race and gender did effect how Americans viewed and treated the Seminoles from 1865 to 1934. However, this type of analysis has not been completed for the Seminoles leading up to the Second Seminole War.

Intriguingly, ethnohistorians of the Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creeks, and Cherokee have written accounts that analyzed how white American ideals impacted the way that these Indians constructed their race and gender. The historians Richard White, James R. Atkinson, Theda Perdue, and Claudio Saunt all point out that the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee and Creeks were highly influenced by racial ideals of the U.S. Each of these historians demonstrated that subsets of these Indian Nations accepted white ideals and began farming and changed their culture in some manner. Eventually, each of these Indian Nations were divided concerning removal because a subset wanted to accept white ideals while another wanted to adhere to their traditions, thus rejecting white ideals. Ultimately, and regardless of the acceptance of white ideals or not, all of these Indian Nations were removed by the U.S. Specific to the Seminole Indians, Claudio Saunt engaged them and argued that they rejected white ideals, but he was only interested in the 18th century. Furthermore, Theda Purdue focused on the impact that American ideals had on the construction of race and gender among the Cherokee. However, she failed to note that as Americans were constructing the race and gender of the Cherokee they were also defining themselves.¹² Despite these historians depicting that Indian tribes were dealing with race and gender and that Americans were trying to get them to accept their ideals no one was interested in

¹¹*Ibid.*, 435.

¹²Richard White, *The Roots of Dependency Subsistence, Environment, and Social Change Among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983).; James R. Atkinson, *Splendid Land, Splendid People The Chickasaw Indians to Removal* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004).; Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society.*; Saunt, *A New Order of Things.*

this angle with the Seminoles past 1820. The majority of Second Seminole War historians and ethnohistorians have missed examining this topic when studying the Seminoles, and more specifically, the Second Seminole War.

An analysis of how white American policy makers viewed the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles from 1820 to 1836 will depict that as American men constructed what it meant to be a Seminole or Black Seminole these views in turn impacted American Indian policy. Interestingly, this study will also demonstrate how white men during this time constructed their own race and gender. The framework of this study is highly influenced by several racial and gender historians. The frameworks of race historians Robert Berkhofer, David Roediger, and George Fredrickson will be used to highlight the racial ideals of the time. Also, Michael Kimmel's analysis will be used to add gender to the framework of this study which will demonstrate that as American men were constructing other groups' races they were also constructing their own race and manhood.

Berkhofer examined how Americans viewed Indians as a race through time. He demonstrated that Americans debated whether Indians were noble savages or ruthless savages while regarding Indians as dependent on the U.S.¹³ He argued that "noble savages" were typically Indians the U.S. already defeated, or were far removed from the U.S. by time or space.¹⁴ David Roediger analyzed how white working class men during the Antebellum era constructed their own race. He argued that white antebellum workers defined themselves as the

¹³Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), 91-157.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 88.

opposite of slavery because of their own fears of dependence.¹⁵ This interchange of ideas is vital because it provides support for the notion that as white men defined the race of other groups they were also defining their own race. Another historian, Frederickson offers a framework for understanding how Americans viewed the Black Seminoles. He notes that by 1831 white Americans feared a slave rebellion in the South because of the slave uprising led by Nat Turner.¹⁶ Frederickson deduced that this fear led to a dual picture of blacks: while under slavery they were domesticated, but when they were free they were barbarians and a threat to white society.¹⁷

Finally, Kimmel offers a way to understand white manhood and the gender ideals of America from 1820 to 1836. He notes that there were multiple forms of manhood present during the years leading up to the Second Seminole War and highlights a form of manhood that focused on Jeffersonian ideals.¹⁸ Kimmel also provides a framework to help explain why American men viewed the Seminole Indians and Blacks Seminoles as threats to their independence. He argued that white males viewed themselves as independent in that they dominated over others, particularly children, women, and people of color.¹⁹ This also provides evidence for the notion that white men believed that there was a racial hierarchy where they were at the top, the Seminole were under them, and Blacks were at the bottom. This is why white American men viewed the Seminoles and Black Seminoles as dependent because it reinforced their racial and gender world views.

¹⁵David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*, revised edition, (New York: Verso, 1999), 14-36.

¹⁶George M. Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971), 52-53.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 53.

¹⁸Michael Kimmel, *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (New York: The Free Press, 1996), 16.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 6-7.

In this analysis there are several key terms that are employed that need to be defined. These terms are Jeffersonian ideals, dependence, and paternalism. In regard to Jeffersonian ideals, Michael Kimmel highlighted their presence in his study of manhood in America. He argued that at the turn of the 19th century there were three types of manhood. One type of man was called the Heroic Artisan, who was viewed by Kimmel as the embodiment of republican virtue.²⁰ Kimmel described the Heroic Artisan as “an honest toiler, unafraid of hard work, proud of his craftsmanship and self-reliant.”²¹ He also highlighted that these men prized independence and were “a firm believer in self-government, the Heroic Artisan was the embodiment of Jeffersonian liberty, the virtuous ‘yeoman of the city,’ as he called them...His body his own, his labor his property.”²² Kimmel clearly links this form of manhood to Thomas Jefferson and property ownership. Drew R. McCoy describes Jeffersonian ideals as the opposite of “inequality, luxury, and dependence.”²³ He argued that this form of political economy was about morals and avoiding corruption. But according to Jefferson, in order for men to avoid dependence and corruption they needed to be industrious farmers. However, one necessary ingredient that was needed in order for Jeffersonian ideals to come to fruition in America was land. The need for land to fulfill an ideal is one clear reason for Indian removal.²⁴ Overall, Jeffersonian men were independent industrious farmers that felt justified in taking land from Indian tribes.

The other terms that require defining are dependence and independence. Most gender historians interested in manhood and masculinity during Antebellum America, despite theoretical

²⁰ *Ibid*, 17.

²¹ *Ibid*, 16.

²² *Ibid*, 28-29.

²³ Drew R. McCoy, *The Elusive Republic Political Economy in Jeffersonian America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980), 203.

²⁴ *Ibid*, 6-85.

orientation, agree that dependence was indicative of lacking manhood. Men were viewed as independent while women were viewed as the opposite (dependent). Some historians, such as Bertram Wyatt Brown, Michael Kimmel, Bruce Dorsey, and Edward Baptist, even described Blacks and children as other examples of dependents.²⁵ Kimmel shifted the discourse on dependence by pointing out that many gender historians focus on white male dominance as how white men define themselves. He argued that “manhood is less about the drive for dominance and more about the fear of others dominating us, having power or control over us.”²⁶ Thus, men feared being seen as dependent or being dominated by others, such as a slave or a woman. The opposite of dependence, independence, separated a white male from everyone else during this time. Not only did white males view children, women, and people of color as dependent on them, but they also considered it their job to protect them (i.e., paternalism). In fact, white males’ view of their own independence was greatly affected by their views of dependence and paternalism. Intriguingly, Jeffersonian ideals, dependence, and paternalism are all terms that can be used to describe someone’s race and gender. A race or a man can be Jeffersonian, dependent, or paternal; which highlights how these terms are loaded with both racial and gender connotations.

This study will be separated into three chapters that are organized chronologically. Chapter one will analyze the American image of the Seminoles, Black Seminoles, and white American men from 1820 to the Treaty of Moultrie Creek in 1823. Chapter two will analyze these same groups from the Treaty of Moultrie Creek until 1829. In both of these chapters American images of the Seminoles and themselves will both be analyzed. Also, the American

²⁵ Bertram Wyatt Brown, *Honor and Violence in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 227-230. , Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 6-7. , Bruce Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women: Gender in the Antebellum City* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 5. , Edward E. Baptist, *Creating an Old South: Middle Florida’s Plantation Frontier before the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 37.

²⁶ Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 6-7.

image of the Black Seminoles will be studied in a different section of each chapter. Due to the fear of a possible slave insurrection and Indian Removal, chapter three will analyze white Americans, Black Seminoles, and Seminole Indians together, from 1829 to 1836. As hostilities began white fears increased and the American image of the Seminole Indians and the Black Seminoles changed. As fear over possible slave insurrections increased both of these aforementioned groups were considered threats to white society. Yet, the Seminole Indians were still viewed as dependent on the U.S. Each of these three chapters will also highlight similarities between the way the Seminoles and other Indian tribes in the South were treated to demonstrate how American Indian policy throughout the South was highly influenced by white racial and gender ideals.

Overall this study will analyze how white male policy makers', soldiers', and settlers' notions of race and gender from 1820 to 1836 influenced Seminole policy in Florida. This study will demonstrate that as white men defined the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles as dependent and eventual threats to white society, they were also using these groups to define themselves as independent industrious farmers. This study will not engage how the Seminole Indians or Black Seminoles constructed race or gender as it is outside of the scope of this current study. Intriguingly, as time passed and the calls for the removal of the Seminole Indians increased, the group of individuals that appeared to be the driving force of Seminole Indian policy were American settlers in Florida because they wanted Seminole land and property to help themselves become Jeffersonian agrarians. Furthermore, this current study can be viewed as a case study for other Indian groups in the southern U.S. in that the Seminoles and other Indian

groups (e.g., Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Creeks) were treated similarly by white American policy makers.

CHAPTER 1: THE AFTERMATH OF THE FIRST SEMNOLE WAR 1820-1823

Exploring how white American policymakers viewed the Seminoles, the Black Seminoles, and themselves from the end of the First Seminole War to the Treaty of Moultrie Creek will serve as a baseline into understanding how American policy makers' ideals of race and gender influenced their policies. One can study the influence of these gender and racial ideals by analyzing primary sources contributed by white observers of the Seminoles Indians, government officials, military personnel, and settlers in Florida from 1820 to 1823. All of the individuals that had opportunities to observe the Seminole Indians in the early 1820s demonstrate that as whites were defining the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles they were also defining themselves as Jeffersonian, independent, and paternalistic.

From 1820 to 1823 the American view of the Seminoles was fairly consistent. Most, of the white observers of the Seminoles and Black Seminoles viewed both groups as dependent on the United States, and as no legitimate threat to white ideals. Regardless, individuals, such as Andrew Jackson, in this era labeled the Seminoles Indians and Black Seminoles as threats to white society. Jackson highlighted a fear that the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles could threaten white settlers' ability to tame the land and bring about Jeffersonian agrarianism in the region. This fear was the result of white American racial and gender ideals of the time. White American men, especially settlers, needed land in order to become independent Jeffersonian paternalists. Jackson highlights a fear that this ability to obtain land on the frontier could be challenged.

White perceptions of the Seminole Indians caused Americans to disagree over whether the Seminole were noble or ruthless savages that could threaten white authority. According to Robert Berkhofer noble savages “could help the White settler and then die forecasting the wonders and virtues of the civilization that was to supersede the simplicity and naturalness of aboriginal life,” and “the noble Indian deserved White pity for his condition and passing...”²⁷ “Savage Indians could scalp helpless Whites or die under torture singing their defiant death songs according to the old ways of aboriginal life.”²⁸ The difference between noble and savage Indians was if they stood in the way of “white civilization.” From 1820 to 1823, only a few observers of the Seminoles and Black Seminoles were threatened by them, but from 1823 to 1836 more and more American settlers supported Andrew Jackson by viewing the Seminoles and Black Seminoles as threats to white society.

Intriguingly, no matter how much the Seminoles accepted, rejected, or resisted white ideals and American Indian policy all observers of the Seminoles whether they were government officials, military personnel, observers, or settlers viewed the Seminoles as dependent on the U.S. None of these individuals pointed out that the Seminole Indians were making their own decisions that they believed were in their best interest because that would make the Seminoles independent. The racial and gender world view of Americans prevented white individuals in Florida from seeing that the Seminoles were exercising their independence. This influenced American policy concerning the Seminoles because policy makers fell back on ideas from their gender and racial world views which caused them to want to “civilize” the Seminoles; meaning get the Seminole Indians to accept Jeffersonian ideals of farming and industry.

²⁷Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, 91.

²⁸*Ibid.*

This period will also demonstrate that even though American officials encouraged the Seminole Indians to accept farming they were doing this because they wanted to concentrate the Indians and take their land. They never intended on viewing the Seminoles as independent or equally “civilized” as whites. They just used these policies as a tool to take their land, which whites in the South felt entitled to as white Jeffersonian farmers.²⁹ Berkhofer also supported this view by arguing that “both kinds of Indian (noble or savage) would be eliminated through disease, alcohol, bullets or the passage of time to make way for the presumed superior White way of life.”³⁰ No matter what the Seminole Indians did from 1820 to 1823 they were never able to be on the same level as white Americans. This chapter will begin by analyzing the white view of the Seminole Indians. Then the white view of the Black Seminoles will be explored.

After the First Seminole War, the U.S. government became more interested in the Seminole Indians of Florida and Indians in the South in general. Many officials were sent by the government between 1820 and 1823 to observe Indian tribes. These individuals’ accounts of the Seminole Indians demonstrate that most officials viewed the Seminole Indians as no threat, as noble savages, and as dependent on the U.S. These perceptions reinforced their own white American views of race and gender. The War Department, headed by John C. Calhoun, commissioned Jedidiah Morse to “make a visit of observation and inspection to the various Indian Tribes in our immediate neighborhood, in order to acquire a more accurate knowledge of their actual condition, and to devise the most suitable plan to advance their civilization and happiness.”³¹ These statements were clearly influenced by white American racial and gender

²⁹ McCoy, *The Elusive Republic*, 208-210.

³⁰ Berkhofer, *The White Man’s Indian*, 91.

³¹ Jedidiah Morse, *A Report to the Secretary of War on the United States on Indian Affairs* (New Haven: Converse, 1872), 11. In the American Culture Series II, Jan. 21, 2006.

ideals of the antebellum period. Uplifting Indians into a state of “civilization” was paternalistic, because it was the role of the U.S. to protect its dependents; similar to a father and his family.

After his tour of Indian tribes, Morse wrote a report to the Secretary of War in 1820 that addressed the Seminole Indians. His comments demonstrate that from the perspective of white Americans the Seminoles were noble and dependent on the U.S. He argued that, “they feel themselves to be in a feeble, dependent state, and willingly yield to any reasonable measure proposed by the government for their good.”³² He also stated that the Seminoles would “do whatever their Great Father shall advise them to do.”³³ The Great Father was the President of the United States. Addressing the President of the U.S. in this manner had clear paternalistic underpinnings. Morse labeled the Seminole Indians as dependents and argued that they would not resist the efforts of the U.S. to “civilize” them, which made them noble and reinforced white ideals of the time.

William Simmons, a white American traveler, went to Seminole country in 1822. He wrote an account of the Seminole Indians that viewed them as dependent, ignorant, and easily influenced while actively ignoring Seminole independence. In his journal Simmons told a story of how the Seminole Indians were convinced to sell some of their slaves and property at a cheap rate because whites informed them that America planned to attack.³⁴ At this point he referred to the Seminole Indians as “ignorant people.”³⁵ He also argued that the Seminole Indians lacked ambition, were in a primitive state, and simple because the Seminole were “satisfied with the shelter of the tree, and the usual supplies of the forest, the can laterally live without either bread

³² *Ibid*, 310.

³³ *Ibid*.

³⁴ William H. Simmons, *Notices of East Florida*, A Facsimile Reproduction of the 1822 Edition with Introduction and Index by George E. Butler (Gainesville: University Florida Press, 1973), 42.

³⁵ *Ibid*.

or gold, and are happy in this simple condition.”³⁶ At the conclusion of his journal Simmons wrote, “it is a further advantage, that the Indians within our southern limits, are now safe from the malignant influences and incitements of our enemies, to which they were previously subject; and will be thus rendered more docile to the humane measures, that have been adopted by our Government, for their civilization and improvement.”³⁷ He labeled the Seminoles as ignorant pawns who were influenced by enemies of the U.S. He also believed the U.S. could influence the Seminoles and improve their culture. This is the epitome of dependence and paternalistic language.

Intriguingly, Simmons also demonstrates that the Seminole Indians were rejecting white ideals, but instead of highlighting the rejection he argued that it was because the Seminole Indians were ignorant. He stated that, “considering, then, that ignorance is not inconsistent with a clear and active state of the reasoning powers, we cannot be surprised, to see the savage reject our boasted improvements and silken luxuries.”³⁸ Simmons also demonstrated that President Monroe believed the Seminoles’ problems came from “their being treated as independent communities” and advised him “to cease regarding them any longer in that capacity, and adopting some cohesive plan for their improvement.”³⁹ This statement is extremely telling because Americans refused to see the Seminole Indians as independent and actually saw the Seminoles being treated as dependent as a major part of American Indian policy. Americans policy makers were not capable of understanding that the Seminoles were independent because they saw the Seminole Indians through lenses colored by their gender and racial world views.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *Ibid*, 53.

³⁸ *Ibid*, 62.

³⁹ *Ibid*, 58.

Americans at this time thought Indians were dependent, so no matter what the Seminole Indians did they were still seen as dependent.

Furthermore, Simmons ignored the independence of the Seminole Indians by arguing that violent acts committed by the Seminole Indians only developed because of the influence of Europeans. First, he believed that Seminole revenge cycles were only spurred by white violence.⁴⁰ For example, Simmons wrote “all the first visitors of the continent, testify, that the Indians received them with hospitality, and most affecting simplicity of kindness; and the first blood that was shed between them and the whites, was due to the aggressive acts of the latter.”⁴¹ Not only did he believe that revenge was stimulated by Europeans, he also viewed revenge as one of the “chief causes of the failure to civilize them.”⁴² He further developed his argument by writing, “the hostilities also, which were fomented amongst them by the rival Colonies of Great Britain and France, kept them in a state of perpetual warfare-which tended to render them more barbarous, than they were found on the first discovery.”⁴³ Simmons highlights interference of European nations as the cause of Seminole aggression. He further bolstered his argument by stating that the Seminoles were not the aggressors during the First Seminole War.⁴⁴ Overall, he labeled the Seminoles as dependents that were subject to the whim of Europeans. Simmons’ views reinforced white ideals of race and gender.

Another individual, Horatio Dexter, a merchant that lived in Seminole country, was sent in 1823 by the U.S. to lay the ground work for the Treaty of Moultrie Creek. Dexter, similar to both Morse and Simmons, viewed the Seminole Indians as noble, while at the same time

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 69.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, 72.

⁴² *Ibid*.

⁴³ *Ibid*, 73.

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 74-75.

attempting to bolster white American ideals of race and gender. He stated that, “the Seminoles are distinguished by the same contour and Countenance as the rest of the North American Indians, have a remarkably pleasing expression and are perfectly well made, easy and graceful in their motions, & except when under the influence of strong liquors mild and agreeable to their manners.”⁴⁵ Dexter viewed the Seminole Indians as noble because he describes them as agreeable. He also stated that “in the attempts made to civilize the Indians I think we have rather prematurely endeavored to force upon them, our ideas of distinct landed property.”⁴⁶ First, this statement demonstrates that Americans wanted the Seminoles to accept ideals of landed property and uplift them, which is a clear example of white paternalism. Second, Dexter argued that the effort was premature; meaning that the Seminole Indians were rejecting these white American ideals. Similar to other individuals, Dexter was highly influenced by the gender and racial ideals of the time and was not able to see the independence of the Seminole Indians, and glossed over an instance where they rejected white American ideals.

Private Citizens working on behalf of the U.S. government were not the only individuals to have opinions regarding the Seminoles in the early 1820’s. U.S. military personnel were also present. George McCall, who later became a Major General in the U.S. army, was stationed in Pensacola Florida in the early 1820’s and spent much of his military career in Florida.⁴⁷ In a collection of letters he sent to his family and friends during his service in Florida, one can see that McCall viewed the Seminoles as dependent. He stated “I could not help feeling an interest in

⁴⁵Horatio S. Dexter, *Observations on the Seminole Indians, 1823*: 1, 2.
<http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.com/~texlance/seminoles/observations.htm>; Jan. 21, 2006.

⁴⁶Ibid, 1, 4.

⁴⁷Major General George A. McCall, *Letters From the Frontiers A Facsimile Reproduction of the 1868 Edition with an Introduction and Index* by John K. Mahon (Gainesville: The University of Florida Press, 1974), xii-xiv.

the safety of the children of the forest, between whom and the vengeful Spaniard I knew a feud must continue to exist.”⁴⁸ Referring to the Seminole Indians as children is a sign of dependence. During the early 1800’s, according to several gender historians one of these being Michael Kimmel, children or boys were seen as dependents rather than men. Kimmel argued that being a man meant not being a dependent or a boy and believed this was a reason why adult male slaves were referred to as boy.⁴⁹ Furthermore, McCall referred to the Spaniard as “vengeful,” and depicted him as the aggressor. Like Simmons, McCall saw the Seminole Indians as peaceful if it were not for the encroachment of Europeans. McCall’s views demonstrate how entrenched racial and gender ideals of white paternalism were in the psyche of the white American male in Florida during the early 1820’s because he felt that it was his role to protect the Seminole Indian from the Spaniard.

All of the individuals discussed so far viewed the Seminole Indians as noble and dependents of the U.S. that required white paternalism to lift them to a different level of “civilization.” These individuals also demonstrate that as white American men were defining the Seminole Indians they were also defining themselves. It was a white man’s role to help enhance the life of the Seminole Indians through “civilization;” meaning that white manhood was linked to viewing the Seminole Indians as dependent and inferior. This explains why none of these individuals highlighted instances when the Seminole Indians exercised their independence. They always ignored these efforts or argued that they were the result of European influences. Intriguingly, government documents from 1821 to 1823 give another reason why many white American men ignored Seminole Indian efforts at independence; because they did not want to

⁴⁸Ibid, 63.

⁴⁹ Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 18.

recognize that the Seminole Indians were a threat to white manhood. White men viewed the Seminole Indians in these ways because these perceptions reinforced white manhood and their world views.

Documents from the *Florida Territorial Papers* demonstrate that most government officials from 1821 to 1823, similar to the visitors of the Seminole Indians, viewed the Seminole Indians as dependent on the U.S., passive, noble, and ignored Seminole efforts at independence. However, a few government officials during this time viewed the Seminole Indians as clear threats to the U.S. The major government official who supported this image was Andrew Jackson. He became governor of Florida in 1821 and viewed the Seminoles as a threat to the frontier. Between 1821 and 1823 a debate began between the supporters of Jackson's view of the Seminole Indians and other government officials that viewed the Seminoles as no threat. Interestingly, most government officials from this time viewed the Seminole Indians as dependent; even if the Seminole Indians were trying to exercise their independence. This was because officials were incapable of overcoming the white male American world view of the time. Ultimately, settlers supported Andrew Jackson's view of the Seminole Indians, which will be seen in later chapters.

Andrew Jackson was an extremely intriguing historical figure, especially in regards to gender and race. Kimmel argues that Jackson was an example of "hyper masculinity", brought about by the emotions of "fear and rage."⁵⁰ He further argued that Jackson was "the fatherless son, struggling without guidance to separate from the mother and, again, for adult mastery over his environment. Terrified of infantilization, of infantile dependency, his rage propelled the

⁵⁰*Ibid*, 33.

furious effort to prove his manhood against those who threatened it, notably women and infantilized others.”⁵¹ Kimmel also addressed the gender underpinnings of Jackson and Indian removal by stating that, “Jackson projected his own and the nation’s fears of dependency onto the Indians who were cast as the passive, helpless children that the Heroic Artisan was attempting to avoid becoming.”⁵² Kimmel was correct in that Jackson viewed the Indians as dependent. However, Jackson did not see the Seminoles as the passive figures Kimmel describes. Rather, Jackson viewed the Seminoles as an active threat to the American frontier and American men’s ability to declare their independence through land ownership. Kimmel characterized Jackson as “the last gasp of Jeffersonian republican virtue.”⁵³ Overall, he argued that Jackson and Heroic Artisans, who were synonymous with Jeffersonian men, feared having their independence challenged, which clearly influenced American Indian policy during this time.

The best place to begin is with Andrew Jackson’s view of the Seminole Indians. In a letter to the Secretary of War Jackson espoused that the Seminole Indians were a threat to the borders of the U.S. and wanted the Seminoles removed from Florida.

If the Indians be removed within the limits of the country assigned to the Creek nation, (of which the Seminoles are a part,) this object, on which the security of the Southern border so much depends, will be speedily attained. With what pretense of justice can those who fled from the Creek nation, and kept an exterminating war on our frontier until crushed by the arm of our government in 1818, set up such claims? And is the safety of the frontier to be jeopardized by the complaints of a few Indians excited by would be Indian agents, and Indian treaty makers, who compose flowry talks for them and put words into their mouths they never conceived...and why should we hesitate to order them up at once, when the Executive government with the aid of Congress, can do ample justice, by law if

⁵¹*Ibid*, 34.

⁵²*Ibid*, 34-35.

⁵³*Ibid*, 33.

necessary, to those who deserve it, by giving such equivalent as will enable them to settle their families in the upper country, and to cultivate their farms.⁵⁴

Jackson's belief that the Seminoles were a threat to the security of the U.S. was further demonstrated at the end of his letter where he espoused that if the Seminoles were left in Florida "that they will greatly weaken your frontier."⁵⁵ Jackson tied his argument concerning the Seminole Indians to security of the region. But at the same time, similar to other officials and visitors of the Seminole Indians, Jackson ignored Seminole independence and argued that the Seminoles were dependent by espousing that the Seminoles were being influenced by outside forces, having words put in their mouths, and were subject to the whims of the U.S. government. As a result, he wanted the Seminole Indians removed and, similar to other officials, wanted the Seminole Indians to ultimately accept white Jeffersonian ideals of farming and industry. Jackson was not a passive observer of the Seminole Indians at this time he was the governor of Florida, which may account for his view of the Seminole Indians because he wanted the citizens of the region to settle and farm former Seminole lands, which would define them as Jeffersonian agrarians. As Kimmel pointed out Jackson was ultimately afraid of challenges to white manhood; hence him espousing that the Seminoles were a threat to the American frontier.⁵⁶

Andrew Jackson clearly saw Florida as a part of the frontier not a distinctly southern state. Edward Baptist argued, in a study of Middle Florida's plantation system, that Florida was on the frontier and that it needed to be viewed as a state more similar to a western state despite having slavery and being technically in the South. Furthermore, both Mikaela Adams and Kevin

⁵⁴ From Governor Jackson to the Secretary of War Sept. 17, 1821 in Clarence Edwin Carter, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, Vol. XXII, *The Territory of Florida 1821-1824* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1956), 206.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 208.

⁵⁶ Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 33-35.

Kokomoor in their analyses viewed Florida as being a frontier.⁵⁷ Jackson clearly viewed the security of the frontier as extremely important because the frontier was necessary to achieve the goal of making a nation of farmers as Jefferson imagined. Jackson was protecting the frontier for settlement by white men. Kimmel also addressed the frontier in his analysis; he argued that the frontier was seen as a place where white men could exercise their manhood.⁵⁸ He also pointed out that the frontier was a place where the Heroic Artisan or Jeffersonian men “returns in the guise of the pioneer, the masculine primitive, but he is still humble and beholden to his origins.”⁵⁹ The frontier was a place where white American men could go to fulfill their goals of becoming farmers and Jeffersonian agrarians.

Intriguingly, Jackson also challenged American policy concerning Indians and further labeled the Seminoles as dependent. Jackson stated that “the absurdity of holding treaties with Indian tribes within our territorial limits, subject to our sovregnty and municipal regulations, and to whom, by legislation, every justice can be done, the safety of our Southern frontier perfectly secured.”⁶⁰ Finally, Jackson stated that the Seminoles could be “protected and made by the bounty and humanity of our Government,” if the Seminoles were removed to Creek territory.⁶¹ Not only did Jackson label the Seminole Indians as dependent, he actually challenged American policy by arguing that the U.S. should not treat Indians as if they were nations. Jackson clearly thought that it was the role of the U.S. to protect the Seminole Indians, but this was conditional; the Seminoles had to follow white authority to be protected. Overall, Jackson viewed the

⁵⁷Baptist, *Creating an Old South*, 2-4; Adams, “Savage foes,” 404-435; Kokomoor, “A Re-assessment of Seminoles,” 209-236.

⁵⁸Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 61.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, 64.

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, 207.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, 208.

Seminole Indians as threats to the American frontier in Florida, because he was trying to protect the frontier for settlement by white men.

Many other government officials ignored Jackson and viewed the Seminoles as no threat to American ideals or Indian policy. Seminole Indian Agent John Bell, in 1821, depicted how John Calhoun, similar to Jackson, believed that it was the role of the United States to protect the Seminoles. He stated that “as little as their past conduct has entitled them to the kindness of the United States, now they have been brought under their protection the government will extend towards them the same justice and generosity which it always has towards the other Indian tribes within our limits.”⁶² Calhoun believed that white paternalism benefited Indians. His statement also depicts that he did not view the Seminole Indians as a current threat because he highlights their actions in the past and viewed them as defeated. At a later point in his letter he labeled the Seminoles as, “poor ignorant creatures,” which further supported his dependent view of them.⁶³ Calhoun’s sentiments were similar to both McCall and Simmons who viewed the Seminoles as ignorant. Furthermore, Calhoun, similar to Jackson, wanted the Seminole Indians concentrated and for them to accept Jeffersonian ideals of industry and farming in order to get land for American settlers, but he did not want to force the Seminole Indians to accept removal. He maintained the current American policy and negotiated a treaty with the Seminole Indians. Calhoun sent Bell to “ascertain their opinion of the extent of Country held by them (Seminoles), and on what condition they hold it, and without stating the ultimate determination of the Government urge on them the propriety on their own account, either to join the Creeks who I

⁶² From the Secretary of War to John R. Bell Sept. 28, 1821 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXII, 219.

⁶³ *Ibid*, 221.

understand will receive them, or to concentrate their people in one place and become peaceable and industrious farmers.”⁶⁴

Despite having a difference of opinion over whether the Seminoles were a threat or not Jackson, Calhoun, and Bell all agreed that the Seminole Indians needed to be concentrated and encouraged to farm. In April of 1822, John Bell wrote, “if the government concentrate the Florida Indians they must turn their attention to agricultural pursuits.”⁶⁵ In a later letter where he addressed the role of the Indian Agency in Florida he stated that, “as the duties of this agency will be, among other things, to collect together the scattered bands, to extinguish the Seminole title to most of the lands, and to use, in the best possible manner, every means that shall tend to make them cultivators assisted by their slaves.”⁶⁶ Several historians of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee and Creeks also pointed out this “civilization” policy. Richard White argued that American agents told the Choctaw “to look to agriculture, not presents, for their well-being,” and argued that Americans did this because they wanted to take the Choctaw’s best lands.⁶⁷ James Atkinson also highlighted how American officials wanted the Chickasaw to accept farming and “white civilization.”⁶⁸ Furthermore, Theda Perdue demonstrated that American officials also wanted the Cherokee to accept “civilization” meaning that they wanted them to farm.⁶⁹ Finally, Claudio Saunt argued that the goal of white officials was to get the Creek Indians to farm and accept whites’ plan to “civilize” them.⁷⁰

⁶⁴*Ibid*, 220.

⁶⁵From John R. Bell to the Secretary of War Apr. 22, 1822 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 410.

⁶⁶From John R. Bell to Thomas Metcalfe, No date 1822 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 465.

⁶⁷White, *The Roots of Dependency*, 91,100.

⁶⁸Atkinson, *Splendid Land, Splendid People*, 182-184.

⁶⁹Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society*, 50-54.

⁷⁰Saunt, *A New Order of Things*, 139.

Encouraging the Seminole Indians and other Indian nations to farm had multiple implications. First, all these American government officials wanted to force the Seminole Indians to live on less land so that they could turn around and make that land available to white settlers. This would enable settlers to become Jeffersonian agrarians and would in turn reinforce their assumptions about white manhood. Second, the Seminole Indians acceptance of these Jeffersonian ideals became linked to the Seminole Indians accepting American “civilization” policy and white authority. This meant that if the Seminole Indians challenged these ideals they were also challenging white perceptions that were based on white Americans racial and gender world view. If the Seminole Indians refused to farm they would need more land that then would interfere with white men’s ability to settle the frontier. As all of this was going on, American men saw themselves as Jeffersonian agrarians. These perceptions influenced their policies because they believed that rejection of these policies meant that the Seminoles were rejecting white authority.

Calhoun and Bell were attempting to commence a dialogue with the Seminoles that eventually led to the Treaty of Moultrie Creek, which concentrated the Seminole Indians onto a reservation in west Florida. As the dialogue over the Treaty began the debate over the nature of the Seminole Indians intensified. American officials were concerned whether the Seminole Indians would accept white ideals of “civilization” or not. Indian Agent Gad Humphreys believed that they would as long as they were given tools and arable land.

I made it a consideration of primary importance to ascertain the disposition and views of the Indians in relation to the cultivation of the Soil, and the adoption of the habits of civilized life, and I am happy to be enabled to say, that my inquiries have resulted in a seemingly well founded belief, that very little more is necessary to bring them into the measure, then to furnish them with the proper Implements

of Husbandry, and locate them upon a tract of land sufficiently fertile to reward and encourage their labours.⁷¹

Despite his view, some government officials still argued that the Seminole Indians would reject American Indian policy and white authority. This debate continued until the Treaty of Moultrie Creek in 1823.

The debate over whether Seminoles would resist white efforts to “civilize” them renewed with the acting territorial governor of East Florida, W.G.D. Worthington in 1821. He viewed the Seminoles as no threat to the U.S. He wrote,

On Indian affairs, I have only to observe, that, the best opinion I can obtain from them, is that they are willing to be Concentrated in Florida, and that they would prefer the place assigned for them, to be where their principle towns are...it is said, they never will consent to go up amongst the Creeks—They will assume no hostile attitude, against the United States, no matter, what the Course they may adopt respecting them—But if they are ordered up amongst the Creeks, they will take to the bushes—⁷²

He estimated that the worst outcome for the U.S. was that the Seminoles might challenge white authority by fleeing south into the Everglades. This was very different from Jackson’s call for removal and stability on the southern border.

In 1822, even as it appeared that the Seminole Indians would actively resist the U.S. the acting Governor of Florida and military personnel discounted the threat. Eustis informed Territorial Governor Duval of Florida that, “Micanope was assembling his warriors & negroes & was determined to fight in defence of his home & property...the hostile party is supposed to be about one hundred & thirty. As their object appears merely to be plunder, I do not believe there

⁷¹From Gad Humphreys to Secretary Walton Apr. 19, 1823 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXII, 672.

⁷²From Acting Governor Worthington (East Florida) to the Secretary of War, Dec. 4, 1821 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 294.

will be much bloodshed.”⁷³ Eustis did not seem threatened by possible Seminole Indian resistance because he did not sound an alarm or call for more troops. By December, the concerns of Eustis were discounted in letter from acting Territorial Governor Walton to the Secretary of War. Walton stated that he “previously received a letter from Colo. Eustis, of the 22d of October, in which he assures me, that the alarm amongst the Seminoles upon the subject, has been discovered to be wholly without foundation.”⁷⁴

These opinions were further bolstered by other reports sent from Major Wright who had contact with Seminoles, who stated that, “the principal chief, Emeamathla, assured me, that he, his chiefs and warriors, would remain peaceable and contented, until an authorized agent should arrive, for the purpose of establishing a definite and durable understanding between them and the government.”⁷⁵ Toward the end of his report, Major Wright assessed the situation and wrote, “I feel fully authorized in assuring you, that no apprehension should be entertained of the friendly disposition of these Indians. They have no inclination to commence hostilities with whites, or among themselves, as has been intimated to you.”⁷⁶ Walton, Eustis, and Wright all viewed the Seminoles as no threat to the U.S., but Wright’s accounts demonstrated that the settlers were afraid of possible resistance. There was a clear debate taking place over the nature of the Seminole Indians.

⁷³From Abraham Eustis to Governor Duval Oct. 16, 1822 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 549.

⁷⁴From Acting Governor Walton to the Secretary of War Dec. 8, 1822 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 577.

⁷⁵*Ibid*, 578.

⁷⁶*Ibid*.

In the summer of 1823, Jackson renewed his calls for Seminole Indian removal. Jackson was supported by a similar minded Indian agent, James Gadsden, who in June of 1823 called for Seminole removal.⁷⁷ He argued that

An Indian population under these circumstances, connected with another class of population (runaway slaves) which will inevitably predominate in Florida, must necessarily add to natural weaknesses, and endanger the security of one of the most exposed, but important frontiers of the Union-It is useless therefore to enlarge on the policy of removing a class of Savages from where they may prove dangerous, to where they would be comparatively harmless.⁷⁸

Gadsden then went onto call for the establishment of a military post in Florida to stop the Indians from attacking ranchers and committing other hostilities.⁷⁹ Gadsden, similar to Jackson, believed that the Seminoles were weakening the frontier and thus were a savage threat to the U.S. This opinion is in contrast to that of Walton, Eustis, and Wright. Interestingly, all of the government officials thus far viewed the Seminoles as dependent on the U.S. Gadsden also viewed the Seminoles as a clear threat to the frontier because Seminole Indian resistance itself would undermine white men's ability to settle it. As mentioned previously, the frontier symbolized manhood so an assault on the frontier was also an assault on American manhood and white authority.

In July, Jackson echoed Gadsden's call for troops. He argued that, "a movement of Troops to Tampas bay, previous to the Talks being held with them, would have a powerful influence upon their minds, and give great effect to the Talks of the commissioners."⁸⁰ Next, Jackson hinted that the Indians should not be concentrated on the best land, which he believed

⁷⁷ From James Gadsden to the Secretary of War Jun. 11, 1823 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 695.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ From Andrew Jackson to the Secretary of War Jul. 14, 1823 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 719-720.

should be saved for “a dense white population, sufficient to overawe the Indians.”⁸¹ Jackson clearly continued to view the Seminoles as a threat to white ideals because he called for troops, but his ultimate goal can also be ascertained from this quote. Jackson wanted the Seminole Indians stripped of their best land so that the government could ensure that white Americans obtained it so that they could exercise their manhood by farming it and becoming industrious. Jackson saw the Seminole Indians as a threat because their resistance could undermine the ability of white men to settle the frontier.

In September of 1823, with the Treaty of Moultrie Creek, the Seminole Indians agreed to concentrate on reservations in Florida. The commissioners of this treaty are extremely important because they demonstrate that Andrew Jackson’s view of the Seminole Indians was not falling on deaf ears. A letter from the Indian commissioners, who negotiated the Treaty, to the Secretary of War demonstrated that the Seminole Indians initially rejected the Treaty because they did not want to be concentrated within the bounds that Andrew Jackson offered, which were clearly not their best lands. One of the commissioners of the Treaty reported that the Seminoles insisted “that force only could drive them into those limits, and that they were well convinced that the Americans possessed the power, and they not the ability to resist-The Indians therefore threw themselves on the protection of the U States; and appealed feelingly to the humanity of the Commissioners not to locate them in a country in which they must inevitably starve.”⁸² After this exchange, the U.S. decided to change the locations of the

⁸¹*Ibid.*, 720.

⁸²From the Indian Commissioners to the Secretary of War Sept. 26, 1823 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 749.

reservations. Intriguingly, the Seminole Indians appealed to the American spirit of paternalism in order to get what they wanted.

The commissioners then went onto state that the Seminole Chiefs that obtained reservations “are all represented to be men of industrious habits, and who have made some advances in civilization...the land allotted each Chief & and their connections are so limited, as to force the occupants into civil habits and pursuits.”⁸³ Interestingly, in the closing of the letter concerning the Treaty, the commissioners discussed some concerns which highlight that the debate over the nature of the Seminoles was not complete.

It was a misfortune to Florida as a frontier Territory and with her maritime exposure to have any Tribes of Indians within her boundaries-It would have been a National benefit to have removed them to a more interior position; but as this seems to have been impracticable; the only course left was that which was adopted-The Confining the Indians within certain limits, and in the part of the Territory least objectionable-This being accomplished it is indispensible for the benefit of the Indians; as well as future security of Florida that all intercourse with foreign Countries or Individuals exercising an influence over them be cut off, and that an exclusive control be obtained and maintained by the American Government-This is only to be effected by the immediate establishment of Military posts.⁸⁴

The commissioners, similar to Jackson, saw Florida as a frontier and wanted the Seminole Indians totally removed, but they were not able too. They negotiated with the Seminole Indians and let them stay in Florida because they did not yet see the Seminole Indians as threats. But, the commissioners of the Treaty demonstrate that many individuals were swayed by Andrew Jackson. Despite the commissioners of the Treaty of Moultrie Creek arguing that the Seminole Indians were accepting America’s plan for their “civilization” these commissioners were still unsure about the nature of the Seminole Indians. Interestingly, even though they were

⁸³*Ibid.*

⁸⁴*Ibid*, 750.

questioning the nature of the Seminole Indians they still viewed the Seminole Indians as dependent because they seemed more afraid of possible European interference with the Seminole Indians than the Seminole Indians themselves.

All white opinions of the Seminoles were consistent in that they viewed the Seminoles as dependent on the U.S. and easily influenced by Europeans. However, there was a disagreement, over the nature of the Seminoles, and whether they would resist white efforts to bring them to “civilization” or white efforts to take their land. Many government officials from this time did not see the Seminole Indians as a threat to white ideals and authority, but Andrew Jackson’s hostile opinion of the Seminole Indians appeared to be winning over the citizenry of Florida. This can be seen in the words of the commissions of the Treaty of Moultrie Creek. Interestingly, all of these groups viewed Florida as a frontier. These opinions were rooted in the gender and racial ideals of the time because white American men needed Seminole Indian lands in order to farm the frontier which was linked to white manhood and Jeffersonian agrarianism. There was a difference of opinion over the nature of the Seminoles and it was rooted in the white view of Florida as a frontier. All of the groups that viewed Florida as a frontier saw the Seminoles as possible threats in some way. This debate over the nature of the Seminole Indians continued all the way up to the beginning of the Second Seminole War. American policy makers perceived and interacted with the Seminoles Indians the way they did because they were being influenced by their white gender and racial world views.

As American policy makers debated about the nature of the Seminoles in the early 1820’s, they also held opinions concerning the Black Seminoles. The white view of this group further provides insight into white men’s ideals of dependence and insight into how their racial

and gender world view influenced their decisions. Individuals and government officials in the early 1820s viewed the Black Seminoles as dependent and as no threat to white manhood. But Andrew Jackson, similar to what he argued about the Seminoles, viewed the Black Seminoles as a possible threat to white ideals and white American manhood. Interestingly, leading up to the Second Seminole War more and more individuals, especially settlers, began to endorse Jackson's view of the Black Seminoles.

Horatio Dexter depicted the Black Seminoles as the property of the Seminole Indians.⁸⁵ Simmons portrayed the Black Seminoles as dependent on the Seminoles and whites. Simmons referred to the Black Seminoles in the following manner:

The union of ignorance and civilization, as displayed in the manners of these people, and among the lower orders, in even the most enlightened countries, presents the general condition of the human race, in a singular point of view; and seems to show, that the greater part of civilized mankind, can hardly be placed on a level with the savage portion of the species; for the later retain many virtues, and a simplicity of character, that are wholly wanting in the former; who are mostly, in fact, plunged in the grossest vices, and brutal in manners; and ever ripe for the commission of outrages and crimes.⁸⁶

He viewed the Black Seminoles as savage, dependent, and controlled by their emotions. Simmons believed in a racial hierarchy, with Blacks placed at the bottom. Despite these concerns, he did not indicate that they were a threat to white society. At another point in his account, he also referred to the Black Seminoles as being "shy and ignorant as savages."⁸⁷ Many of the individuals who visited the Seminoles in the early 1820s espoused that the Black Seminoles were not a threat to white society. Rather, they viewed the Black Seminoles as

⁸⁵Dexter, *Observations on the Seminole Indians*, 1.

⁸⁶Simmons, *Notices of East Florida*, 45.

⁸⁷*Ibid*, 47.

dependent on the Seminole Indians because whites believed in a racial hierarchy where Blacks were at the bottom.

Furthermore, in the early 1820s, many white government officials viewed the Black Seminoles as being at least partially secure and as no threat to white paternalism or white authority. A letter which appeared in Morse's report, written by Mr. Peniere to General Jackson, bolstered this argument. He stated that Black Seminoles were "in a state of half slavery among the Indians."⁸⁸ A white official referring to this group among the Seminoles as being in a state of half slavery would be reassuring to whites because they were under Seminole authority. But, they were still referred to as being in "half slavery" because they had freedom of movement among the Seminole Indians. They believed that the Seminoles at least had limited control over the Black Seminoles. Simmons also supported this claim by stating that, "the Negro property, also in the South, is now surrounded with greater security, and rendered less susceptible of being converted into a source of domestic danger."⁸⁹ White visitors did not think of the Black Seminoles as a threat to white society because of their racial and gender world views; at least not yet.

The Black Seminoles were only mentioned a few times in the Florida Territorial Papers from 1820-1823, and when they were mentioned, officials showed little concern. Two of these documents called for runaway and stolen slaves' to be returned to their owners. The Secretary of War in September of 1821 informed John Bell that, "the government expects the Slaves who have run away or been plundered from our Citizens or from Indian tribes within our limits will be given up peacefully by the Seminole Indians when demanded through the Agent and

⁸⁸From Peniere, to Gen. Jackson Jul. 1821 in Morse, *A Report to the Secretary of War*, 311.

⁸⁹Simmons, *Notices of East Florida*, 53.

satisfactory proof made of the fact.”⁹⁰ This was interesting because the burden of proof was not with the Seminoles, but with the person demanding the return of the slave. At this time, the U.S. did not appear concerned about the Black Seminoles.

By 1822 the U.S. government even tried to use enticements to get the Seminoles to bring in runaway slaves. In a talk delivered to the Seminole Governor Duval said that, “if your Chiefs will have all the slaves belonging to the white men who have run away to Florida brought to the Post of St. Marks you shall have what is right for bringing in the Negroes, I will see that you shall be paid for your time and trouble...”⁹¹ Theda Perdue also pointed out this phenomenon among the Cherokee and argued that American policy makers used Indians to hunt down slaves to drive a wedge between the two groups in order to “prevent conspiracies of Indians and slaves.”⁹² Less than a year later, Duval asked the Secretary of War for a force to hunt down runaway slaves to return them to their owners, and he called for Indian Agent Humphreys to lead the expedition with the help of the Seminole.⁹³ The government was concerned about getting white property returned, but this was not because they were a threat to the U.S. Interestingly, this also demonstrates that there was a link between white manhood and slavery because white men needed slaves to help them farm. So, their ability to farm and define themselves as white men was linked to the frontier and slavery. Hence, wanting their supposed runaway slaves returned because they needed them to help reinforce their ability to define themselves as Jeffersonian agrarians.

⁹⁰From the Secretary of War to John R. Bell Sept. 28, 1821 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXII, 220.

⁹¹Governor Duval’s Talk with Seminole Chiefs Jul. 1822 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 504.

⁹²Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society*, 41.

⁹³ From James Gadsden to the Secretary of War Jun. 11, 1823 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXII, 695.

The first government official that was concerned about the number of Africans in Florida was Andrew Jackson. In a letter addressing the negotiations for the Treaty of Moultrie Creek he argued that, “a dense White population,-sufficient to overawe the Indians, and keep down the insurrection of the Blacks, of which there must be a large number in Florida at some future day.”⁹⁴ Jackson believed a large white population in Florida would secure the peninsula. He did not see them as a current threat to white authority, but as a possible future threat. Intriguingly, Jackson again was concerned by yet another possible threat to white manhood and the frontier because a slave insurrection could totally undermine white men’s efforts to claim their independence through farming.

This analysis serves as a starting point because it demonstrates that white government officials, visitors of the Seminole Indians, and American military personnel all viewed the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles as dependent; even if the Seminoles and Black Seminoles began to exercise their independence. Most American officials saw themselves in a paternal light, but at the same time they were using their perceptions of the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles to define themselves as white industrious and independent men. They also needed the lands of the Seminole Indians to help define themselves as men because they viewed Florida as a part of the frontier. The frontier was where white men and Jeffersonian agrarians were supposed to dominate. By 1823 many Americans, especially settlers, began to agree with Andrew Jackson and view the Seminole Indians as a threat to the frontier because the Seminoles could hinder a white man’s ability to become an industrious farmer. A debate was brewing over the nature of

⁹⁴From Andrew Jackson to the Secretary of War Jul. 14, 1823 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 720.

the Seminole Indians: were they passive and going to accept white ideals of farming and white authority or were they going to reject white authority and “civilization.”

CHAPTER 2: CHANGING IMAGES 1823-1828

A continued analysis of how white American policy makers viewed the Seminoles and the Black Seminoles from the Treaty of Moultrie Creek in 1823 to 1828 will demonstrate that American policy makers' and settlers' perceptions of the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles began to change. Both of these groups continued to be influenced by their racial and gender world views. The settlers endorsed the ideals of Jeffersonian agrarianism and wanted to be viewed as Jeffersonian men that were developing the frontier; while government officials were paternalists whose views of race and gender justified their paternalism. Interestingly, a break in the perception of the Seminole Indians seemed to take place during this time. Most government officials did not view them as a threat although settlers saw them as a threat because they perceived that the Seminoles rejected white efforts to "civilize" them by refusing to stay on the reservation. This was a perceived threat to settlers' ability to develop the frontier in Florida and be Jeffersonian agrarians. From 1823-1828 the white male American image of the Black Seminoles changed as well. Government officials adopted Andrew Jackson's views and called for the return of runaway slaves.

The language of the Treaty of Moultrie Creek demonstrated that white American policy makers wanted the Seminole Indians to accept efforts to "civilize" them through the adoption of farming. Article three of the Treaty states that,

the United States will take the Florida Indians under their care and patronage, and will afford them protection against all persons whatsoever; provided they conform to the laws of the United States, and refrain from making war, or giving any insult to any foreign nation, without having first obtained the permission and consent of the United States...the United States promise to distribute among the tribes, as

soon as concentrated, under the direction of their agent, implements of husbandry, and stock of cattle and hogs.⁹⁵

Clearly, American policymakers viewed the Seminole Indians as dependent, but at the same time wanted them to accept Jeffersonian ideals. As seen in past sections, American policy makers wanted Seminole land and could assuage their consciences by arguing that they were racially uplifting Indians. Despite viewing the Seminole Indians as dependent and encouraging them to accept white plans for their “civilization,” American policy makers, soldiers and settlers debated about the nature of the Seminole Indians well past 1823. The debate reflected white anxieties that resulted from the perceived need to concentrate Seminoles on reservations and the desire for “progress” in Florida-progress that remained exclusive as long as Indians were viewed as a threat to frontier life.

Soon after the signing of the Treaty of Moultrie Creek, James Gadsden sent a letter to the Secretary of War calling, yet again, for the establishment of a military post on Tampa Bay. Gadsden wrote that, “the Indians would have never have voluntarily assented to the terms had they not believed that we had both the power & disposition to compel obedience.”⁹⁶ Thus, he called for a military post and sought to set boundaries for the reservation as soon as possible in order for the Treaty to succeed.⁹⁷ By November, President Monroe approved of Gadsden’s plan of action.⁹⁸ At this time Gadsden wrote, “Though I am far from believing the Indians would attempt to resist the execution of the orders from the President; yet it is certainly prudent to be

⁹⁵The Treaty of Fort Moultrie in John T. Sprague, *The Origins, Progress, and Conclusion of the Florida War*, A Facsimile Reproduction of the 1848 Edition with Introduction by John K. Mahon (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1964), 20-21.

⁹⁶From James Gadsden to The Secretary of War Sept. 29, 1823 in *FLorida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXII, 752.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*

⁹⁸From the Secretary of War to James Gadsden, Nov. 4, 1823 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 784.

prepared for all contingencies-I therefore conceive it my duty to urge the necessity of the speedy movement of the troops detailed for the occupation of the Bay of Tampa.”⁹⁹ Gadsden continued to view the Seminole Indians as a possible threat after the Treaty of Moultrie Creek and feared that the Seminole Indians might resist concentration on a reservation.

In a letter from December of 1823, Gadsden explained the reason why he was uneasy. He was concerned for the settlers and the security of the frontier. He wanted to complete the Treaty but, “apprehension of Indian hostilities are not all together removed from the minds of the Population of this Territory. They have suffered so severely & so frequently that it is almost impossible to convince them of their present security-The Indians penetrating their timidity of character continue to threaten & have excited alarms of late which it would be gratifying to me to see most effectually removed-They cannot be so, but by the measures proposed.”¹⁰⁰ Gadsden was one of the first government officials to demonstrate that settlers feared the Seminole Indians and saw them as a threat. These settlers would agree with Gadsden and Jackson that troops needed to be sent to secure the region, and the Seminoles possibly removed from Florida all together.

Intriguingly, right after Gadsden finished setting the borders for the Seminole reservation in June of 1824 he wrote another letter to the Secretary of War explaining why he wanted the Seminole Indians removed and how he felt about the current reservation in Florida. He wrote,

but if removal be impracticable the only alternative left is the most judicious location, within proper limits & under such government as to ensure their dependence & discipline-The least objectionable location is, in my opinion, the one which has been selected... under this belief as expressed; the sooner the

⁹⁹From James Gadsden to the Secretary of War Nov. 26, 1823 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 795.

¹⁰⁰From James Gadsden to the Secretary of War Dec. 1, 1823 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 802.

Indian can be advised of their fate, and concentrated within the limits allotted; the sooner in my opinion; will all apprehensions of hostilities on our southern border vanish; Florida recover from the embarrassments under which she has hitherto labored-and an enterprising population induced to improve the advantages of her climate & soils, which can alone ensure the national objects for which the purchase from Spain was made.¹⁰¹

Gadsden linked removal of the Seminole Indians to the land allotted to them in the Treaty, which will be referred to as their reservation for the rest of this study, with progress of whites in Florida. He clearly wanted the Seminole Indians relocated outside of Florida, but still believed that the reservation would be effective by securing the Seminole Indians and the frontier. Making progress and peace was contingent on the Seminole Indians moving to the reservation. Gadsden set up a paradigm in which Seminole Indians who were off the reservation were threats to white society. Gadsden personally believed that if the Seminole Indians moved to the reservation and accepted white efforts to “civilize” them then they would no longer be a threat to the frontier. His opinion of them was contingent on their acceptance of “civilization” as defined by whites and the reservation. If the Seminole Indians rejected these efforts and the reservation they were threats to white male authority and expansion of white “civilization” on the frontier. Overall, Gadsden’s and the settlers’ perceptions of the Seminoles were linked to the security of Florida because white men needed to conquer the land and bring “civilization” to it in order define themselves as Jeffersonian agrarians. Settlers and their representatives were not concerned with paternalism or what was best for the Seminole Indians they were worried about their ability to farm.

The policies of Gadsden were very similar to the policies that American policy makers used with the Choctaw and Chickasaw. Richard White argued that government officials,

¹⁰¹From James Gadsden to the Secretary of War Jun. 15, 1824 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 971.

specifically Thomas Jefferson, “supported the mutually contradictory policies of encouraging the acquisition of livestock to ‘civilize’ the Choctaws while simultaneously attempting to strip them of their best grazing land...”¹⁰² Gadsden and other government officials during this time were doing the same thing to the Seminole Indians. Furthermore, similar to the Seminole Indians American policy makers wanted the Chickasaw to cede lands to the U.S. in Tennessee, and they offered several influential Chickasaw Chiefs, who were mostly of mixed blood, their own reservations.¹⁰³ Also, it seems that American settlers were ignoring paternalism when they engaged the Chickasaw as well. James Atkinson, argued that “land hungry found it easy to encroach on these isolated areas...” and he highlighted that these individuals were stealing and harassing the Chickasaw.¹⁰⁴ It seems that American policy makers were using many of the same tactics with the Seminole Indians as they were with other Indian tribes in the Southeast, and that settlers responded to Indian tribes in similar ways.

Many government officials disagreed with Gadsden because they did not link their perception of the Seminole Indians to their acceptance of the reservation; nor did they view Seminole Indians outside the reservation as threats. However, there was a shift in the way that many policy makers perceived the Seminole Indians because they began to view subsets of the Seminoles as threats. Governor Duval was one of these individuals. He viewed individual Indians and certain groups of Seminoles as possible threats. He characterized the situation in Florida differently from Gadsden by writing that

I have taken great pains to ascertain the real feeling of the Indians toward us-and can relay with some confidence, on the friendship of all the chiefs except

¹⁰²White, *The Roots of Dependency*, 110.

¹⁰³Atkinson, *Splendid Land, Splendid People*, 205-206.

¹⁰⁴*Ibid*, 204.

Neamathla, he is a man of uncommon capacity, bold, violent, and restless-He cannot submit to a superior or endure an equal. No reliance can be placed on him, and his men are the most lawless and vile of the Indians in Florida, I feel confident that they will not remove into the boundary given to them by the late Treaty unless there is a military force in the vicinity to overawe them- I do not believe that these Indians will dare to commence hostilities.¹⁰⁵

Duval argued that a majority of the Seminole Indians accepted white authority, but called for a military force to help subdue Neamathla, the head chief of the Seminoles. He stated that Neamathla “is the only turbulent Man in the Nation-he is creating daily more and more dissatisfaction among the Indians he has avoided me since my Arrival here, although he was to meet me on a Day appointed, which he promised but failed to do.”¹⁰⁶ Despite his seemingly more enlightened view, Duval was highly influenced by his racial and gender world view because he believed that whites were superior to Indians even those who adopted “civilization.” In one instance Neamathla visited Duval to ask about visiting the President and Duval responded by telling him to “patiently wait” for a response. Duval used a paternal-like response in this instance by telling Neamathla to wait rather than discussing the issue with him. He treated Neamathla like a child or as his dependent.¹⁰⁷

Eventually, Duval removed Neamathla as the chief of the Seminole Indians for inciting the Seminole into a frenzy in July of 1824. This clearly demonstrates that American government officials saw it as their role to oversee the Seminole Indians; meaning that Duval viewed them as dependent on the U.S. and was taking on the role of a paternalist. He wrote,

¹⁰⁵ From Governor Duval to the Secretary of War, Jan. 12, 1824 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXII, 832.

¹⁰⁶ From Governor Duval to the Secretary of War Jul. 12, 1824 in Clarence Edwin Carter, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, Vol. XXIII, *The Territory of Florida 1824-1828* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1958), 16.

¹⁰⁷ From Governor Duval to the Secretary of War Apr. 11, 1824 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXII, 922.

Sir I have had some difficulty with the Indians in this quarter, They did not make an attack on our citizens, but they were extremely insolent and made many threats, Their chiefs had in some instances killed our cattle and hogs-they also had gone with their men to several of our settlers and ordered them off, they threatened to drive the people out of the country and make war on me In short the whole of their conduct was such, that I saw immediate hostilities must ensue if they did not receive a check.¹⁰⁸

To check the possible threat, he gathered volunteers who were settlers and members of the peaceful Apalachicola band from within the Seminole Nation. The response of this force caused the Tallahassee and Miccasukee Indians to back down.¹⁰⁹ Next, Duval went to Neamathela's town because he believed that resistance was a result of Nemathela's leadership and stated that "I found their about 300 warriors and I saw many of them were armed-I immediately went into their square yard and gave them a talk, and ordered them all to meet me...On the day appointed about 600 Indians attended at this place and I delivered to them a talk that made considerable impression on them, I then appointed John Hicks their chief to lead them south to their land..."¹¹⁰ Duval removed Neamathela as their chief and appointed a new one; John Hicks. Duval was only having problems with a few of the Seminole tribes because of one leader, and Duval removed this leader as the principle chief. Duval seemed concerned because Nemathela was rejecting white authority. Overall, Duval believed that the Seminoles were accepting his authority and white efforts to "civilize" them because he viewed the actions of the Seminoles through a prism of white manhood.

¹⁰⁸From Governor Duval to the Secretary of War Jul. 29, 1824 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXIII, 22.

¹⁰⁹*Ibid.* Many historians argue today that the Miccasukee and the Seminoles were two distinct Indian tribes, but Americans at this time viewed the Miccasukee tribe as a part of the Seminole nation. Hence, for this study they can be viewed as being members of the same group because of the viewpoint of Americans during this time.

¹¹⁰*Ibid.*

Duval also argued that, “the Indians on the Apalachicola River behave very well they seem Anxious to follow my directions and are Rapidly improving in their building Fences and mode of Cultivation, even Faster than was expected...”¹¹¹ Interestingly, subsets of other Indians groups in the south were also accepting white efforts to “civilize” them. Both Richard White and James Atkinson pointed out that groups among the Choctaw and Chickasaw were accepting farming and white efforts to “civilize” them, especially the upper class.¹¹² Theda Perdue also pointed this out among the Cherokee. She argued that, “in compliance with the government’s ‘civilization’ program, the Cherokees quickly adopted the white man’s farming implements and techniques...”¹¹³ It appears that American government officials throughout the southeastern U.S. perceived that Indians tribes were accepting white authority and their efforts to “civilize” them.

A few months after Duval replaced Neamathela; he analyzed the Seminole Indians again and stated that, “the state of the Indians in a moral point of view in Florida would shame their more polished white brothers. Drunkenness is the only common vice that they commit. They are generally honest and chaste, & many of them industrious.”¹¹⁴ Labeling the Seminoles as industrious further bolstered his point that the Seminoles were farming and accepting white authority. Later he stated, “the difficulty of reconciling the Indians to the late treaty; and to restrain them from outrage has not been inconsiderable, but to purswade and threaten them into a peaceable removal from this truly delightful country, required the exercise of uncommon patience, time, and prudence. I now believe confidently they will go without force, but evidently

14. ¹¹¹From Governor Duval to the Secretary of War Jul. 12, 1824 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII,

¹¹²White, *The Roots of Dependency*, 126-127; Atkinson, *Splendid Land, Splendid People*, 199.

¹¹³ Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society*, 1979), 50.

¹¹⁴From Governor Duval to Thomas L. McKenney Oct. 3, 1824 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXIII, 80.

with reluctance.”¹¹⁵ Despite highlighting that the Seminoles were not particularly happy about going to the reservation, Duval did not view the Seminoles as a threat to white authority that was attempting to “civilize” the Seminoles, even after the issues with Neamathela.

Gad Humphreys, the newly appointed Seminole Indian agent, in July of 1824, seems to have agreed with Duval, and pointed out, contrary to Gadsden’s opinion, that the lands given to the Seminoles were “wretchedly bad, and in my opinion cannot long sustain the Indians should any considerable number come from the West.”¹¹⁶ He further argued that because of the bad land the Indians desired to extend the reservation to the north. However, at the same time Humphreys indicated that, “the Indians however to say as far as can be ascertained they are perfectly pacific in disposition and appear to place great reliance on the Justice and fidelity of the United States.”¹¹⁷ Similar to Duval, Humphreys assumed that even though the Seminoles disagreed with the U.S. on some issues, they were peaceful and accepting white efforts to “civilize” them. He believed this because he was viewing the Seminoles through a prism of white manhood that assumed that Indians would accept white authority and policies. Throughout 1824 and 1825 many of the Seminoles began to slowly move into the reservation.¹¹⁸

Despite Duval and Humphreys viewing the Seminole Indians as no threat to white progress and the ability of white men to “civilize” the frontier, the citizens of Florida were concerned. Gadsden pointed out that, “the citizens of the counties of St. John and Alachua have

¹¹⁵From Governor Duval to the Secretary of War Oct. 26, 1824 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 89.

¹¹⁶From Gad Humphreys to Governor Duval Jul. 26, 1824 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 77.

¹¹⁷*Ibid.*

¹¹⁸Mahon, *History of the Second Seminole War*, 57.

for the last three weeks been agitated with apprehensions of Indian hostilities...¹¹⁹ As the result of the “unsettled state of most of the savages, arising from their very recent removal within limits to which they have never been perfectly reconciled.”¹²⁰ Gadsden argued that this dissatisfaction among the Seminoles “may possibly lead to secret individual outrages, and to depredation upon the stocks and fields of the White neighbors in Alachua...”¹²¹ This justified the use of a reservation because Gadsden believed that whites and Indians could not share land and needed to be separated. He also called for a military force to protect Florida’s “enterprising citizens.”¹²² The concern for white safety revolved around the notion that Seminoles may attack them and reject white authority that wanted to “civilize” them. Gadsden ultimately believed that the Seminole Indians were rejecting the reservation, which meant that they were rejecting white efforts to “civilize” them and could threaten white progress and the frontier. White settlers, at this time, agreed with Andrew Jackson’s opinion of the Seminole Indians because they saw them as clear threats to white authority and efforts of settlers to “civilize” the frontier.

After the Treaty of Moultrie Creek many government officials did not view the Seminole Indians as threats to white settlement and authority. In fact they went to great lengths to demonstrate that only a subset of the Seminoles were resisting white efforts to “civilize” them and place them on reservations; while at the same time arguing that a majority of the Seminole Indians were accepting white efforts to “civilize” them. Regardless, it seems that a majority of settlers began to view the Seminole Indians as threats to their ability to bring progress to the frontier and become Jeffersonian agrarians. Indeed, they began to view Seminoles who rejected

¹¹⁹ From James Gadsden to the Secretary of War Jul. 7, 1825 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXIII, 279.

¹²⁰*Ibid.*

¹²¹*Ibid.*

¹²²*Ibid.*

white authority by not accepting white “civilization” and Seminoles that were outside of the reservation as clear threats to their authority as white men. Eventually, the debate over the nature of the Seminoles shifted because questions arose about the reservation itself and whites began to fear that the Seminole Indians might not be capable of staying on the reservation even if they wanted too.

The question of whether the Seminoles would remain on the reservation was a major concern for two reasons: first, the Seminoles were starving and lacked resources, and second, if Indians left the reservation they could interfere with white settlers; meaning that they could challenge white perceptions of their dependence and challenge white Americans’ ability to farm the frontier. A letter written by the acting Territorial Governor of Florida George Walton, from October of 1825, depicted the problems with the Seminole reservation. He states that they,

have no means of subsistence within themselves; that there is no game in their country; that it is moreover exceedingly unhealthy, exposing them to sickness and inevitable death; and in fine, that no part of the country allotted to them for a residence is of such a description as to afford them comfortable settlements, or of such a quality as will enable them either to have stock or raise corn¹²³

Walton advised Humphreys to resolve the situation.¹²⁴ He argued that the Seminoles were using their complaints about the reservation to justify returning to their old settlements and warned that “if the Indians cannot be restrained within their limits, occurrences of an unpleasant nature between them and the white individuals must infallibly ensue complaints against them having been already made for depredations committed upon the Stocks of cattle & fields of corn belonging to whites.”¹²⁵ The Treaty of Moultrie Creek gave the best lands to white settlers and

¹²³From Acting Governor Walton to Thomas L. McKenney Oct. 6, 1825 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 335-336.

¹²⁴*Ibid*, 336.

¹²⁵*Ibid*.

left the Seminole Indians land that they could not farm. As a result, many Seminoles were incapable of accepting white agriculture even if they tried. So, the Treaty Moultrie Creek set up a situation where the Seminoles were stripped of their best lands, and forced to choose between starving or white authority. This was all taking place because in order for American settlers to be Jeffersonian agrarians they needed to develop land. In this case they needed to develop the former lands of the Seminole Indians on the frontier in Florida. Interestingly, because the Seminoles were unable to remain on the reservation settlers interpreted this as a rejection of white authority and began to view the Seminoles as a threat.

To ameliorate these concerns, Walton articulated two major goals: first, he wanted to keep the Seminoles from starving, and second, he wanted to protect white settlements. Intriguingly, both of these efforts reinforced the idea among white government officials that the Seminole Indians were dependent on the U.S. and accepting white authority that wanted to “civilize” them. He wanted to accomplish both objectives by stationing one of his agents along Suwannee River to both prevent the Seminoles from leaving and to give them corn, which was unsuccessful.¹²⁶ Furthermore, Walton continued to believe that the Seminoles would stay on the reservation peacefully if they were given, “some means of subsistence.”¹²⁷ He also argued that removal of the Seminoles to the west was an option because of “their present distressed & dissatisfied condition; and likewise be of incalculable advantage to the interest of the territory itself.”¹²⁸ Clearly, Walton believed that Seminole Indians needed to either accept white authority or be removed to the west. He pointed out that Americans perceived the Seminole Indians as

¹²⁶From Acting Governor Walton to Thomas L. McKenney Oct. 21, 1825 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 345-346.

¹²⁷*Ibid.*

¹²⁸*Ibid.*

threats when they rejected white efforts to “civilize” them. Walton, similar to other government officials, was acting like an authority figure of the Seminoles, but he broke with other government officials by supporting the settlers. His racial and gender world view and his view of himself as a paternalist and a Jeffersonian were interacting in this instance.

After receiving Walton’s letters, the superintendent of Indian Affairs, Thomas McKenney, wrote the Secretary of War about the condition of the Seminole Indians. He stated, “there is no difficulty in adjusting the limits so as to take in the Big Hammock. The line has already been directed to be so extended, as to embrace it...it is not reasonable to expect that there will be any change in their disposition and feelings, unless the Government undertake to feed them always.”¹²⁹ Next, he recommended that the government extend the reservation to include the Big Hammock so that the Seminoles would have more arable land, as Gad Humphreys called for, and if the Seminoles were still not happy, then he endorsed removal.¹³⁰ The superintendent favored removal if the U.S. needed to support the Seminoles for a long period of time, or if the Seminoles ultimately rejected white authority and efforts to “civilize” them. This opinion demonstrates that white paternalism and white efforts to “civilize” the Seminoles had their limits, especially when the Seminoles were not accepting white authority.

By the beginning of 1826 a clear divide had developed; settlers and their representatives saw the Seminole Indians as threats to their ability to bring “civilization” to the frontier. While most government officials perceived the Seminoles as being peaceful and no legitimate threat to white society. In January, a resolution from the legislative council of Florida demonstrates the

¹²⁹From Thomas L. McKenney to the Secretary of War Nov. 28, 1825 in *Florida Territorial Papers* XXIII, 358.

¹³⁰*Ibid*, 358-359.

opinion of the settlers “that the present condition of the Indians and the recent hostilities committed by them, form powerful motives for the adoption of measures for their immediate removal beyond the limits of the territory.”¹³¹ Despite moving to the reservation, settlers still viewed the Seminole Indians as threats to white society. The recent hostilities that the resolution mentioned caused Joseph White, the delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives from the Florida Territory, to call for the removal of the Seminoles. His argument sheds light on why Americans in Florida were so concerned about the Seminole Indians. He called for Seminole removal “for the protection of the agricultural interests of the Territory.”¹³² He thought the Seminole Indians were a threat to white men’s ability to improve Florida and become Jeffersonian agrarians.

Interestingly, White argued that the problem with the reservation was not that the land was unsuitable, but that the Seminoles refused to farm.¹³³ Therefore, he opposed extension of the reservation. He believed that if “they (the Seminoles) were disciplined in agricultural pursuits, a definite and small portion of land might be adequate to their wants; but considering their habits and mode of cultivation, it would be difficult to assign a satisfactory limit.”¹³⁴ He also argued that Seminoles were “deprived of the privileges of the chase” and that, “they were wanderers in an inhospitable clime...”¹³⁵ If the Seminoles were removed “Florida would be relieved from a disease, which has preyed upon its inhabitants with a morbid severity...”¹³⁶

White linked his view of the Seminole Indians to their failure to farm and their continuation of a

¹³¹Resolution by the Legislative Council Jan. 1, 1826 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 403.

¹³²From Delegate White to the Secretary of War Jan. 31, 1826 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 432.

¹³³*Ibid*, 433.

¹³⁴*Ibid*.

¹³⁵*Ibid*, 434.

¹³⁶*Ibid*.

nomadic lifestyle, one that stood in opposition to Jeffersonian agrarianism. He was not acting as a paternalist towards the Seminoles; his major concern was to preserve white Americans' ability to improve the frontier. This makes sense because many paternalists saw themselves as acting in the best interests of the larger community, and removing barriers to farmers would serve the white citizens of Florida.

Despite viewing the Seminoles as a threat to Jeffersonian agrarianism, White still viewed them as no major military threat. He stated that, "these people are distinguished from the Creeks and Cherokees, by a superior gentleness and docility, which would in a great measure incline them to yield to the impressions of persuasion."¹³⁷ He only saw the Seminoles as a threat if they rejected white ideals. His opinion of the Seminoles had nothing to do with them as a military threat. Many settlers and their representatives thought that the presence of the Seminole Indians would in some way impede their ability to develop the frontier. All the fears of the settlers at this time were not the result of genuine acts of violence but based off of rumors and hearsay.

Governor Duval challenged the arguments of the settlers and their representatives by stating that only one group of the Seminole were involved in hostilities. Duval pointed out that a majority of the Seminole Indians were not a threat to white society. He stated that,

I do not hesitate a moment in stating that the whole Indian Nation is under more complete control, and order than any other nation of Indians that can be found in the limits of the United States... The Mickkeesukee, tribe I must except from this general remark: they are and have ever been the most violent and lawless Indians in all the South. They have set their own Chiefs at defiance, and have abandoned

¹³⁷*Ibid.*

their limits, roving among the white inhabitants killing their hogs and cattle, and pillaging plantations.¹³⁸

He further argued that the “Indians complain as much as the Whites, they have most wantonly killed up the Cattle and hogs of the Nation, and will continue to do So. In fact their own people has Suffered as much from their depredations as our Citizens.”¹³⁹ This is the same argument that Duval made in 1824 concerning Neamathla.

Other government officials also recognized that only a subset of the Seminole Indians were a threat to white society, but they disagreed with Duval over which group posed the greatest threat. The Secretary of War argued, during a meeting with Seminole chiefs that were on visit to Washington D.C., that, “your young men are not always good. They go into the settlements and steal, and kill stock, and alarm whites, and the Women and Children.”¹⁴⁰ He informed the Seminole chiefs that, “your Great Father does not wish to oppress his Red Children. He has heard of your sufferings, and sent you some help. But he wishes me to inform you, that you have had time to plant and gather your crops, that you must rely for the future, on yourselves, and by your industry provide for your own support.”¹⁴¹ He continued, “your Great Father expects you to live in peace with one another, to be industrious and sober.”¹⁴² The racial and gender world view of white American men was definitely impacting the way that Secretary and President viewed the Seminole Indians and influenced their policies towards the Seminoles. Referring to the Seminoles as “Red children” and the President as “Great Father” clearly depicts

¹³⁸From Governor Duval to Thomas L. McKenney Apr. 5, 1826 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 501.

¹³⁹*Ibid.*

¹⁴⁰*Ibid.*

¹⁴¹*Ibid.*

¹⁴²From the Secretary of War to Delegation of Florida Indians May 10, 1826 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 540.

that these white policy makers believed that the Seminoles were dependent on the U.S. and that they would accept white authority. These individuals assumed this and because of their gender and racial world view they crafted a policy that required the Seminole Indians to accept white authority that wanted to “civilize” the Seminole by getting them to accept farming, and at the same time neither the Secretary or President viewed Seminole Indians as a threat.

In May of 1826, Gadsden reinserted himself in the debate over the nature of the Seminoles by arguing that Seminole Indians not on the reservation were the problem and defended the boundaries that he set for the Seminoles’ reservation. He espoused that if the Seminoles farmed the reservation it would have been more than sufficient for their subsistence.¹⁴³ Next, he called for only the Seminoles who “commence improvements” to get provisions from the U.S.¹⁴⁴ He also argued that the Seminoles outside the reservation were “a band of restless savages who have infested our Southern border ever since the termination of the Creek war of 1813-Wandering Ishamalites their hands are, and will continue to be raised against every people who will not assume the authority they have power to exercise.”¹⁴⁵ Similar to Duval, he viewed the noncompliant Seminoles as the major concern, but this was a large portion of the Seminole nation not one tribe or individual. Gadsden saw Seminole Indians outside of the reservation as threats to white improvement of Florida and to white men’s ability to exercise their manhood on the frontier.

A letter from July of 1836, written by a citizen of Florida, John Rodman, sheds light on how the citizens of Florida viewed the Seminole Indians. Rodman was concerned about the

¹⁴³From James Gadsden to the Secretary of War May 17, 1826 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 545-546.

¹⁴⁴*Ibid*, 547.

¹⁴⁵*Ibid*.

removal of a company of troops from Florida because he believed this would leave the citizens without protection because he thought that Governor Duval failed to organize the militia.¹⁴⁶ This argument was extremely critical of governor Duval and the letter argued the he was “entirely ignorant of the Real state of affairs in this district.”¹⁴⁷ Finally, Rodman purported that, “until the Indians be all removed, and quietly established within the boundaries allotted to them by the late treaty, there can be no peace or security for the inhabitants of this territory.”¹⁴⁸ This statement demonstrates that white settlers feared the Seminoles when they were outside the confines of the reservation because they were both a military threat and a threat to progress.

In August of 1826, Duval had an opportunity to respond to his critics and reiterated his past arguments. He acknowledged that the militia was not ready but, argued that the Seminoles were not the threat the public believed. He espoused that,

If I had two hundred muskets, and one hundred rifles to place in the hands of such men as belong to this Territory, we would want no aid or assistance from the United States to control the Indians in Florida, if any danger is to be apprehended it is from about two hundred lawless Indians Most of whom are the notorious Micosuka tribe... They are the Outlaws of their own Nation... The great body of the Nation have long since quietly Settled on their lands, and are friendly and attentive to the advice given to them... There is no danger of the Indians resorting to arms except in self defense, they are entirely sensible of their feeble situation and dependence on the Government.¹⁴⁹

He also argued that if a “detachment of regular troops could be ordered ...to land at Fort St. Marks and scour all the Country between that place eastward thro’ Alachua County destroying all the Indian Settlements out of their limits, I can assure you that No More Complaints will be

¹⁴⁶From John Rodman to the Secretary of War Jul. 11, 1826 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 604-605.

¹⁴⁷*Ibid*, 605.

¹⁴⁸*Ibid*.

¹⁴⁹From Governor Duval to the Secretary of War Aug. 29, 1826 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 636.

Made of Indian Depredations.”¹⁵⁰ Finally, he pointed out that some of the Seminoles were in an excited state because of problems that were occurring among the Creeks.¹⁵¹ At no time did Duval believe that all Seminoles posed a threat to the security of Florida. Duval attempted to demonstrate that the concerns were unwarranted. Furthermore, Duval appeared to be in the middle of a public debate concerning the nature of the Seminole Indians, one in which he disagreed with the citizens of his territory.

Other government officials, including some soldiers, supported Governor Duval. George McCall bolstered Duval’s arguments. He depicted the Seminoles as no real threat, and labeled the settlers as alarmists. In October, McCall stated that, “notwithstanding all the alarms that have tortured the minds of the over-anxious and the prognostications of the over-wise, the command, both here and detached, has enjoyed uninterrupted health.”¹⁵² His statement implied that he saw no indication of a Seminole threat and believed the settlers were overreacting. A clear public debate was taking place in which most government officials denigrated the perceived Seminole threat even as settlers expressed their fears of the Indians.

In the winter of 1826 American-Seminole relations reached a critical point after a group of Seminoles murdered Americans in both Florida and Georgia. The Secretary of War sent 500 troops to help secure Florida under the command of Colonel Clinch.¹⁵³ As a result of these hostilities, there was a renewal in the calls for removal of the Seminoles, but the arguments shifted because these individuals believed that the Seminoles were rejecting white authority and efforts by white men to push them to “civilization.” In January of 1827 Thomas McKenney once

¹⁵⁰*Ibid*, 637.

¹⁵¹*Ibid*.

¹⁵²McCall, *Letters From the Frontiers*, 1974), 163.

¹⁵³From the Secretary of War to Governor Duval Jan. 8, 1827 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXIII, 717.

again argued in favor of removing the Seminoles, but this time his argument shifted from opposition to government support for the Seminoles to a position that claimed removal would free the Seminoles of temptation. He wanted the Seminole removed “into a Country where they would be at once freed from the temptations to depredate which the supplies of their more provident neighbors set before them.”¹⁵⁴ His argument had clear paternalist roots because he wanted to make the decision for the Seminoles and, similar to Gadsden, his main concern was to “secure the citizens of Florida.”¹⁵⁵ Joseph White also advocated, yet again, for the removal of the Seminoles, but unlike McKenney, he did not want to remove the Seminoles from temptation; rather he wanted to protect them. White espoused that the Seminole Indians “must eventually be removed, or perish, I think there can be no question...with their habits of life, and ignorance of the arts of husbandry and agriculture, it is impossible that they can live within the present assigned limits.”¹⁵⁶ White wanted to remove the Seminoles to protect them from themselves because he genuinely believed that the only way to save the Seminoles was for them to accept white authority by farming.

Duval’s reaction depicts that government officials and settlers viewed the Seminole differently even though it appeared that hostilities were underway. Duval’s reaction differed greatly from McKenney’s and White’s because, even after hostilities, he argued that a subset of the Seminole Indians were the problem and viewed most Seminoles as no real threat. He stated that, “hostilities have now Commenced and I do believe that the discontented Creeks & the

¹⁵⁴From Thomas L. McKenney to Delegate White Jan. 9, 1827 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 720.

¹⁵⁵*Ibid*, 721.

¹⁵⁶From Delegate White to the Secretary of War, Jun. 15, 1827 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 866.

Mickasuky tribe of the Seminole Indians have determined to destroy our settlements.”¹⁵⁷ He even stated in another letter that, “I have no fear of general hostilities, but danger is apprehended from the marauding bands of the Mickasukee tribe.”¹⁵⁸ Furthermore, his argument was, yet again, bolstered by military personnel in Florida. Colonel Clinch, who was sent by the Secretary of War believed the Seminoles to be no legitimate threat. He reported that, “from all that I have been able to learn I feel Confident that there is no hostile intention on the part of either the Creek or Seminole Nation...The outrages and murders recently Committed in Georgia and Florida, were the Acts of a few desperate Outlaws...”¹⁵⁹ Clinch further supported his claims in April by saying that, “it appears that all of the Indians with a very few exceptions were within their limits and appeared disposed to be orderly and peaceable.”¹⁶⁰ The Adjutant General Edmund P. Gaines also espoused “that perfect tranquility has been restored in that quarter, and that outrages committed there in the winter were not indicative of any general Spirit of Indian hostility, but rather, ascribable to the wantonness of a few individuals of the tribe.”¹⁶¹ Overall, these government officials perceived the Seminoles as no threat, unlike the settlers of Florida, because these officials did not believe that they were rejecting white authority.

Despite having reassurances that the Seminoles were secure, white settlers continued to view the Seminole Indians differently from most government officials because they believed that

¹⁵⁷*Ibid*, 864.

¹⁵⁸From Governor Duval to Thomas L. McKenney, Jan. 9, 1827 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 722.

¹⁵⁹From Duncan L. Clinch to the Commanding General Feb. 13, 1827 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 758.

¹⁶⁰From Duncan L. Clinch to the Adjutant General Apr. 1, 1827 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 808-809.

¹⁶¹From the Adjutant General to Edmund P. Gaines Jul. 6, 1827 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 883.

the Seminoles were still committing hostilities. A Memorial to the Congress by the Legislative Council of Florida stated that,

the most inhuman butcheries have been committed by them; a whole family has fallen a sacrifice to their vengeance, and individuals have been murdered while on the high way and engaged in that industry which constitutes the Soul and energy of our country. Our corn houses have been broke and plundered; our cattle killed, and our citizens driven from their homes, and threatened with all the horrors of Indian cruelty, within the space of the last two months.¹⁶²

These comments are intriguing because members of the U.S. military argued that Florida was secure and quiet throughout this two month period. It is unclear if the memorial was referring to some new unrecorded hostility, to the events that took place months before in Georgia, or if it was fictitious. The source also portrays that the Seminole Indians were attacking the cornerstone of America's racial and gender world view the ability for white men to farm and become Jeffersonian agrarians. Furthermore, the Memorialists espoused that the actions of Duval and the military "in some degree quieted the fears of our citizens, but at what time, and in what place, the bent bow will let slip its arrow, the blood of our citizens, will we fear, soon proclaim. In this gloomy situation of our Territory, your Memorialists beg the speedy removal of these people out of the Territory."¹⁶³ These citizens even argued that the Seminoles were "bent on war."¹⁶⁴

Similar to past arguments, many white settlers feared the Seminole Indians and wanted them removed because they were a threat to white men's ability to develop Florida and the frontier. In this instance they truly believed that the Seminoles were a legitimate threat to white authority.

Furthermore, in July of 1827, Delegate White took concerns about the Seminoles to another level by arguing that the Seminoles could conquer all of Florida. He wrote,

¹⁶²Memorial to Congress by the Legislative Council Jul. 1827 in *Florida Territorial Papers* XXIII, 897.

¹⁶³*Ibid.*

¹⁶⁴*Ibid.*

I might urge that it was impolitic if not dangerous in case of invasion, to leave an internal foe, as numerous as the whites, in a frontier remote from the States, and inaccessible, in the moment of need, to be tampered with, by such enemies, as it has been our lot to find. Sir, such men as Nicols, and Armbrister, and Arburthnot, aided by British arms and British gold operating on savage cupidity would revolutionise East Florida and massacre the whites, before the people of Georgia could hear of the danger.¹⁶⁵

This argument appealed to the world view of many Americans because they thought that the Seminoles were highly susceptible to the influence of foreigners who did not have the best interests of the Seminoles at heart. These white male government officials really believed that the best thing for the Seminoles was white American authority because they wanted to push the Seminoles to “civilization.” Similar to other individuals, White wanted the Seminoles removed, not just because they were a military threat, but because they were a threat to white industry. He highlighted a dream of Florida filled “with emigrants from every portion of the union-Forrest falling before the axe of Industry and fields of cotton blooming where they stood-I will show you a city, in the place of a wigwam-and a press inculcating the mild principles of republicanism, where the war hoop was lately heard.”¹⁶⁶ Americans, such as White, were highly influenced by their racial and gender world view, which caused them to view the Seminole Indians as a threat to whites’ ability in Florida to become Jeffersonian agrarians if the Seminole Indians rejected white efforts to “civilize” them.

After the Secretary of War sent more troops to Florida in the winter of 1826-1827, complaints over the Seminoles committing crimes and injustices against whites decreased in the territorial papers significantly. Despite this, in April of 1828 Delegate White’s reaction to the

¹⁶⁵From Delegate White to the Secretary of War Jul. 1827 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 899-900.

¹⁶⁶*Ibid*, 899.

possible closing of Fort King demonstrated that he clearly believed the only reason Florida was peaceful stemmed from the presence of the Army in the region. He stated that,

I am aware, Sir, that the Indians within the Territory of Florida, at present are quiet, and have recently given no indications of an unfriendly disposition; but the removal of these troops-the abandonment of Camp King, will leave them without check; and will expose an extensive planting district in East Florida...to all the apprehensions and hazards of an unprotected frontier, bordered by Savages.¹⁶⁷

Even though complaints concerning the Seminole decreased many individuals still feared them.

Despite the Seminoles appearing to be in a “peaceful” state and under the control of the military, calls for the removal of the Seminoles remained; but this time Territorial Governor Duval was leading the charge. He stated that, “the Semminolee nation are poor & miserable and if not removed will in a few years become extinct. Their preservation & happiness, demand the change more than the interest of Florida-though it is admitted that the growth and propriety of the Territory depend in a considerable degree on the removal of the Indians.”¹⁶⁸ Duval, similar to White and Andrew Jackson, adopted an extremely paternalistic argument and wanted the Seminole Indians removed for their own good because they were rejecting white authority. Theda Perdue also pointed out that the rejection of white authority and farming was also a reason why Andrew Jackson wanted the Cherokee Indians removed, which is interesting because the Cherokee were farming and accepting “civilization.” She also argued that Thomas Jefferson wanted the Cherokee removed as well because he thought that they would be destroyed by white “civilization.”¹⁶⁹ These were very similar argument to the ones used at this time for the Seminole Indians. This was a major shift in Duval’s behavior from his previous advocacy for the

¹⁶⁷From Delegate White to the Secretary of War Apr. 16, 1828 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 1066.

¹⁶⁸From Governor Duval to the Secretary of War Jan. 24, 1828 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 1014.

¹⁶⁹Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society*, 60-62.

Seminoles to remain in Florida. Duval continued to support his new position, in July, when he called for the Secretary of War to allow McKenney to visit the Seminoles and to convince them to move west. Duval stated that, “humanity will be consulted and the remnant of these Tribes Saved from destruction”¹⁷⁰ He echoed these arguments in October when he wrote, “These Indians residing on the River, must soon become extinct. The trade is increasing fast and their intercourse with boatmen, will certainly destroy them...Humanity demands the removal of these unfortunate people as early as possible.”¹⁷¹ Duval’s writings, demonstrate that the reason he supported removal was that the Seminoles were causing their own destruction because they were rejecting white authority and in order to save them he believed that they needed to be removed.

At this point it seems that government officials’ view of the Seminole Indians began to change because many of them called for the removal of the Seminole Indians outside of Florida. Both the Secretary of War and Gad Humphreys adopted Duval’s and Andrew Jackson’s argument. In July of 1828 the Secretary of War argued that, “the condition of the Florida Indians is such as to its very wretchedness, besides the annoyance which they occasion to the Citizens of Florida, which is consequent upon their poverty and want, as to make it extremely desirable to relieve both; and nothing prevents the steps being taken, at this time, which you suggest, but the inadequacy of the means provided by Congress for such objects...”¹⁷² In October, Gad Humphreys demonstrated that a group of Seminole Chiefs were willing to travel west to view territory for possible removal. He then argued “that I have long hoped, that Such removal, under

¹⁷⁰From Governor Duval to the Secretary of War Jul. 17, 1828 in Clarence Edwin Carter, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, Vol. XXIV, *The Territory of Florida 1828-1834* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1959), 41.

¹⁷¹From Governor Duval to Thomas L. McKenney, Oct. 12, 1828 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 83.

¹⁷²From the Secretary of War to Delegate White Jul. 11, 1828 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 35.

suitable and fair circumstances, would tend to the benefit & happiness of the Indians themselves:-distressed as I know these people are, by irremediable evils within the present limits of their National Territory, & harassed by the persecution of their neighbors...”¹⁷³ Both the Secretary and Humphreys agreed with Duval that removal was in the best interest of the Seminoles.

Historian Richard White also points out that American government officials’ policies during Choctaw removal were informed by their paternalist world view. He argued that as subsets of the Choctaw accepted farming and white efforts to “civilize” them, “the Americans wrapped removal in the mantle of benevolence, arguing that they only wished to rescue starving hunters from impoverishment and degradation.”¹⁷⁴ This argument is similar to the arguments by Jackson, Duval, Humphreys and several other government officials concerning the Seminole Indians.

By the end of 1828 there was a clear disparity of opinion concerning the Seminole Indians because of the racial and gender world views of the American groups involved. Settlers and their representatives viewed the Seminole Indians as a threat to Jeffersonian agrarians in the region and the frontier because they rejected white efforts to “civilize” them. Many government officials began to support removal of the Seminole Indians because they wanted to protect them from extinction by white society because many of the Seminoles would not accept white authority and efforts to “civilize” them. This argument is at its core paternalistic because these white men believed that they had the authority to make these decisions for the Seminole Indians.

¹⁷³From Gad Humphreys to Thomas L. McKenney Oct. 20, 1828 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 92.

¹⁷⁴White, *The Roots of Dependency*, 126-127.

Both government officials and settlers wanted the Seminoles removed, but for different reasons. Furthermore, their arguments harkened back to Andrew Jackson's opinion that the Seminole Indians needed to be removed for their protection and to secure the frontier in Florida.

Between 1823 and 1828 American opinions of the Seminoles shifted several times and similar to white views of the Seminole Indians their views of the Black Seminoles also shifted. Between 1820 and 1823 the white American view of the Black Seminoles was fairly consistent because most government officials and settlers, except for Andrew Jackson, viewed them as no threat. Furthermore, settlers wanted these slaves to help white men farm the frontier, which would bring "civilization" to the region and help define these white men as Jeffersonian agrarians. Between 1823 and 1828 the American perspective of them definitely began to change. Most government officials, especially Governor Duval and Gad Humphreys, began to agree with Jackson and viewed the Black Seminoles as threats. Meanwhile, settlers and their representatives continued to call for the return of runaway slaves, as they did between 1821 and 1823, because they needed them for labor but the amount of claims increased exponentially. Interestingly, by 1828, both government officials and settlers seemed to have the same goal; they wanted to separate or strip the Seminole Indians of their slaves, but for what appeared to be different reasons and they used different methods. Regardless, both groups seemed to want the Black Seminoles under white authority. George Fredrickson pointed this idea out, but he argued that Americans began to believe that all slaves needed to be under white authority because of the fear of a slave revolt.¹⁷⁵ This fear does not appear in the territorial papers up to this point. But, that

¹⁷⁵Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind*, 52-53.

does not mean that it was not an underlying reason driving settlers to want to obtain the slaves among the Seminoles.

A petition from October of 1823 to the President of the U.S. demonstrated that settlers were concerned because they claimed that they were losing property with no recourse. In this petition they argued that it was “utterly impossible for your petitioners, and other Sufferers, to reclaim their property.”¹⁷⁶ They attested that the government was inactive and argued that more slaves were escaping who were “putting themselves under the protection of individual Indians, who claim them as their private property merely to protect them from their rightful owners.”¹⁷⁷ Finally, they called for the President to remedy the situation by instituting tribunals to determine who owned claimed slaves.¹⁷⁸ In December, the Secretary of War responded to the petition by arguing that the President did not have the power to fix the situation and that the petitioners needed to contact Congress.¹⁷⁹ Similar to 1823, these settlers saw themselves as Jeffersonian agrarians that wanted their runaway slaves returned because they saw slavery as a way to farm the frontier, but they also wanted to have these slaves under white authority not the authority of the Seminole Indians. Settlers could have wanted these slaves returned and under white authority because they were a possible threat. No evidence of this has yet been seen in the source material used in this study, but Theda Perdue did point these concerns out among the Cherokee and argued that white Americans wanted to separate slaves and Indians because of their fears of

¹⁷⁶Petition to the President by Inhabitants of the Territory Oct. 4, 1823 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXII, 763.

¹⁷⁷*Ibid.*

¹⁷⁸*Ibid.*

¹⁷⁹From the Secretary of War to Samuel Cook and Others Dec. 30, 1823 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXII, 820-821.

possible slave rebellions.¹⁸⁰ This may have been an underlying driving force for the efforts of settlers to get their slaves returned and under their authority.

Governor Duval's view of the Black Seminoles changed, in January of 1826, when he began to see the Black Seminoles as possible threats, similar to Andrew Jackson. While addressing possible removal of the Seminoles, Duval stated that, "I strongly advise that the Florida Indians be encouraged to sell all their slaves-I am convinced that it is owing to them that the Indians have not acted properly-the negroes have unbounded influence over them and are much more hostile to the white people than their masters-The Indians exercise no control over their slaves, and they derive no advantage from their labour..."¹⁸¹ Duval, because of his paternal world view, was critical of the Seminoles because they were not treating their slaves as dependents. The main reason why he wanted the Seminoles and Black Seminoles separated was because he thought the Black Seminoles were influencing the Seminoles to reject white authority. Intriguingly, Duval seems to call for the Seminoles and Black Seminoles to be separated at the same time that he began to call for Seminole removal. Furthermore, as Perdue mentioned, he was trying to separate the Seminole from their slaves, but he does not seem to link these fears to a possible slave rebellion.¹⁸² But, as mentioned previously, and considering that Duval called for removal and separation right around the same time fears of a slave rebellion could be an underlying cause. Intriguingly, at this time it seems that both government officials and settlers wanted to separate the Seminole Indians and their slaves, but government officials

¹⁸⁰ Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society*, 41.

¹⁸¹From Governor Duval to Thomas L. McKenney Jan. 12, 1826 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXIII, 414.

¹⁸²Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society*, 41.

wanted the Seminoles forced to sell all their slaves and settlers were content with taking them one at a time.

Later in March, Duval also tied his argument to Jeffersonian ideals by arguing that the Seminoles were not benefiting from their ownership of the slaves; meaning that their slaves were not producing or helping the Seminoles become more industrious.¹⁸³ Finally, he suggested “that the Secretary advise them to Sell their Slaves as Soon as they Can find purchasers and Clear out all free negroes from the Nation.”¹⁸⁴ Duval also argued, “if this was done you would never hear of the planters Complaining that their Slaves were Constantly running away from them into the Indian nation, which has been and is now the fact not less than four gentlemen have met with me at this place in order to reclaim slaves...”¹⁸⁵ Clearly, Duval was under a tremendous amount of pressure to obtain these claimed slaves from the Seminoles. But, it also demonstrates that the Seminoles were not accepting white authority because they were not using their slaves to farm, which helped justify Seminole removal and separating the Seminoles from the Black Seminoles who were influencing them to reject white authority.

In the later part of March, Duval stated that,

I wish you would converse at large with CO Humphreys as to the manner these people have been cheated and imposed upon by some of the Inhabitants of Florida, The persons who have been most clamourous about their claims on the Indians for property are those who have cheated under false reports, these people of their slaves who have since gone back to the Indians I have been adjudicating on these claims for some time almost daily since my arrival here. The Justice which the Indians are intituled to they cannot obtain... The government should have their property restored to them or pay the value of it.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸³From Governor Duval to Thomas L. McKenney Mar. 2, 1826 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXIII, 454.

¹⁸⁴*Ibid.*

¹⁸⁵*Ibid.*

¹⁸⁶From Governor Duval to Thomas L. McKenney Mar. 20, 1826 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 483.

Duval pointed out that settlers would do whatever it took to gain slaves from the Seminole Indians, or separate the Seminoles from their slaves. Interestingly, Duval seems to have the same goal as the settlers because he wanted to separate the Seminoles from their slaves because they were influencing the Seminoles to reject white authority, but he clearly disagreed with them in the way the situation should be handled. He was clearly informed by paternalism and was placing himself in the role as an advocate for the Seminole Indians at this time because he was trying to protect them from white settlers that were trying to cheat them out of their property.

Calls by white Americans in the South for the return of slaves continued to increase throughout the rest of 1827 and 1828. As a result in September of 1827, Gad Humphreys, similar to Duval, began to see the slaves among the Seminoles as a possible threat. Humphreys wanted the authority to give Seminoles permission to sell their slaves.¹⁸⁷ Similar to Duval, Humphreys believed that, “the negroes of the Seminole Indians, are wholly independent, or at least regardless of the authority of their masters; and are Slaves but in name... a more Substantial reason however... exists in the fact, of the great influence the Slaves posses over their masters...”¹⁸⁸ These were the same reasons why Duval wanted the Seminoles to give up their slaves, and saw them as a potential threat because they were influencing the Seminoles to reject white authority. Similar to Duval, Humphreys was alarmed by the state of the slaves because the Seminoles were not using their slaves to bring themselves into “civilization” and their slaves were influencing them. So, Humphreys called for these two groups to be separated.

¹⁸⁷From Gad Humphreys to Acting Governor McCarty Sept. 6, 1827 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIII, 911.

¹⁸⁸*Ibid.*

Interestingly, the Seminole Indians seemed to understand the goals of the settlers of Florida and government officials in the region. Government agents among the Seminoles highlighted that the Seminoles were becoming concerned about their slaves and “that it is the determination of the United States to take them all.”¹⁸⁹ Furthermore, in a talk with a Seminole chief named Jumper, Jumper stated that “it seems that the white people will not rest, or suffer us to do so, till they have got all the property belonging to us, and made us poor...we fear that the laws will leave to us nothing.”¹⁹⁰ Clearly, the Seminole Indians understood what was going on, but their statements also bolster that it was the ultimate goal of government officials and settlers to strip the Seminoles of their slaves and their land.

Duval and Humphreys genuinely saw the influence of the Black Seminoles over the Seminole Indians as a threat because they were encouraging the Seminoles to reject white authority, but Duval wanted the Seminole Indians compensated for their slaves because of he saw himself as their advocate, which reflected his paternalist world view. Settlers at first glance seemed to want obtain the slaves among the Seminoles for themselves by claiming that they were runaways, or by using fraud. This was done to support settlers’ ability to bring “civilization” to the frontier. Both groups wanted the Seminoles and their slaves separated. Interestingly, none of the source material mentions if settlers also wanted their slaves returned because they feared the Black Seminoles, but it does seem that they wanted to make sure that these slaves were under white authority. Duval and Humphreys viewed the Black Seminoles influencing the Seminole Indians as a threat because they believed they were encouraging the

¹⁸⁹Sprague, *The Origins, Progress, and Conclusion of the Florida War*, 52.

¹⁹⁰*Ibid*, 50-51.

Seminole to reject white authority. As mentioned previously, an underlying cause of these calls for the slaves among the Seminoles may also have been linked to the fear of a slave rebellion.

By the end of 1828, both government officials and settlers wanted the Seminole Indians removed and the Black Seminoles separated from the Seminole Indians. However, both of these groups wanted these goals attained for different reasons. Settlers wanted the Seminole Indians removed because they saw them as a threat to their ability to improve the frontier and define themselves as Jeffersonian agrarians. They were acting according to their racial and gender world view that was highly influenced by Jeffersonian ideals and fears of challenges to their independence and white authority. While government officials did not view the Seminole Indians as threats, they ultimately wanted them removed in 1828 because they were rejecting white authority and “civilization” that these officials thought would lead to their extinction. These beliefs were clearly informed by paternalism, but they also acknowledged that removing the Seminole Indians would benefit Florida; demonstrating that they were also informed by Jeffersonian ideals. These two world views would eventually collide and government officials eventually supported one by the time the Second Seminole War began. Furthermore, settlers wanted the Seminole Indians and the Black Seminoles separated because they wanted the slaves to assist them in improving Florida. While government officials wanted the two groups separated because they believed that the Black Seminoles were a threat because they were influencing the Seminole Indians to reject white authority. Interestingly, the underlying causes of these calls are not yet understood, but they maybe, as the next section of this analysis will show, linked to white American fears of a slave rebellion.

CHAPTER 3: SLAVERY AND REMOVAL 1829-1836

From 1820 to 1828 white American policy makers and settlers were influenced by their racial and gender world views. Both settlers' and government officials' world views by 1828 were highly influenced by Jeffersonian ideals of manhood or their desire to be Jeffersonian agrarians; whereas many government officials in Florida also appeared to be influenced by paternalism. By 1828, settlers wanted the Seminole Indians removed because they were a threat to their own progress as agrarians and were calling for the return of runaway slaves that they claimed were the Black Seminoles. Government officials did not fear the Seminole Indians, but they called for their removal to protect them and because of their rejection of white authority. They did fear the influence that the Black Seminole had over the Seminole Indians and called for the Seminoles and the Black Seminoles to be separated. From 1829 to 1836 the opinions of Americans concerning the Seminoles and the Black Seminoles changed dramatically due to fears of a possible slave insurrection, and resistance to removal by the Seminole Indians.

Many American settlers continued to view the Seminoles as threats to white men's attempts to bring "civilization" to Florida, but increasingly the Seminole Indians were also viewed as a threat to the slave population. Government officials also shifted their position to view both the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles as threats to white authority. George Fredrickson pointed out that Nat Turner's actions fostered a fear of slave insurrections and convinced Americans that slaves needed to be under white authority in order to not be considered a direct threat to white society.¹⁹¹ The events leading up to the Second Seminole War

¹⁹¹Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind*, 52-53.

represented the unfolding of the worst fears of white American men because Seminoles and Black Seminoles resistance to removal posed a clear threat to the frontier and white men's ability to pursue their economic and political interests as Jeffersonian agrarians. Indeed, their rejection of white authority posed a threat to the entire system of plantation slavery in the southern U.S. By the beginning of the Second Seminole War white Americans viewed both groups as threats to white authority and endorsed removal.

From 1829 to 1831 Americans' concerns about the Seminoles and the Black Seminoles were not frequent topics in the territorial papers, perhaps because troops stationed in the region were able to manage the Indian population in Florida. Many Americans thought the Seminoles would remove peacefully. Nevertheless, hints of future problems could be discerned in the correspondence surrounding an alleged abuse of power by the Indian agent, Gad Humphreys. In January of 1829, Governor Duval voiced trepidations that, "we shall have much more difficulty than the Department, could anticipate from the Agents letter..."¹⁹² It appeared that Humphrey's dereliction could compromise removal. In May, Duval claimed that Humphreys had undermined him in his duty of enforcing removal.¹⁹³ At this point Duval viewed Humphreys as the major problem and apparently did not regard the Seminoles as a threat.

Territorial delegate White also had concerns about Humphreys. In February he argued, that

The miserable condition of the Florida Indians, and the present state of affairs with the agent, present great difficulty as to the best mode of proceeding; They have signified their willingness to go over the Mississippi, & their present situation renders it indispensable that something should be done-I would

¹⁹²From Governor Duval to Thomas L. McKenney Jan. 28, 1829 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXIV, 147.

¹⁹³From Governor Duval to the Secretary of War May 4, 1829 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 210.

respectfully suggest that a deputation be ordered here under the direction of Governor Duval & the subagent Phagan, so that their views wishes, & prospects may be fairly known, & such measures taken as may be most proper for them & the country.¹⁹⁴

White, similar to Duval, understood that the U.S. needed to ascertain the intentions of the Seminoles without the input of Humphreys. White also reiterated the paternalist argument that the Seminoles needed removal as it would protect them because of their “indispensible” situation. Interestingly, at the same time these government officials were concerned about the impact of Humphreys’ potential removal from office, in March of 1829 citizens wrote a Memorial that called for the government to keep Humphreys in place. They stated, “We have good reason to believe that if the Services of Col. Humphreys in his present capacity are continued, the final emigration of the Seminole Indians out of the Territory (an event so much to be desired by the Inhabitants of this County, most of who reside in the immediate vicinity of the Indians) may in short time be effected.”¹⁹⁵ They wanted Humphreys to stay because they thought his presence would speed up removal. Settlers did not seem concerned about removal in early 1829 because the Seminole or the Black Seminoles were a threat, but because the firing of the Indian Agent might send negotiations into a tailspin.

The question of Seminole removal and Humphreys’ role as Indian agent was complicated by differing perceptions of who was responsible for satisfying planter claims regarding runaway slaves. In a letter from May of 1829, Duval indicated that he received criticism because several citizens believed he was not performing his duty in regards to runaway slave claims.¹⁹⁶ However,

¹⁹⁴From Delegate White to Thomas L. McKenney Feb. 14, 1829 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 151.

¹⁹⁵Memorial to the Secretary of War by Inhabitants of Alachua County Mar. 15, 1829 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 165.

¹⁹⁶From Governor Duval to Oren Marsh May 29, 1829 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 232.

Duval defended himself by claiming that, “so far as my authority and power could extend, everything I could do was done by me.”¹⁹⁷ He then espoused that Humphreys was the problem. He supported his opinions with a letter written by Oren Marsh who wrote, “I believe in almost every one, he (Humphreys) has thrown every obstacle in his power, in the way, to prevent the delivery to the white claimants of the slaves in the nation.”¹⁹⁸ An unstable Indian Agent in 1829 caused much concern among Floridians and Marsh’s charges reflect the fears planters had that the actions of Indian agents could undermine the slave system. Both government officials and settlers were concerned about the stability of both the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles; clearly they did not want any obstacles in the way of possible removal.

In October 1829, settlers again voiced their concerns about the Seminole Indians following the removal of troops from Fort King. James Dell wrote President Jackson that the inhabitants of Alachua were “helpless and unprotected,” because of the closing of the fort.¹⁹⁹ He then stated, “that a family of the name of Howard have been butchered at Suwanney Old Town by the Indians” and that the Seminole were “buying up all the powder they can get...”²⁰⁰ Finally, he expressed the hope that, “a garrison of four companies of United States troops be stationed at Micanopia...”²⁰¹ To protect the women and children of the region. He believed the garrison would “be the only possible means of keeping the Indians within their boundary and of putting a stop to their depredations.”²⁰² A letter to President Jackson from the citizens of Alachua bolstered Dell’s claims, stating that “our situation at present is alarming, and rendered still more

¹⁹⁷*Ibid.*

¹⁹⁸From Oren Marsh to Governor Duval May 29, 1829 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 233.

¹⁹⁹From James Dell *Et Al.* to the President Oct. 1829 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 282.

²⁰⁰*Ibid.*

²⁰¹*Ibid*, 283.

²⁰²*Ibid*, 283-284.

so by a leave of absence for six months which we are sorry to learn has been granted the Agent. Within a few days parties of them (Seminoles) have been detached in the fact of plundering our stock...²⁰³ They demanded a garrison of four companies and ammunition sent to the militia to defend the county and their families.²⁰⁴

In November of 1829 more concerns surfaced. Samuel Cooper, an Aide de Camp, argued in a letter to commander Clinch that settlers were concerned about the “Creeks who visit them (Seminoles) occasionally, may be mischievously inclined, and that they will materially thereby affect the peace and happiness of the settlement and have requested that a post might be established somewhere in the interior, in order to check the restless disposition evinced by the Indians.”²⁰⁵ Cooper then proposed a change in strategy to secure Florida. He argued that, “an excursion could be made at any time by a company, lightly armed and equipped for a short tour of service, without any considerable expense, and it is such a movement, which is contemplated as all that will be required to keep peace in the Peninsula...”²⁰⁶ All of the concerns of citizens at this time had to do with how many troops were in Florida and how they were being used.

By the end of 1829 settlers perceived the Seminoles as threats to white authority and white men’s ability to bring “civilization” to the frontier, but as in the past these concerns were unwarranted and overestimated. Furthermore, government officials in Florida did not view the Seminole Indians as a threat. In January of 1830, General Clinch responded to Cooper. Clinch argued that he had a “tolerable and correct estimate as to the least expensive, and most certain

²⁰³Inhabitants of Alachua Country to the President No date 1829 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 285.

²⁰⁴*Ibid.*

²⁰⁵From Samuel Cooper to Duncan L. Clinch, Nov. 30, 1829 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 297-298.

²⁰⁶*Ibid.*, 298.

mode of giving safety to, and quieting the fears and apprehensions of the Citizens of this new and interesting section of the Union.”²⁰⁷ He proposed that, “a company permanently stationed near the boundary line, would keep the Indians in awe and prevent them in great measure from making their predatory excursions into the settlements...”²⁰⁸ He also called for the reopening of Fort King.²⁰⁹ Clinch also received the endorsement of the Commander of the Army in January of 1830. General Macomb stated that, “if the commanding Officer Colonel Clinch uses that vigilance which I have every reason to believe he will, I cannot see that any danger, can be apprehended from the miserable Indians, who inhabit the peninsula of Florida.”²¹⁰ Interestingly, Macomb used paternalist language when referring to the Seminoles as being in a “miserable” state; he viewed the Seminoles as dependent and as no real threat to the white authority. Until October of 1831, the presence of the military in the region reduced the number of complaints against the Seminoles.

For the rest of 1830 and most of 1831 three topics dominated the discussion of American agents in Florida: education for children, the return of runaway slaves, and delays in negotiations for the removal of the Seminoles. In April of 1830, it came to the attention of Governor Duval that President Jackson and the Secretary of War wanted the male children of the Seminoles sent to schools in Kentucky. This desire reflected the paternalist ideals of racial uplift. McKenney, the head of the Department of Indian Affairs, argued that “the greatest benefits which we can bestow on the Indians, is to enlighten and improve their Children, and qualify them to be of use to

²⁰⁷From Duncan L. Clinch to the Commanding General Jan. 4, 1830 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 319-320.

²⁰⁸*Ibid*, 320.

²⁰⁹*Ibid*, 320-321.

²¹⁰From the Commanding General to the Secretary of War Jan. 28, 1830 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 340.

themselves and their tribe.”²¹¹ After working out the particulars and funding, the Seminoles finally accepted the school in May of 1831 and several chiefs sent their sons to Kentucky, although some Seminoles refused to participate in the education experiment.²¹² James Atkinson highlights a similar effort with the Chickasaws. He noted that the Chickasaw agent tried several times to establish a school in the nation and failed. Finally, an 1819 act of the Congress provided funding for the U.S. government to pay for the education of the Chickasaws by missionaries.²¹³ Government officials seemed to be using many of the same policies with the Seminoles that had been tried successfully with other Southeast Indian nations.

Between 1830 and 1831 calls for the return of runaway slaves among the Seminole persisted. Samuel Hamilton of the Department of War Office of Indian Affairs recommended “that if claimants will authorize the agent to offer the Indians a reasonable compensation for apprehending and delivering them...there is little doubt it would lead to the recovery of the negroes in many instances, where other means have failed.”²¹⁴ Paying Indians to round up runaway slaves was a common practice that had the added benefit of fostering animosity between the two groups. The strategy was designed to prevent slaves and Indians from interacting and fomenting a slave rebellion, and to prevent them from challenging white authority.²¹⁵

²¹¹From Thomas L. McKenney to Governor Duval Apr. 13 1830 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 392-393.

²¹²From Samuel S. Hamilton to Governor Duval Nov. 19, 1830 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 454; From Samuel S. Hamilton to Governor Duval, Dec. 4, 1830 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 461-462; From Governor Duval to the Secretary of War Jan. 6, 1831 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 479-480; From Governor Duval to Samuel S. Hamilton May 26, 1831 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 528-529.

²¹³Atkinson, *Splendid Land, Splendid People*, 217.

²¹⁴From Samuel S. Hamilton to Governor Duval Nov. 8, 1830 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXIV, 452.

²¹⁵Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society*, 41.

Finally, settlers between 1830 and 1831 seemed confident that the Seminoles would ultimately be removed, but the question was when. In December of 1830 Seminole removal was delayed because it had to wait until “the decision of the Government upon the Creek negotiation.”²¹⁶ Besides a few flare ups over the number of troops in Florida and strategy, the perception of government officials and settlers concerning the Seminoles and Black Seminoles were very similar to 1828. Government officials continued to view the Seminole Indians as no threat to white authority and settlers continued to view them as a threat to their ability to farm the frontier; while both government officials and settlers wanted to separate the Seminole Indians from the Black Seminoles.

The Nat Turner slave insurrection of 1831, according to George Frederickson, caused white Americans to view slave bondsmen living outside the confines of white authority as a potential source of slave insurrections.²¹⁷ Like their counterparts elsewhere in the South, white Floridians became increasingly concerned about the slave population and the Black Seminoles. Intriguingly, before this point the Florida territorial papers demonstrate that the settlers really did not overtly view the Black Seminoles as a threat, but following Nat Turner these concerns came to the surface. In October of 1831, the Alderman of Pensacola wrote a resolution that, “resolved that the Government of Florida be requested to make application to the General Government for one or two Companies of Infantry to be stationed in or near Pensacola for the protection of the people of Florida against any insurrection of slaves or free negroes in the vicinity.”²¹⁸ Unlike

²¹⁶From Delegate White to William Wilson, Dec. 14, 1830 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXIV, 470.

²¹⁷Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind*, 52-53.

²¹⁸Resolution by the Board of Alderman of the City of Pensacola, Oct. 31, 1831 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXIV, 581.

previous calls for military protection against wandering Seminoles, whites now identified runaway slaves and possibly Black Seminoles as the greater threat.

Interestingly, in 1830 Floridians accepted the lengthy delay in the negotiation for removal but due to the fear of a slave insurrection, in 1831, calls for removal were reinforced. In January a petition by the inhabitants of Jefferson County reached the desk of Acting Territorial Governor James Westcott. It called for the removal of the Seminoles because they were roaming outside of the reservation “without any possible means of subsistence, unless by destroying the game of the Country, and pillaging from the Inhabitants...”²¹⁹ At first this sounds similar to the past arguments, but these petitioners added that, “the presence of the Indians amongst them opens a door for the slave population to carry on a system of depredation which unless stopped must inevitably lead to the impoverishment of your petitioners, render the country unsafe, and not only the property but the lives of your petitioners will be in continual jeopardy.”²²⁰ This argument reflected both the fear of a slave insurrection and the past arguments of Duval and Humphreys concerning the influence of the Black Seminole. Now the settlers viewed both the Black Seminoles and the Seminole Indians as threats to white authority because the Black Seminoles or runaway slaves threatened white plantation slavery and society in general. Hence, Seminole Indian and Black Seminole resistance to removal was viewed as a challenge to white authority and white American ability to bring “civilization” to the frontier or become Jeffersonian agrarians. These fears reinforced calls for the Seminole Indians’ removal and reinforced efforts to separate the Seminoles and Black Seminoles.

²¹⁹Petition to the Acting Governor Westcott by Citizens of Jefferson County Jan. 18, 1832 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 632.

²²⁰*Ibid*, 633.

Despite Congressional appropriation delays, in January of 1832, President Jackson became committed to removing the Seminoles. The Secretary of War, Lewis Cass, wrote that “I have understood from the President, that he has already mentioned to you his willingness to treat with the Florida Indians, for the relinquishment of their present reservation, and for their removal to the Country West of the Mississippi...measures shall be taken without delay, to effect the removal of the Indians.”²²¹ He sent James Gadsden to Florida to negotiate a treaty for Seminole removal.²²²

White American anxieties over a possible slave insurrection in Florida and the renewal of calls for removal also led Floridians to call for troops to protect the people and “white civilization.” A meeting of the citizens of Alachua County laid out the concerns of the people.

Whereas it having been ascertained that there are exceeding 1600 Warriors & over 1100 Slaves (belonging to the Indians) now residing in the Seminole Indian Nation many of whom are traversing the Country adjoining the Northern Boundary of the Indian Nation and it having been estimated that these are a larger population of slaves than white persons owned by the citizens of said country residing within 30 miles of said Northern Boundary, and Whereas an armed force is deemed requisite to protect the Citizens of said County from aggressions by the Indians or attempts of an insurrection among the slaves, in which case no assistance could readily be obtained from the two Companies stationed at Cantonment Brooke Tampa Bay...²²³

Alarmed by the fact that whites were outnumbered by the slave population, the petitioners wanted more troops in the region to protect them from the “depredations” of the Seminoles and a possible slave revolt acts that were perceived as threats to white authority, white male

²²¹From the Secretary of War to Delegate White Jan. 25, 1832 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 641.

²²²From Secretary of War to James Gadsden, Feb. 23, 1832 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 662.

²²³Proceedings of Meeting of Citizens of Alachua County Jan. 23, 1832 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 643-644.

dominance, and progress in Florida. Furthermore, using the word depredations implies that the Seminoles were no longer being “civilized” and could not be racially uplifted.

Interestingly, as the settlers of Florida wanted the Seminole Indians removed from Florida because they were a major threat, many government officials still called for the Seminoles to be removed because they were rejecting white authority. Acting Governor Westcott argued that the Seminoles needed removal to protect them from themselves, writing that “the common Indians are however very drunken, lazy, worthless, and indeed none of their chiefs are entirely exempt from these vices.”²²⁴ He also characterized their existence as one dominated by hunger and committing depredations against whites in Florida.²²⁵ His depictions of Seminole life suggested that they had rejected white authority and white efforts to “civilize” them. He noted that, “they have not much land in cultivation, and they will not devote any great attention to agriculture. A more vagabond race does not exist on the face of the earth than the lower class of the Seminole.”²²⁶ Furthermore he demonstrated that the slaves of the Seminole were not held under the same standards as white American slaves. He believed that out of all of the slaves among the Seminoles “only a few are owned by indians to whom they have no value, but are runaways from Georgia or Florida, and a very limited number are free. Those negroes have great influence over them and in fact it is said control their chiefs and councils.”²²⁷ He finally argued that, “the only hope for any good in regard to this fallen and degraded remnant of a people once high spirited and of noble character, is founded upon removal... separating them from the negroes now amongst them, and keeping them from all intercourse or association with the

²²⁴From Acting Governor Westcott to Abraham Bellemy, Feb. 2, 1832 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 668.

²²⁵*Ibid*, 669.

²²⁶*Ibid*.

²²⁷*Ibid*.

whites...and avoid the certain fate of total extinction which inevitably awaits them in Florida.”²²⁸ Similar to other government officials, Westcott thought the Seminoles needed removal to protect them from extinction, needed to be separated from their slaves, and racially up lifted.

A memorial from the citizens of Florida, in March of 1832, further highlights the settlers’ view of the Seminole Indians and the Black Seminoles at this time. It demonstrates that settlers now saw the Black Seminoles as threats. It also suggests that the settlers continued to perceive the Seminole Indians as threats to white authority, Jeffersonian agrarianism, and slaveholders. These citizens espoused that, “their (Seminoles) depredations upon our stock; are so frequent and extensive, that we cannot for a moment, feel anything like Security...we apprehend that unless the Indians are entirely removed from our territory to some distant position, the evil in view, can not be effectually remedied.”²²⁹ The Memorialists also opposed keeping the Seminoles in Florida because “absconding Slaves, find ready security among the Indian & such aid as is amply sufficient, to enable them successfully to allude the best efforts of their masters to recover them...”²³⁰ At the end of their letter they argued that, “so long as a state of things thus dangerous to the interest of the inhabitants of Florida continues she cannot hope for prosperity or improvement: It cannot be expected that people of property will settle in Country where there is so little security in relation to their property.”²³¹ They wanted the Seminoles removed because they were a threat to white authority and progress in Florida and slaveholding was insecure as long as the Seminoles remained. The Seminoles were perceived as a larger threat than in the past.

²²⁸*Ibid*, 670.

²²⁹Memorial to Congress by Inhabitants of the Territory Mar. 26, 1832 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 679.

²³⁰*Ibid*.

²³¹*Ibid*.

The anxieties of the settlers concerning the Seminoles and Black Seminoles culminated with the Treaty of Payne's Landing in May of 1832. In this Treaty a group of Seminole Chiefs, including head chief Blunt, agreed to go west to inspect lands for a reservation among the Creeks and if the land was sufficient they agreed to removal within three years. James Gadsden was responsible for negotiating the Treaty with the Seminole Indians. However, although only a few chiefs agreed to the Treaty, the U.S. believed that it was binding on the entire Seminole Nation.²³² The Treaty also touched on the Seminoles' slaves. Article VI of the Treaty stated that

the Seminoles being anxious to be relieved from the repeated vexatious demands for slaves, and other property, alleged to have been stolen and destroyed by them, so that they may remove unembarrassed to their new homes, the United States stipulate to have the same property (properly) investigated, and to liquidate such as may be satisfactory established, provided the amount does not exceed (7000) dollars.²³³

Otherwise, these Seminole chiefs agreed to let the U.S. do what they wanted with their slaves as long as they were compensated. This produced a white perception that the Seminoles were ultimately accepting white authority at this point, which was not necessarily the case. This was the same argument that Governor Duval used in 1828 when he wanted to make sure that the Seminole Indians were compensated for their property, and was the goal of government officials at that time. The Treaty of Payne's Landing created a rift within the Seminoles because many of them did not want to remove, and a rift between them and their slaves. This Treaty and its consequences eventually led to the Second Seminole War.

With the signing of the Treaty of Payne's Landing, the concerns of settlers abated, as they did in 1826 and 1827. However, settlers and government officials were concerned about

²³² Treaty of Payne's Landing, May 9, 1832 in Sprague, *The Origins, Progress, and Conclusion of the Florida War*, 74-76.

²³³ *Ibid*, 75.

whether the Seminoles would accept the Treaty, meaning white authority, and then remove peacefully. At this point, American policy makers linked Seminole acceptance of the Treaty with their acceptance of white authority. These concerns dominated the view of the Seminoles and the Black Seminoles from the Treaty in May of 1832 until July of 1834 when Chief Blunt removed.

Many government officials in Florida worried that the Seminoles would reject the Treaty because they were being influenced by individuals who did not have the best interests of the Seminoles at heart. These influences were Americans that the government believed wanted to profit off of the death of the Seminole Indians. This argument was very similar to past views that held that the Seminole Indians were dependent and influenced by Europeans. It was believed that Seminole compliance with the Treaty provisions was dependent on outside influences. Clearly, the gender and racial views of white government officials led them to believe that Seminoles would resist or reject the Treaty only if told to do so by whites. In August of 1832 Governor Duval bolstered this argument in a letter in which he argued that Gad Humphreys, recently removed Indian Agent, was telling the Seminoles to remain in Florida. He wrote, "I have received several communications from the Agent, informing me that Gad Humphreys the late agent and a man by the name of Centre-are intriguing and interfering with the Indian-to persuade them not to remove from Florida...I am convinced that certain Individuals of the Indians will endeavour to prejudice them against removing west of the Mississippi..."²³⁴ His letter implied that the Seminoles were being influenced and were only listening to Humphreys because they did not understand that removal was in their best interest. Duval was worried that individuals might influence the Seminoles to ultimately reject removal and white authority.

²³⁴From Governor Duval to the Secretary of War Aug. 31, 1832 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXIV, 726.

James Gadsden claimed that the Seminole Indians were being influenced to resist the Treaty and white authority. He argued that Chief Blunt was encouraged to demand more compensation than was allotted for in the Treaty. He stated that, "I fear however, from the information received, that some attempts have been made by those who hope to participate in the plunder, to induce, Blunt to be very extravagant in his demands..."²³⁵ Gadsden went on to state that, "indeed the important object is to remove the Seminoles on the Peninsula... They could not survive 5 years in their present situation & the most intelligent of their Chiefs are well convinced of this..."²³⁶ Similar to Duval, Gadsden saw removal as being in the best interest of the Seminoles and claimed that the "intelligent" chiefs understood the situation and accepted white paternalism and the Treaty. When Gadsden visited Blunt in September he wrote that, "the proposition I had to make him (Blunt)... fell so short of expectations he had, no doubt, been induced to encourage from private interference, that he required some further time to deliberate with his people, and the Chiefs alike interested in removal."²³⁷ These private influences were private American citizens that Gadsden described as "deceiving them (Seminoles) as to the great anxiety of the General Government on the subject of their removal, and encouraging delay as the surest plan of obtaining their extravagant demands."²³⁸ American government officials in Florida still used paternal arguments concerning the Seminole Indians and wanted them removed for their protection, but this did not mean that Gadsden agreed with other government officials who saw the Seminoles as no threat to white authority.

²³⁵From James Gadsden to the Secretary of War, Aug. 30, 1832 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 727.

²³⁶*Ibid*, 728.

²³⁷From James Gadsden to the Secretary of War Sept. 19, 1832 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 734.

²³⁸*Ibid*.

In early 1833, it appeared that all was going well with Seminole removal. In March the Chiefs returned from their review of the reservation. Gadsden wrote that, “Blunts exploring party has returned & report favourably of the Country...the chiefs from the other Towns who accompanied the expedition seem much pleased...”²³⁹ The chiefs who went to see the reservation then signed the Treaty of Fort Gibson, which stated they accepted the land in the west.²⁴⁰ Gadsden then negotiated for “a final & successful result.”²⁴¹ At this point, it appeared as if Gadsden would be able to convince all the Seminoles to remove. Things also looked promising for settlers because the Congress ratified the Treaty of Payne’s Landing in April of 1833.²⁴² Finally, Acting Governor Westcott argued that, “I do not anticipate any difficulty in getting off by the 1st of Nov; all those Indians of the Appalachicola towns, whose chiefs signed the Treaty last fall, and those not included in the Treaty will ultimately follow Col. Blunt, and may possibly be induced to go with him now.”²⁴³ Settlers and government officials thought that the peaceful removal of the Seminole was soon at hand, but this did not mean that their concerns about the Seminole Indians and the Black Seminole were gone.

In July of 1833 Gadsden began to run into some problems. The chiefs who he thought would be willing to negotiate for removal rejected many of his advances because they were “against Blunt”, and distrusted an interpreter named Richard.²⁴⁴ Gadsden eventually addressed these chiefs and, “discovered that the above chiefs were as much indisposed to treat for a

²³⁹From James Gadsden to Elbert Herring Mar. 30, 1833 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 824.

²⁴⁰Treaty of Payne’s Landing, May 9, 1832 in Sprague, *The Origins, Progress, and Conclusion of the Florida War*, 76-77.

²⁴¹From James Gadsden to Elbert Herring Mar. 30, 1833 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXIV, 824.

²⁴²From the Secretary of War to Governor Duval Apr. 12, 1833 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 829.

²⁴³From Acting Governor Westcott to the Secretary of War Apr. 27, 1833 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 834.

²⁴⁴From James Gadsden to the Secretary of War Jul. 6, 1833 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 859.

removal as ever...they have been exposed...to so many disagreeing talks by unauthorized individuals; have been secretly influenced by so many who hoped in the negotiation to profit by the terms concluded on...”²⁴⁵ As in the past Gadsden believed that these chiefs were resisting removal because they were under the influence of whites who wanted to profit from their death. This demonstrates that these individuals who were influencing the Seminole Indians did not endorse ideas of paternalism because they were encouraging the Seminoles to reject white authority. Finally, Gadsden argued that, “I cannot believe they will ultimately (should the Seminole remove) conclude to remain in the Country and come under the laws of Florida... They want but time and when convinced of removal of the Seminoles we may rest assured they will follow.”²⁴⁶ Ultimately, Gadsden believed the Seminole Indians would move west and accept white authority. Interestingly, after this exchange Gadsden quit and handed over the authority to negotiate with the Indians to Governor Duval.²⁴⁷

The problems with Seminole removal continued when Blunt changed his mind. According to Governor Westcott, in September of 1833 Blunt used a number of excuses to delay removal. Asked to attend a meeting to discuss his preparations for removal, Blunt sent some of his sub-chiefs instead.²⁴⁸ These chiefs “made a variety of excuses and gave many reasons for not having got ready as they promised. I conversed with these chiefs fully & wrote to Blunt...encouraging him to get off &c.”²⁴⁹ Then in October Westcott was informed that, “there

²⁴⁵*Ibid*, 860.

²⁴⁶*Ibid*, 861.

²⁴⁷From Daniel Kurtz to Governor Duval Aug. 9, 1833 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 865.

²⁴⁸From Acting Governor Westcott to Elbert Herring Sept. 1, 1833 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 877.

²⁴⁹*Ibid*.

appears to be great reluctance on the part of Blunt and his adherents to remove...²⁵⁰ That same month the head of the Department of Indian Affairs informed Westcott to “give notice to Blunt and his party, that the Government will insist upon faithful performance of their Treaty, and that no possible consideration can change that determination...the Government will hold them responsible for the departure of their whole Band, states to consist of Two hundred and fifty persons...²⁵¹ Clearly, the U.S. would not allow Blunt to undermine white efforts at removal or white authority.

Westcott finally held a talk with Blunt in November of 1833 and informed him of the government’s instructions. After the talk Westcott argued that, “nothing now exists to delay the departure of Blunt and Davy with the principal portion of their people but the absence at the Indian school in Ky of the boys belonging to their Towns. They will not stir a step however till the boys arrive, but are prepared to go off immediately on their arrival.”²⁵² According to Governor Duval, the boys arrived back with their families in January of 1834. But, now Blunt refused to go because he wanted his cut of the annuity that he was supposed to receive under the Treaty of Payne’s Landing.²⁵³ Eventually, despite this excuse, the new Indian Agent Wiley Thompson convinced Blunt to remove in March of 1834.²⁵⁴ It appeared that Seminole removal was finally under way, despite the so-called interferences. Interestingly, at no time during this process did government officials claim that the Seminole Indians delays were a threat to white authority.

²⁵⁰From Elbert Herring to Acting Governor Westcott Oct. 2, 1833 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 889.

²⁵¹From Elbert Herring to Governor Duval Oct. 31, 1833 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 899.

²⁵²From Acting Governor Westcott to the Secretary of War Nov. 13, 1833 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 913.

²⁵³From Governor Duval to Elbert Herring Jan. 23, 1834 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 945.

²⁵⁴From Governor Duval to Elbert Herring, Mar. 9, 1834 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXIV, 989.

American government officials thought, that the Seminoles would remove with few problems. In fact the head of the Office of Indian Affairs in the War Department informed Wiley Thompson that he needed to start preparations for closing the Indian agency within a year. Herring wanted the Agency closed by December 31st of 1834. Herring also, as in the past, put Thompson in charge of investigating claims for runaway slaves.²⁵⁵ Government officials in Florida clearly thought that the Seminoles were going to leave the territory with little or no resistance, and settlers continued to claim that several Seminole slaves were runaways even as removal was underway.

In the fall of 1834 government officials' perceptions of the Seminole Indians and Black Seminole changed as both groups resisted removal. Two Captains in the Army stated that it was "the settled determination of a Majority of the influential Chiefs of this nation to disregard the obligations imposed on them by the Treaty of Payne's Landing..."²⁵⁶ Not all of the chiefs signed the Treaty of Payne's Landing, but after trying to negotiate with the holdouts, the U.S. had determined the Treaty would apply to the entire Seminole Nation. The military claimed that the holdouts were threatening chiefs that agreed to remove. They recommended that the government give one of those who had been threatened, Holate Emartla, protection on Blunt's former reservation.²⁵⁷ Clearly, the Seminoles were split over removal and the chiefs who signed the Treaty were now targets. By rejecting the Treaty and resisting removal the Seminoles and Black Seminoles were undermining white authority and they threatened white Jeffersonian agrarian

²⁵⁵From Elbert Herring to Wiley Thompson Jul. 10, 1834 in Clarence Edwin Carter, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, Vol. XXV, *The Territory of Florida 1834-1839* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1960), 33-34.

²⁵⁶From John B. F. Russel and William M. Graham to Wiley Thompson Oct. 27, 1834 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 57.

²⁵⁷*Ibid.*

men's ability to bring "civilization" to the frontier and the system of plantation slavery in the South.

Interestingly, the Choctaw responded to removal in similar ways. Richard White demonstrates that, "the mass of Choctaws both rejected removal and feared the impact of Mississippi's laws...in reality, however, these people were leaderless."²⁵⁸ He also argued that when the government was about to remove the Choctaw that there was a group that wanted to resist removal and White argues that, "The council of the Western District reported that any captain or headman who negotiated for land was in danger of losing his life..."²⁵⁹ Clearly, many of the Choctaw wanted to resist removal.

In October, Wiley Thompson noted that resistance to removal was becoming more organized, and he called for more troops. In an effort to convince Seminoles to accept the Treaty and removal, Thompson met with tribal chiefs, but reported that

They are obstinately fixed in a resolution to disregard the Treaty of Pains Landing While I was portraying to them the inevitable & utter ruin which would overwhelm them were it possible for them to remain in their present location a few Years longer, silence ensued their previous frequent interruptions, they were awe struck by the pictures I presented to them of utter dessionation and hopeless wretchedness...At that important crisis I heard Powell a bold & dashing Young Chief who was seated by Micoanopa, and who is vehemently opposed to the removal of the Indians speak to the latter, apparently in much earnestness; and the interpreter informed me subsequently that Powell then urged Micoanopa to be firm in his resolution.²⁶⁰

Thompson pointed out the future leader of Seminole resistance, and the man who would later murder him, Powell who was also known as Osceola. The Seminoles were more organized

²⁵⁸White, *The Roots of Dependency*, 142.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁶⁰From Wiley Thompson to Elbert Herring Oct. 28, 1834 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXV, 59.

against removal and continued to threaten chiefs who agreed to remove.²⁶¹ Even though, Thompson closed his letter by calling for troops in the region for several reasons. He believed it was his

imperious duty to urge the necessity of a strong reinforcement of this Post, and the location of a strong force in Tampa Bay...an imposing force thus promptly marshaled to coerce the refractory people will have the effect to crush the hopes of those who have been tampering with them-awe the Chiefs into a proper respect of the Government-Afford protection to the neighboring white settlements, and supersede the necessity of Holate Emartla & and his followers fleeing the country.²⁶²

Thompson argued that additional troops would prevent outsiders from influencing the Seminoles and afford protection for the people of Florida and the Seminoles who wanted to remove west. Clearly, government officials viewed the Seminole Indians as threats to white authority, but they still understood the situation through the lens of paternalism.

As news of possible resistance spread settlers became increasingly concerned and called for more troops and protection. A memorial from the citizens of Hillsborough County characterized their

situation is a perilous light in consequence of the noncompliance of the Indian with the wishes of Government to remove them from the Territory, aware of the dangerous and very treacherous character of the Indians and the numerous threats held out by them should the Government insist on their removal, we therefore deem it a necessary measure to ourselves and our families to present you this memorial praying that a sufficient number of Troops may be stationed at Tampa...in order to keep the Indians in check and to protect the lives and property of the now helpless settlers.²⁶³

As it looked more likely that the Seminole Indians would resist removal and white authority, settlers began to see them as a greater threat and this memorial even referred to their

²⁶¹*Ibid*, 59-60.

²⁶²*Ibid*, 61.

²⁶³From the Secretary of War to James Gadsden Nov. 28, 1834 in *Florida Territorial Papers* XXV, 69.

“treacherous character.” These settlers wanted troops to protect them, their property (slaves) and white progress in Florida. Furthermore, referring to the Seminoles as being treacherous also acknowledged that they lacked “civilization.”

By January of 1835, government officials, similar to the settlers, perceived the Seminoles as a threat. General Clinch characterized the Seminoles as a major threat:

the more I see of this Tribe of Indians, the more fully am I convinced that they not the least intention of fulfilling their treaty stipulations, unless compelled to do so by a stronger force than mere words-Their minds have been completely prevented, by a set of interested, & designing men, that no argument or reasoning will have the least influence with them, except the argument of force-& if a sufficient military force to overawe them, is not sent into the Nation, they will not be removed, & the whole frontier may be laid waste by a combination of the Indians, Indian negroes, & the Negroes on the plantations.²⁶⁴

Clinch maintained the paternalistic argument that the Seminole Indians were being influenced to resist removal and white authority. But, he clearly feared that the Seminoles and Black Seminoles could destroy the frontier. Clinch was influenced by his Jeffersonian world view, and now saw the Seminoles as a clear threat to the frontier. Clinch also depicts a shift where government officials started to perceive the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles as threats to the frontier in Florida. Seminole resistance represented the worst fears of whites in Florida and in the southern U.S. The rejection of white authority meant that Seminoles would remain in Florida where they could undermine Jeffersonian agrarianism. Their resistance could lead to a slave revolt that would destabilize white society in the region.

In April 1835 a tentative agreement for the peaceful removal of the Seminoles was reached. General Clinch left Florida for a short time, and his temporary replacement Alexander

²⁶⁴From Duncan L. Clinch to the Adjutant General, Jan. 22, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers XXV*, 99-100.

Fanning explained this agreement: “in conjunction with Gen Thompson, the Indian Agent, effected an arrangement with at least one half of the Seminole Chiefs, by which they and their followers and their negroes are to leave Florida for their new homes on the 1st of December next, and there are strong reasons to believe that before that time all the discontented chiefs will come into the measures of the executive and depart with their brethren.”²⁶⁵ The major concession that produced an agreement allowed the Seminoles to take their slaves west with them. Fanning then argued that the only potential stumbling block to peaceful removal were Americans in Florida who continued to influence the Seminoles to remain. He believed

that the harmony of this agreement and the just expectations of the executive will be destroyed by the culpidity of our citizens. Under an impression that the Indian negroes can be bought for little or nothing, speculators will shortly be flocking in the Country-The Negroes, who are bold, active and armed will sacrifice some of them to their rage. This is not all: they will quit the party of their owners who are disposed to emigrate and join the discontented chiefs who only want this encouragement to resist the mandates of the Government.²⁶⁶

Fanning pointed out that whites would do anything to obtain more slaves. He postulated that they might cause the tentative agreement to breakdown.

As December of 1835 approached, it appeared that a group of the Seminoles were willing to remove, but many were still unwilling to go. In October, General Clinch claimed that, “there are still however a large number that are unwilling to remove; & from recent indications I am induced to believe, that force will have to be used to compel them to comply with their Treaty Stipulations.”²⁶⁷ Clinch was most concerned about the Mickasuky and believed “that we shall

²⁶⁵From Alexander C. W. Fanning to the Adjutant General Apr. 29, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 133.

²⁶⁶*Ibid.*

²⁶⁷From Duncan L. Clinch to the Adjutant General Oct. 8, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 182-183.

have to strike a blow at the Mickasuky tribe...’’²⁶⁸ Furthermore, he noted that planters were anxious because they thought “there is already a secret & improper communication carried on between the refractory Indians, Indian, negroes, & some of the plantation negroes.’’²⁶⁹ Perhaps he meant that the Seminoles, Black Seminoles, and slaves might be conspiring to commit a slave rebellion. As resistance seemed more likely government officials in Florida shed their paternal arguments and agreed with the settlers that the Seminoles posed a threat to the security of the frontier.

Despite the calls for more troops by Clinch and the ordinary citizens, many government officials outside Florida still believed that the Seminoles would ultimately remove peacefully in December. Furthermore, they thought that the Seminoles who resisted removal would go once the rest of the tribe removed. Secretary of War, Lewis Cass, replied to Clinch’s letter concerning his duty and argued that, “it is very desirable to accomplish the object of removing the Seminole Indians without the application of actual force, and I cannot but hope that such will be the result. You will of course proceed to embark and remove those first who are willing to go, postponing any decisive course with relation to the refractory ones till the others are set out. My impression in that they will then all peaceably follow.’’²⁷⁰ But, then the secretary laid out what he wanted done to the Seminoles if they refused to remove and resisted white authority. He argued that, “it is out of the question under any circumstances to leave a lawless banditti, as they would then be if not removed, to form the associations which you apprehend with the negroes and to involve

²⁶⁸*Ibid*, 184.

²⁶⁹*Ibid*, 183.

²⁷⁰From the Secretary of War to Duncan L. Clinch Oct. 22, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 188.

the frontier in blood.”²⁷¹ Despite maintaining his paternalistic argument, the Secretary espoused the view that if the Seminoles rejected removal they would be threats to the frontier and slavery in the region. This argument was the same as the settlers and government officials in Florida. Even though he hoped that the Seminole Indians would remove peacefully, Lewis Cass was clearly concerned about the situation.

By October of 1835, some Floridians argued that the people who were influencing the Black Seminoles came from the North trying to start a slave revolt in the South. Joseph Hernandez argued that, “much apprehension is already manifested by the community at large on this subject. And particularly as there are a large number of Negroes amongst the Indians, who may be under the influence of the Abolitionists of the North, whose machinations, are now endangering our safety.”²⁷² He blamed abolitionists for the problems and insecurity in Florida. Clearly, settlers feared rejection of removal and white authority because they thought it would lead to a slave revolt. The groups who settlers feared the most at this time were not the Seminoles, but the Black Seminoles and their own slaves.

In November, as hostilities broke out between whites and the Seminoles and their Black Seminole allies, the image of the Seminoles and Black Seminoles as clear threats to white authority in Florida and the South solidified. The Seminoles and Black Seminoles were officially rejecting white authority and removal. This caused government officials to agree with the settlers and perceive the Seminole Indians as ruthless savages who were threats to white development of

²⁷¹*Ibid.*

²⁷²From Joseph M. Hernandez to Governor Eaton Oct. 26, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 190.

Florida and slavery in the region because this rejection of white authority could threaten white men's ability to bring "civilization" to the frontier.

The first hostility recorded in November of 1835, occurred when a band of Seminoles attacked Clinch's house in Silver Springs and burned it to the ground. Clinch was not present, but this incident caused many to renew their demands for protection from the Seminoles.²⁷³ The leader of these hostilities was Osceola and later reports stated that he killed Chief Charley O Matler, who was one of the chiefs in favor of removal.²⁷⁴ Furthermore, the Acting Territorial Governor G. K. Walker believed that the reason why Matler was killed was because he "made known his determination of delivering up his property, to the Indian Agent employed by the Government to superintend the removal of those Indians, for the purpose of being sold preparatory to his removal..."²⁷⁵ Clinch informed his commanding officer that he had called up volunteers and was doing everything he could to contain the Seminoles. He also warned that, "the whole frontier may be laid waste."²⁷⁶ Across the territory there were reports of attacks similar to the one on Clinch's home.²⁷⁷ In December General Thompson, the Indian Agent, was murdered outside of Fort King by a band of Seminoles led by Osceola.²⁷⁸

²⁷³From Duncan L. Clinch to the Adjutant General Nov. 3, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 192.

²⁷⁴From Alexander C. W. Fanning to Duncan L. Clinch Nov. 27, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 200; From Duncan Clinch to Acting Governor Walker Dec. 1, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 207.

²⁷⁵From Acting Governor Walker to the Secretary of War Dec. 8, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 205.

²⁷⁶From Duncan L. Clinch to the Commanding General, Dec. 1, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 203.

²⁷⁷From Acting Governor Walker to the Secretary of War Dec. 4, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 206.

²⁷⁸From Duncan L. Clinch to the Adjutant General Dec. 29, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 218; Mahon, *History of the Second Seminole War*, 103.

As hostilities commenced government officials and settlers officially perceived the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles as threats and the Seminole Indians as ruthless savages. General Clinch's changing view of the Seminole personified this shift. He referred to the Seminole as a "lawless band."²⁷⁹ He also stated that his goal was to "drive these incendiary and murderous wretches within their limits..."²⁸⁰ Clearly, the Seminoles were no longer passive they were now a clear threat to white society.

Accounts of attacks and damage in Florida by American newspapers contributed to the changing image of the Seminoles both inside and outside of Florida. Newspapers demonstrate that Americans throughout the U.S. viewed the Seminole Indians as ruthless savages. A newspaper article from January typified this shift: "a white man for an Indian' is their motto, and the innocent are never more secure against their savage butchery, than the guilty, when once their fiendish revenge is excited."²⁸¹ Another article suggested, "the Indians scalped all, taking off the scalp clear around the head, as far as the hair extended, and then beating in the skulls. The heads of Roger and Suggs were shockingly mangled."²⁸² The images of mangled and scalped bodies had a huge impact on the image of the Seminoles. The *New York Herald* communicated that, "Families of high distinction, nurtured in luxury in the Old States, and removed to Florida have fallen, root and branch, under the tomahawk and scalping knife, or by more prolonged and refined torture."²⁸³

²⁷⁹From Duncan L. Clinch to the Adjutant General Dec. 9, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXV, 209.

²⁸⁰*Ibid.*

²⁸¹*Atkinson's Saturday Evening Post* (Buffalo), 2 Jan. 1836. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

²⁸²"The Seminole Indians-War in Florida," *Army and Navy Chronicle*, 21 Jan. 1836, 2-3. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

²⁸³*New York Herald*, 22 Jan. 1836, 2.

The Seminoles were not the only Southeastern Indian tribe to resist removal and white efforts to civilize them militarily. Claudio Saunt analyzed the Red Stick War among the Creeks, which took place two decades earlier, and argued that the “Redsticks destroyed forges, spinning wheels, and cattle, leading their enemies to describe the two warring sides in terms of ‘civilization’ and ‘tradition.’”²⁸⁴ The Seminoles and the Creeks reacted in similar ways to white Americans’ efforts to “civilize” them after they decided to resist white authority.

In Florida government officials began to call for the punishment of the Seminole Indians. General Clinch promised that, “I will teach them, that altho’ the Government has been heretofore mild and indulgent to them, that it knows when and how to punish them for their treachery and bad faith.”²⁸⁵ Acting Governor Walker also argued “that such as act of Barbarity and outrage should not be permitted to go unpunished while I have the means of arresting the perpetrators...”²⁸⁶ Both Walker and Clinch, viewed the Seminole Indians as threats and wanted them held responsible for their actions. Clearly, paternalism for these government officials had its limits because they seemed to believe that the Seminoles were incapable of being uplifted by whites.

After detailing the hostilities that were being committed Clinch made an urgent call for more troops because the plantations of Florida were under threat. He argued that, “all the information I receive in relation to the movements of the Indians, represent them as being in considerable force, and manifesting a determination to engage in War, murder, and plunder. It appears also that they are joined by the negroes, and if they are not promptly put down, this spirit

²⁸⁴Saunt, *A New Order of Things*, 254.

²⁸⁵From Duncan L. Clinch to the Adjutant General Dec. 9, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers*, Vol. XXV, 209.

²⁸⁶From Acting Governor G. K. Walker to Duncan L. Clinch Dec. 19, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 295.

may extend to the plantations.”²⁸⁷ Clinch perceived the Seminole Indians and the Black Seminoles the same way as the settlers because they were threatening the frontier, rejecting white authority, and might cause a slave revolt.

Other newspaper articles, from throughout the U.S. demonstrated the way that Americans in general viewed the Black Seminoles. One article reported the escapes of several slaves and claimed some slaves helped the Seminoles attack their master’s plantation so they could escape slavery. The article labeled these slaves as “traitors.”²⁸⁸ It declared that these “negroes were traitors, and must have been in league with the Indians; they assisted them with a boat to cross over the Dummett’s. There were not more than ten who crossed over, who pillaged and burnt the house. The poor old man escaped, but not a thing with him, not even his papers.”²⁸⁹ The article bolstered the idea that white American’s own slaves were a threat to them and that blacks living outside the bounds of slavery, such as those living among the Seminoles, were also a threat to white authority. By January of 1836, the Black Seminoles had turned into a major threat to the U.S. because their alliance with the Seminoles and their resistance to white authority personified a possible slave revolt.²⁹⁰

The event that began the Second Seminole War and caused most Americans throughout the U.S. to perceive the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles as savage threats to white society throughout the southern U.S. was the Dade Massacre that took place on December 28th 1835. Even labeling this event as a “massacre” implied that the people who perpetrated it were savages. After reports of the massacre reached the American press whites distinguished the Seminole

²⁸⁷From Duncan L. Clinch to the Adjutant General Dec. 9, 1835 in *Florida Territorial Papers* Vol. XXV, 210.

²⁸⁸*The Enquirer* (Richmond), 19 Jan. 1836, 2.

²⁸⁹*Ibid.*

²⁹⁰*New York Herald*, 22 Jan. 1836, 2.

Indians as brutal mutilating savages and the image of Blacks reinforced white American's racial and gender world view. The report of Blacks killing white soldiers was viewed by many Americans as a slave revolt. The *Daily National Intelligencer* provided the first report of the massacre. This newspaper erroneously stated that 800 to 1000 Indians attacked Dade, a number that was inflated by about 700 to 900. It also reported that, "Major Dade was shot off of his horse on the commencement of the attack. Captains Gardner and Fraser soon after fell mortally wounded, and their scalps were taken by the savages."²⁹¹ The article referred to the engagement as "butchery."²⁹² Other newspapers stated that the Seminoles scalped U.S. soldiers, that a black man tomahawked a white soldier, and that the massacre was savage. One paper stated, "we do not remember the history of a butchery more horrid, and it stands without an example in the annals of Indian warfare."²⁹³ Another article indicated that, "all the cruelties known to savage warfare were practiced by the ruthless foe, and we are informed that the negroes even aided their allies in the butchery."²⁹⁴ Furthermore, all these papers testified that, "Lieutenant Bassinger was wounded on the outset, and was discovered by a negro in the party of savages, crawling off to a place of concealment, and tomahawked."²⁹⁵

Most of the newspapers were wrong. The official report stated that the Seminoles did not take any scalps and that they did not mutilate or rob the bodies of the dead and surviving soldiers.²⁹⁶ Interestingly, the people in the official report who were vilified the most were the Black Seminoles. The official report detailed that, "many negroes were in the field, but no

²⁹¹*Daily National Intelligencer* (Washington D.C.), 25 Jan. 1836, 3.

²⁹²*Ibid.*

²⁹³*New York Herald*, 26 Jan. 1836, 2.

²⁹⁴*The Enquirer* (Richmond), 26 Jan. 1836, 2.

²⁹⁵*Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 28 Jan. 1836, 2.

²⁹⁶*Daily National Intelligencer* (Washington D.C.), 26 Jan. 1836, 3.

scalps were taken by the Indians, but the negroes with hellish cruelty, pierced the throats of all whose loud cries and groans showed the power of life to be yet strong. The survivors were preserved with immediate death.”²⁹⁷ The reports of these events definitely impacted the white image of the Black Seminoles and reinforced the gender and racial world view of most Americans that blacks not under white authority were violent and a threat to white society. Many Americans viewed this as a slave revolt because they were ultimately afraid that the violence of the Second Seminole War would spread outside of Florida and not only threaten the frontier in Florida, but white society throughout the South.

Between 1828 and 1835, the perception of the Seminole Indians and the Black Seminoles among both government officials and settlers changed dramatically because of the ultimate rejection of white authority by the Seminole Indians and fears of a slave rebellion. During this time government officials slowly began to perceive the Seminole Indians as threats and began to adopt the arguments and perceptions of the settlers; which demonstrated that their paternalistic world view had its limits and that they were also highly influenced by Jeffersonian ideals. However, settlers continually viewed the Seminole Indians as threats to white authority from 1828 to 1835 and their opinions were reinforced when the Seminole began to resist removal and reject white authority. Interestingly, the fear that seemed to be the driving force for settlers to begin to overtly label the Black Seminoles as a threat was the fear of a possible slave rebellion. This fear also reinforced government officials’ view of the Black Seminoles as threats because they were influencing the Seminole Indians to resist white authority.

²⁹⁷*Ibid.*

By 1836, the Seminole Indians and the Blacks Seminoles were clear threats to white authority in Florida and were now considered savages by settlers, government officials, and many citizens throughout the U.S. Both the Seminoles and Black Seminoles were perceived as threats at this point because they were actively resisting white authority. White policy makers and settlers of Florida feared this resistance because it could interfere with white men's ability to bring "civilization" to the frontier and could lead to a slave revolt that could threaten the entire South. Furthermore, these actions could challenge white male independence. Many officials also wanted to punish the Seminole Indians and Black Seminoles for their savage actions. Overall, government officials and settlers were highly influenced by their gender and racial world views from 1820 to 1836 when they were dealing with the Seminoles and Black Seminoles. These perceptions definitely influenced their decision and policies concerning the Seminole Indians and the Black Seminoles.

CONCLUSION

By December of 1835, the Seminole Indians were viewed by most Americans as being savages. Government officials and the settlers of Florida at this time viewed them as clear threats to the frontier and white men's ability to bring "civilization" to Florida. The Seminole and Black Seminole rejection of white authority led to the Second Seminole War; which lasted from 1835 to 1842. This study demonstrates that both government officials' and settlers' perceptions of the Seminoles and Black Seminoles were highly influenced by their paternalistic and Jeffersonian world views, which influenced their policies concerning the Seminoles and Black Seminoles. Between 1820 and 1835, both of these groups began to slowly perceive the Seminoles and Black Seminoles as threats to white authority until the Seminoles ultimately rejected that authority when they resisted removal in 1835.

Interestingly, the Seminoles and Black Seminoles were not always viewed as threats by government officials and settlers. Until 1823, most settlers and government officials viewed the Seminoles as noble savages that were dependent on the U.S, and most of these individuals viewed the Black Seminoles as being secure among the Seminole Indians and as no threat to white authority. However, these ideas started to change in 1823 because many settlers, who were highly influenced by Andrew Jackson, began to see the Seminoles as possible threats to the frontier and white men's ability to bring "civilization" to the frontier. At this point a debate began between most government officials and settlers over whether the Seminole Indians were a threat or not. Furthermore, settlers began to file cases for the return of runaway slaves that were now claimed by the Seminoles. These cases were also highly influenced by the Jeffersonian

world view of the settlers because they needed as many slaves as they could get to help them farm the frontier and define themselves as Jeffersonian agrarians. By 1823, both government officials' and settlers' world views were highly influenced by paternalism, but the settlers were also being influenced by ideals of Jeffersonianism.

These racial and gender world views began to affect policy of government officials towards the Seminoles in 1823. After the Treaty of Moultrie Creek the debate over the nature of the Seminole Indians between settlers and government officials intensified because a majority of settlers began to see Seminoles outside of the reservation as threats to the frontier in Florida, and because of their Jeffersonian world view they called for the removal of the Seminoles. The settlers perceived the Seminoles as a threat to their ability to farm the frontier. Government officials, on the contrary, continued to believe that the Seminole Indians were noble savages that were no threat to the frontier in Florida. But, between 1823 and 1828 these government officials began to slowly believe that the Seminole Indians needed to be removed for their own protection. This shift in policy was the result of government officials' world view because the Seminole Indians were not accepting farming; meaning that they were rejected white authority that wanted to use farming to "civilize" the Seminoles or racially uplift them. So, these officials believed that the paternal thing to do would be remove the Seminoles to protect them from extinction.

Furthermore, the settlers' and government officials' perceptions of the Black Seminoles also began to change between 1823 and 1828. Both groups by 1828 wanted the Seminoles and Black Seminoles separated. Settlers wanted this done because they wanted to obtain the slaves among the Seminoles to reinforce their ability to bring "civilization" to the frontier. While government officials began to perceive the Black Seminoles as a threat because they were

influencing the Seminole Indians to reject white authority. Both of these groups' actions concerning the Black Seminoles were highly influenced by their world views. Settlers wanted the Seminoles and Black Seminoles separated for Jeffersonian reasons and government officials wanted them separated for paternal reasons because they wanted the Seminoles to accept white authority.

In 1828, government officials and settlers disagreed over the nature of the Seminoles and Black Seminoles. Settlers saw the Seminoles as threats and did not show any overt signs of fearing the Black Seminoles; while government officials viewed the Seminoles as no threat and the Black Seminoles as one. But, by 1835 because of the fear of a possible slave revolt and the beginning of Seminole resistance to removal both settlers and government officials saw the Seminoles and Black Seminoles as clear threats to the frontier in Florida. This fear of a slave revolt highly impacted the Jeffersonian world view of settlers because they needed slaves to bring "civilization" to the frontier and a slave revolt as well as a war with the Seminoles could threaten the entire frontier in Florida. Furthermore, both the fear of a slave revolt and Seminole resistance to removal caused government officials to perceive that the Seminoles were rejecting white authority and were a threat to the frontier. This also demonstrates that the paternalist world view of the government officials had its limits and they were also highly influenced by the same Jeffersonian world view of the settlers. Seminole and Black Seminole resistance, because of their world views, caused both settlers and government officials to view the Seminoles as savages that needed to be defeated and removed. Furthermore, both groups viewed the Black Seminoles as threats to the frontier because they could incite a possible slave uprising.

Clearly, this study and its findings can be seen as a Florida story and it explains why white government officials and settlers in Florida viewed and treated the Seminoles and Black Seminoles the way they did. Both government officials and settlers were clearly influenced by their gender and racial world views. This study supports Edward Baptist's, Kevin Kokomorr's, and Mikaela Adams' claims that Florida was considered to be a frontier and shows that, similar to David Roediger, that as these white men in Florida were defining the Seminoles and Black Seminoles they were also defining themselves as white men.²⁹⁸ It also demonstrates that Michael Kimmel's Heroic artisans were present in Florida, and supports Kevin Kokomoor by analyzing the view of the Seminoles and Black Seminoles together because both groups were clearly linked and highly influenced by Indian culture.²⁹⁹ Overall, this study compliments both Patrick Riordan's and Mikaela Adams' analyses of how White Americans viewed the Seminole Indians. It engages Riordan by adding in gender and demonstrating that both race and gender were a driving force for the ways Americans viewed the Seminoles. Furthermore, it points out the changing view of the Seminoles from 1820 to 1836, while Adams does this for 1865 to 1934.³⁰⁰

But, this study does have broader historical implications for outside of Florida. First, it bolsters Michael Kimmel's claims that there was a form of manhood present in the early 1800s that was highly influenced by Jeffersonian ideals called the Heroic Artisan. Clearly, the settlers of Florida and government officials were highly influenced by a Jeffersonian world view that also helped define themselves as Jeffersonian agrarians. Historians need to continue to research the presence of this form of manhood throughout the United States during this period in order to

²⁹⁸Baptist, *Creating an Old South*, 2-4; Kokomoor, "A Re-assessment of Seminoles," 209-236; Adams, "Savage foes," 404-435; Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness*, 14-36.

²⁹⁹Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 1; Kokomoor, "A Re-assessment of Seminoles," 209-236.

³⁰⁰Patrick Riordan, "Seminole Genesis;" Adams, "Savage foes," 404-435.

better understand white manhood. This study also serves as a possible case study on the influence of white male racial and gender world views on their relations and policies towards Indians and slaves. Clearly, government policy makers' decisions in Florida concerning the Seminoles and Black Seminoles were highly influenced by their racial and gender world views. Furthermore, this study pointed out instances where other Indian tribes in the Southeast were treated in similar ways by white government officials. Historians need to reanalyze removals of other Indian tribes in the Southeast to see if government officials' policies towards these groups were highly influenced by white men's gender and racial world views.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- “Army.” *The Military and Naval Magazine of the United States*, March 1835, 5. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- Army and Navy Chronicle*, 21 May 1835, 1. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- Atkinson’s Saturday Evening Post* (Buffalo), 10 Sept. 1831. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- Atkinson’s Saturday Evening Post* (Buffalo), 2 Jan. 1836. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- Atkinson’s Saturday Evening Post* (Buffalo), 16 Jan. 1836. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- Boston Daily Advertiser*, 30 Jan. 1836, 2.
- Boston Recorder*, 29 Jan. 1836, 5. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- The Catholic Telegraph*, 4 Feb. 1836, 5. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- Christian Watchman*, 8 Jan. 1836, 17. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- Carter, Clarence Edwin, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, Vol. XXII, *The Territory of Florida 1821-1824*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1956.
- Carter, Clarence Edwin, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, Vol. XXIII, *The Territory of Florida 1824-1828*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1958.
- Carter, Clarence Edwin, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, Vol. XXIV, *The Territory of Florida 1828-1834*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1959.
- Carter, Clarence Edwin, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, Vol. XXV, *The Territory of Florida 1834-1839*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1960.
- Cohen, M. M. *Notices of Florida and the Campaigns*. A Facsimile Reproduction of the

1836 Edition with Introduction by O. Z. Tyler, Jr. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1964.

Daily Evening Transcript (Boston), 28 Jan. 1836, 2.

Daily Evening Transcript (Boston), 29 Jan. 1836, 2.

Daily Evening Transcript (Boston), 30 Jan. 1836, 2.

Daily National Intelligencer (Washington D.C.), 25 Jan. 1836, 3.

Daily National Intelligencer (Washington D.C.), 26 Jan. 1836, 3.

Daily National Intelligencer (Washington D.C.), 27 Jan. 1836, 3.

Dexter, Horatio S. *Observations on the Seminole Indians, 1823*: 1.

<http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.com/~texlance/seminoles/observations.htm>, Jan. 21, 2006.

“Editor’s Correspondence.” *Army and Navy Chronicle*, 17 Sept. 1835, 1. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

The Enquirer (Richmond), 19 Jan. 1836, 2.

The Enquirer (Richmond) , 23 Jan. 1836, 4.

The Enquirer (Richmond), 26 Jan. 1836, 2.

The Enquirer (Richmond), 28 Jan. 1836, 3.

“Farwell of the Seminole Chief.” *The Family Magazine, or Monthly Abstract of General Knowledge*, 1836, 4. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

“Indian Disturbances in Florida.” *Army and Navy Chronicle*, 14 Jan. 1836, 2. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

Liberator, 27 Feb. 1836, 6. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

Marine Farmer and Journal of the Useful Arts, 5 Feb. 1836, 4. Database Online, APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

McCall, George A. *Letters From the Frontier*. A Facsimile Reproduction of the 1868 Edition with an Introduction and Index by John K. Mahon. Gainesville: The University Presses of Florida, 1974.

Missall, John, and Mary Lou Missall, eds. *This Miserable Pride of a Soldier: The Letters And Journals of Col. William S. Foster in the Second Seminole War*. Tampa: University of Tampa Press, 2005.

Morse, Jedidiah. A Report to the Secretary of War on the United States on Indian Affairs. New Haven: Converse, 1872. In the *American Culture Series II*.

New York Evangelist, 30 Jan. 1836, 7. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

New York Evening Post, 19 Jan. 1836, 2.

New York Evening Post, 27 Jan. 1836, 2.

New York Herald, 22 Jan. 1836, 2.

New York Herald, 26 Jan. 1836, 2.

New York Herald, 27 Jan. 1836, 2.

New York Herald, 28 Jan. 1836, 2.

Niles' Weekly Register, 2 May 1835. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

Nile's Weekly Register, 2 Jan. 1836, 49. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

Nile's Weekly Register, 9 Jan. 1836, 49. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

Nile's Weekly Registry, 30 Jan. 1836. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

Nile's Weekly Registry, 6 Feb. 1836, 49. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

Pennsylvania Intelligencer (Harrisburg), 25 Jan. 1836, 1-2.

Pennsylvania Intelligencer (Harrisburg), 28 Jan. 1836, 1.

Potter, Woodburne. *The War in Florida*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Inc., 1966.

"Seminole Indians." *Army Navy Chronicle*, 5 Feb. 1835, 1. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

"The Seminole Indians-War in Florida." *Army and Navy Chronicle*, 21 Jan. 1836, 2-3. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

- “The Seminole Reply.” *The Family Magazine, or Monthly Abstract of General Knowledge*, 1836, 4. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- “Seminole War.” *Army and Navy Chronicle*, 28 Jan. 1836, 2-4. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- “Seminole War.” *Army and Navy Chronicle*, 4 Feb. 1836, 2. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- “The Seminole War: Subaltern.” *Army and Navy Chronicle*, 4 Feb. 1836, 2. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- Simmons, William H. *Notices of East Florida*. A Facsimile Reproduction of the 1822 Edition with Introduction and Index by George E. Butler. Gainesville: University Florida Press, 1973.
- Smith, Robert. “An Indian Story.” *Parley’s Magazine*, 1 Jan. 1834, 2. Database Online. APS Online.
- Sprague, John T. *The Origins, Progress, and Conclusion of the Florida War*. A Facsimile Reproduction of the 1848 Edition with Introduction by John K. Mahon. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1964.
- Workingman’s Advocate*, 13 June 1835, 6. Online Database. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.
- Workingman’s Advocate*, 2 Jan. 1836, 7. Database Online. APS Online, Jan. 21, 2006.

Secondary Sources

- Adams, Mikaela M. “Savage Foes, Noble Warriors, and Frail Remnants: Florida Seminoles in The White Imagination, 1865-1934,” *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 87 no. 3 (Winter 2009) : 404-435.
- Atkinson, James R. *Splendid Land, Splendid People: The Chickasaw Indians to Removal*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2004.
- Baptist, Edward E. *Creating an Old South: Middle Florida’s Plantation Frontier before the Civil War*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Bederman, Gail. *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Berkhofer, Jr. Robert F. *The White Man’s Indian: Images of the American Indian from*

- Columbus to the Present*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.
- Boris, Eileen. "From Gender to Racialized Gender: Labor Bodies That Matter," *International Labor and Working Class History* 63 (Spring 2003), 10.
- Brevard, Caroline Mays. *A History of Florida*. [electronic resource] New York: American Book Company, 1919.
- Brown, Bertram Wyatt. *Honor and Violence in the Old South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Brown, Bertram Wyatt. *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Brown, Bertram Wyatt. *The Shaping of Southern Culture: Honor, Grace, and War, 1760s-1890s*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Brown, Canter, Jr. "The Florida Crisis of 1826-1827 and the Second Seminole War," *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 73, no. 4 (April, 1995): 419-442.
- Brown G. M. "Ponce de Leon land and Florida war record" [electronic resource] St. Augustine: The Record printing company, 1902.
- Brown, M.L. "Notes on U. S. Arsenals, Depots, and Martial Firearms of the Second Seminole War" *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 61 no.4 (April, 1983) : 445-458.
- Buker, George E. *Swamp Sailors in the Second Seminole War*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1997.
- Covington, James W. *The Seminoles of Florida*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993.
- Davis, Angela Y. *Women, Race, & Class*. New York: Random House Inc., 1981.
- Deloria, Phillip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Denham, James M. "'Some Prefer the Seminoles': Violence and Disorder Among Soldiers and Settlers in the Second Seminole War, 1835-1842," *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 70 no.1 (July, 1991): 38-54.
- Dorsey, Bruce. *Reforming Men and Women: Gender in the Antebellum City*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Frank, Andrew K. *Creeks and Southerners: Biculturalism on the Early American*

- Frontier*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.
- Fredrickson, George M. *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971.
- Friend, Craig Thompson and Lorri Glover, ed. *Southern Manhood: Perspectives on Masculinity in the Old South*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2004.
- Guinn, Jeff. *Our Land Before We Die: The Proud Story of the Seminole Negro*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam, 2002.
- Hofstadter, Richard. *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, Revised Edition. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1944.
- Higginbotham, Evelyn Brooks. "African-American Women's History and the Metalanguage of Race," *Signs* 17 no. 2 (Winter 1992), 253-254.
- Hunt, Michael H. *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.
- Kimmel, Michael. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York: The Free Press, 1996.
- Kokomoor, Kevin. "A Re-assessment of Seminoles, Africans, and Slavery on the Florida Frontier," *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 88, no. 2 (Fall, 2009) : 209-236.
- Laumer, Frank. *Dade's Last Command*. With a forward by John K. Mahan. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1995.
- Littlefield, Jr. Daniel F. *Africans and Seminoles From Removal To Emancipation*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1977.
- Mahon, John K. *History of the Second Seminole War 1835-1842*, revised edition. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1985.
- Mccoy, Drew R. *The Elusive Republic: Political Economy in Jeffersonian America*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- Milanich, Jerald T. *Florida Indians: and the Invasion from Europe*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1995.
- Moore-Willson, Minnie, *The Seminoles of Florida* [electronic resource] Philadelphia: American, 1896.

- Mulroy, Kevin. *Freedom on the Border: The Seminoles Maroons in Florida, The Indian Territory, Coahuila, and Texas*. Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 1993.
- Onuf, Peter S. and Leonard Sadosky. *Jeffersonian America*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.
- Porter, Kenneth W. *The Black Seminoles: History of a Freedom-Seeking People*. Revised and Edited by Alcione M. Amos and Thomas P. Senter. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1996.
- Porter, Kenneth Wiggins, "Florida Slaves and Free Negroes in the Seminole War, 1835-1842," *The Journal of Negro History* 28 no. 4 (Oct, 1943) : 390-421.
- Porter, Kenneth Wiggins. "Negroes and the Seminole War, 1835-1842," *The Journal of Southern History* 30, no. 4 (Nov., 1964): 427-450.
- Purdue, Theda. *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change, 1700-1835*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Purdue, Theda. *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society 1540-1866*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1979.
- Riordan, Patrick. "Seminole Genesis: Native Americans, African-Americans, and colonists on the southern frontier from prehistory through the colonial era" Ph.D. diss., The Florida State University, 1996).
- Rivers, Larry Eugene. *Slavery in Florida: Territorial Days to Emancipation*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000.
- Roediger, David R. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*, revised edition. New York: Verso, 1999.
- Rotunda, E. Anthony. *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era*. New York: BasicBooks, A division of HarperCollins Publishers, Inc., 1993.
- Saunt, Claudio. *A New Order of Things: Property, Power, and Transformation of the Creek Indians, 1733-1816*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Sprague, John T. *The Origins, Progress, and Conclusion of the Florida War*. A Facsimile Reproduction of the 1848 Edition with Introduction by John K. Mahon. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1964.
- Weisman, Brent Richards. *Unconquered People: Florida's Seminole and Miccosukee Indians*. Gainesville: Florida University Press, 1999.

White, Richard. *The Roots of Dependency: Subsistence, Environment, and Social Change among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and the Navajos*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983.

Wright, J. Leitch. *Creeks and Seminoles: the Destruction and Regeneration of the Muscogulge People*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990.